INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9108083

The self in relation to others: Concerns about death

Brown, Jody, Ph.D.

City University of New York, 1990

Copyright ©1990 by Brown, Jody. All rights reserved.

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

A

THE SELF IN RELATION TO OTHERS: CONCERNS ABOUT DEATH

by

JODY BROWN

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

1990

© 1990

JODY BROWN

All Rights Reserved.

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

September 24, 1990
Date

Douglas Kimmel
Chair of Examining Committee

September 25, 1990
Date

Herbert D. Saltzstein
Executive Officer

Douglas Kimmel

Gregory M. Herek

Howard Ehrlichman

Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

Abstract

THE SELF IN RELATION TO OTHERS:

CONCERNS ABOUT DEATH

by

Jody Brown

Adviser: Professor Douglas Kimmel

The present research was designed to examine, first, whether people with systematically different relationships to the power structure of the social order, as manifested in gender, race, and class, have systematically different notions of the self-in-relation-to-others? Specifically, do women, people of color, and members of the working class focus on more interpersonal issues involving attachment and connection in constructing meaning in their world? Correspondingly, do men, whites and members of the middle and upper classes focus on more intrapersonal issues involving autonomy and separation in their constructions of reality?

Second, do people with systematically different notions of the self-in-relation-to-others have systematically different concerns about death? Specifically, do people who are primarily oriented toward interpersonal issues focus on the death of the other and loss? Correspondingly, do people who are primarily oriented toward intrapersonal issues focus on the death of the self and missed accomplishments?

A Death Concerns Scale (DCS), focusing on Inter/Intrapersonal concerns was constructed, using 230 college students. Its reliability and validity were evaluated. The DCS and three personality measures were used to test the hypotheses on a separate sample of 255 college students.

There was a highly significant effect for gender. Women scored more interpersonally than men on both the personality measures and on the DCS. There were no significant effects for race or for occupational status in general.

Separating out mother's and father's occupational status, there was a significant effect for mother's occupational status--respondents whose mothers had high status occupations had higher intrapersonal scores on the DCS than respondents whose mothers had low status occupations. There was a significant gender by occupational status interaction effect on the DCS for father's occupation. Females with high status fathers, had higher intrapersonal scores than females with low status fathers. In contrast, males with high status fathers had lower intrapersonal scores than males with low status fathers.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I wish to thank the many respondents who gave generously of their time and their thoughts. Without them, the work would not exist. My adviser, Douglas Kimmel, was a steadying and helpful influence in the dissertation process. Gregory Herek brought good humor and much helpful advice. Howard Ehrlichman was there with sound advice when it was needed.

Without the daily help of the staff at the computer center, the data analyses would have been very difficult. Danny Choriki stands out for his statistical and software knowledge, and, more, for his unfailing good humor, generosity and sense of perspective.

I thank Diane Poland, Joyce Block, Margaret Fogel, Susan Soverel, and Barbara O'Connor for their friendship and faith in me. My son and my dog, unbeknownst to them, helped keep it all in perspective. Tom Menaker and Buzzy Chanowitz inspired me from beginning to end. My husband, Kit Staton, believed and was always there when I needed him.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter | Page

Chapter Page

TABLES LISTING

Page

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

As humans, we exhibit from birth two powerful characteristics: we are social, and we have an urge to mastery or competence. Both inherent and external forces influence the development of one's social tendencies and the extent and direction of one's urge to mastery.

How we make sense of and interpret our world is a constant and active process shaped by many factors including our position in the social order as "insiders" or "outsiders." This research is interested in the influence of the perspective of the "insider" or "outsider" (manifest in gender, race and class) on one's sociality and mastery tendencies--here discussed in terms of the self in relation to others and society.

Additionally, how one organizes one's experience in the world influences how we cope with life events--death and dying, for example. This research is additionally concerned with examining the influence of place in the social order (and sociality and mastery) on an individual's concerns about death.

The Self in Relation to Others and Society

The Interpersonal/Intrapersonal Orientation

Previous theory and research have addressed what have been seen as two "opposing tendencies" manifest in all humans (Carlson, 1972)--what will be referred to here as the interpersonal/intrapersonal orientation. This orientation is a way of defining the self in relation to others and society. It is more than the self-concept as this has traditionally been construed. It is the self-acting-in-the-world and organizing life experience in a particular way. It focuses on the extent to which the self is oriented to issues of interpersonal concern--with others--as against issues of intrapersonal concern--with the self. Everyone has aspects of both interpersonal and intrapersonal orientation in his or her makeup. Certain life experiences, however, related to one's place in the social order may lead to some groups of people being more one than the other.

The terms "interpersonal" and "intrapersonal" as used here synthesize the work of a number of different theorists who have talked about a similar concept in slightly different ways. Bakan (1966) called the tendencies agency and communion. Spence and Helmreich (1978) have called them masculinity and femininity. Gilligan (1982) and Lyons (1983) have focused on the connection between images of the self in relationship (connected or separate) and moral reasoning (arguments of responsibility or rights). Lykes

(1985) has focused on the individualistic versus collectivist nature of the self.

Bakan's (1966) is perhaps one of the most succinct and oft-quoted descriptions of these two opposing tendencies:

> Agency manifests itself in self-protection, self-assertion, and self-expansion; communion manifests itself in the sense of being at one with other organisms. Agency manifests itself in the formation of separations; communion in the lack of separations. Agency manifests itself in isolation, alienation, and aloneness; communion in contact, openness and union. Agency manifests itself in the urge to master; communion in noncontractual cooperation. Agency manifests itself in the repression of thought, feeling and impulse; communion in the lack and removal of repression. (pp. 14-15)

The following definitions of the two self orientations are an amalgam of Bakan, Chodorow (1974, 1978), Gilligan, Lyons, and Lykes. Both orientations are concerned with relationships and others, but for each the meaning of relationship is different in emphasis, form and substance. For the intrapersonally oriented individual, the self's relationship with others tends to be a means to an end of making one's individual mark in society. For the more interpersonal individual, the self's relationship with others tends to be an end in itself. The focus is on the process and meaning of relationships for their own sake.

Someone with a predominantly intrapersonal orientation focuses a great deal of attention on oneself and one's needs, desires and accomplishments. The self is seen as separate from, if equal to, others. Autonomy is stressed. Relationships with others are usually seen in terms of the

needs of the self. The needs of the other, the group, or the community are secondary. Relationships with others are often instrumental in nature. The fact of the relationship itself is not as important as the goal of the relationship. Objective rules, rather than the feelings or needs of the other participants and the situation, govern relationships with others. Achievement in a task is important as a primary source of a sense of mastery and self-esteem. Failure for the intrapersonal individual is the lack of mastery, achievement, autonomy and missed opportunities for accomplishments.

Someone with a primarily interpersonal self-orientation focuses a great deal on other persons, their needs and desires, and the furtherance of the group or community. Oneself is seen as interdependently connected to others. One's commitment is to the survival of the group and not to individual self-advancement. Relationships with others are stressed. Responding to others in terms of their needs and in the specific aspects of the situation is important in relationships. Caring for others, maintaining relationships, and contributing to the cohesion and advancement of the group and community are important sources of self-esteem. A sense of mastery is attained through mutual cooperation, enhancement of the group, and being part of a working whole. Failure for the interpersonal individual is the loss of relationships and the inability to resolve issues that prevent mutual collaboration on shared

tasks and goals--in effect, the failure of the group as a viable organism, whether it be a dyad, a family, or a community.

Attachment and Separation

By being concerned with the self in relationship to others, the interpersonal/intrapersonal orientation fundamentally deals with issues of attachment and separation. Those who are more interpersonal can be said to be more focused on attachment and being connected to others and those who are more intrapersonal are seen as being more concerned with being separate from others.

This dimension of attachment-separation is most clearly seen at the two extremes of the life cycle--birth and death. Stern (1985) maintains that infants are very social and separate from birth, and that a great deal of what goes on in early infancy is learning to relate. This is in contrast to those (e.g. Mahler et al., 1975) who theorize early symbiosis and lack of separation. Stern maintains that the infant is an active participant in the social interaction between him/herself and the primary caretaker. The infant initiates contact by crying, looking, focusing attention on the other. The infant also initiates separation, or distance, by breaking eye contact or turning away. In the newborn (Stern's work focuses heavily on the first year of life), the interpersonal and intrapersonal seem to be in a balance between self and other reference.

What will be of interest here is how the balance between attachment and separation gets skewed, in association with social structure and cultural values, so that many people end up with a perspective that emphasizes only one of the opposing tendencies. (See Bakan, 1966, and Lykes, 1985, for critiques of our agentic/individualistic culture, and see Chodorow, 1978, Gilligan, 1982, and Miller, 1976, for critiques of a culture that encourages the lack of intrapersonal concern in many women.)

Concerns about Death

These systematic differences in how people view the self in relation to others were examined by observing how meaning was organized in a particular context, concerns about death. Like infancy, death centrally involves issues of attachment and separation. Death raises concerns about separation from others as well as the possibility of not realizing one's life goals. It can also highlight the attachments to others one does, or does not, have. Death ends one's immediate relationship with others, threatening attachment and forcing separation. It also terminates one's relationship to society. The contemplation of death can raise questions for people about the meaning of their lives and what is important to them; it can raise the fear of loss, whether that be of a relationship or of the opportunity to achieve some career goal or individual creation.

Thus, the relative emphasis and focus of those with the primarily interpersonal or intrapersonal orientation may be expected also to shape their concerns about death. For example, one might expect someone with a primarily intrapersonal orientation to be more focused on concerns about the death of the self and missed personal accomplishments in his/her life. The individual who is more interpersonally oriented, in contrast, may be expected to be more concerned about the death of the other and the loss of relationship.

Previous Theory and Research: Interpersonal/Intrapersonal Orientation

Gender-Linked Research

Most previous theory and research have tended to link the interpersonal/intrapersonal orientation with gender. Following are three very different examples (Bakan, 1966; Gilligan, 1982; Spence & Helmreich, 1978) of the gender-linked approach.

Being and not being. Bakan (1966), in discussing the two opposing tendencies in his book, The Duality of Human Existence, argues that agency represents the existence of the organism as an individual and that communion represents the participation of the individual in a larger organism of which it is a part. While both males and females have aspects of both agency and communion in their makeup, Bakan

maintains that, overall, men tend more toward agency and women tend more toward communion.

The primary feature of communion is its involvement in relationships among organismic units. The primary feature of agency is its involvement in the process of differentiation, specialization, and separation of function within and between organismic units. For Bakan, the important aspects of agency are the separations that take place within the psyche--"man" from God, associates, and family, and in work--separation of production from use and "work" from the household.

Bakan's book is also a critique of the dominance of agency in our society and in our science. He argues for the necessity of the incorporation of both tendencies, in ourselves and in our culture. While his discussion of these issues is primarily psychological, he incorporates a structural argument (based largely on Weber) in his discussion of the "unity" of Protestantism, or the Protestant personality, and capitalism. He then links these to the dominance of agency in our culture. (Sampson, 1978, makes a similar point.) Unfortunately, the structural interpretation of the roots of agency stops here. In contrast, Bakan even seems to try to tie the differences between men and women in their expressions of agency and communion to some biological differences between the sexes, although he acknowledges that his theory does not quite fit the reality.

Of particular interest here, Bakan combines a discussion of these two opposing tendencies, agency and communion, with concerns about death--or, in his language, the "ultimate concern"--being and not being. "[T]he singular impulse of man [is] to appreciate the nature of his existence." (p. 5) Bakan sees a great deal of human activity involved in a search for answers to the ultimate concern of being and not being. "The self-definitional activity of man, in substance and in concept, is his most abiding characteristic." (p. 5) (Becker, 1973, makes a similar argument.)

Bakan sees these two fundamental modalities as existing in all living organisms and that our choice in searching for answers to the ultimate concern is the way we "go it"--alone or together. Thus, in the relation between life and death, our accustomed ways of being may determine how we think of our life and our death.

It is not difficult to see that if these suggestions about agency and communion are true, they would have implications for the way death is construed. Bakan describes the agentic as being more focused on "self" issues and the communal as being more focused on "other" issues. Their images of death, then, might follow these distinctions, with the interpersonal being more concerned about the loss of the other and the intrapersonal being more concerned about their own death and what that means to them.

There is some empirical support for Bakan's assertions. Carlson (1971) in testing Bakan's conceptions of agency and communion, found that there is a "consistent picture in which males represent experiences of self, others, space and time in individualistic, objective and distant ways, while females represent experiences in relatively interpersonal, subjective, immediate ways in responding to a range of common tasks" (pp. 270-271). In describing affective experiences, males' responses were judged primarily agentic and females' responses were judged primarily communal/mixed (both communal and agentic themes).

"Masculinity" and "Femininity". Spence and Helmreich (1978; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1975) have done extensive empirical research on the psychological dimensions they call masculinity and femininity, concepts which are comparable to what have here been called the intrapersonal and interpersonal orientations. "Femininity," or "female-valued" characteristics, were described as the more "expressive" behaviors and likened to Bakan's notion of communion. The "masculine," or "male-valued," characteristics were described as reflecting more "instrumental" behaviors and were likened to Bakan's notions of agency.

Utilizing their scale, the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) (see Appendix E), they measured the existence of "masculinity" and "femininity" in a broad range of respondents. They were among the first to document and

strongly support the orthogonal nature of the dimensions and their existence independently in both males and females, and to separate them conceptually from sex roles and stereotypes. They believe these dimensions to be descriptive of core differences between men and women, and to be stable predispositions with cross-situational stability. They have found them to be distinguished from male and female sex-role stereotypes, and to be only weakly related within each sex to actual behavior.

While Spence and Helmreich have carefully detailed the kinds of socio-cultural, economic and historical inputs that could have influenced the development of these differences, they stop short of any kind of sustained structural analysis. Their samples included working class respondents, but they found no significant class differences on "masculinity" and "femininity" in their samples. They indicated that their subjects were almost exclusively white, so they have no data on possible race differences in "masculinity" and "femininity". It seems that ultimately, for them, the dimensions are essentially psychological and are linked to gender per se. In fact, they hint at possible links to "genetically" determined sex differences, while acknowledging a lack of expertise in this field.

Gender and moral reasoning. Building on Chodorow's (1974, 1978) and Miller's (1976) theories of gender differences as well as existing empirical work, Gilligan (1977, 1982) has developed a model of moral development

which parallels the distinctions found between the intrapersonal and interpersonal orientations. This model takes into account the different socialization experiences of boys and girls in the formation of their gender identity and basic sense of self (see also Maccoby, 1990). Gilligan maintains that one's conception of oneself is closely related to one's conception of morality. Males and females, thus, have different perspectives from which to view the world in which they act. They have, in her argument, different "voices" with which to describe this world, its conflicts and its moral choices. As elaborated by Gilligan, women's moral reasoning, in which relationship and connection are primary, is one of responsibility to and caring for others. Men's moral reasoning is one of rights in which the consideration of individuals and non-interference is primary. The problem for men's moral choices is exercising one's rights without interfering with the rights of others. The problem for women's moral choices is limiting responsibilities without abandoning moral concern. Men's mode of thinking about moral problems is formal and abstract, and universal principles determine the ultimate good. Women's mode of thinking about moral problems is contextual and narrative, and non-violence to the self and others is the ultimate good.

Gilligan's work developed, at least in part, as a critique of Kohlberg's (e.g., 1969) theory and stages of moral development which were based on empirical work with

all-male samples. She argued that Kohlberg's tasks and scoring procedures ignored women's types of moral reasoning and that women tended consistently to score lower on Kohlberg's stages of moral development, as his scales did not take into account male/female differences in moral reasoning.

Two review articles of the literature on moral development (Lifton, 1985; Walker, 1984) addressed the question of whether there are, in fact, gender differences in moral reasoning. Walker (1984) examined only those studies which reported testing for sex differences, and which used Kohlberg's scoring system (where Gilligan would expect to find the largest differences). In summarizing his results, Walker indicated that only 8 samples out of 108 examined "clearly indicated significant differences favoring males" (p. 688). More studies--20 out of 108 samples--reported differences, but 6 of them favored females. For the remaining 6, Walker questioned the validity of the differences, based on dubious analysis or possible confounds, and excluded those samples from the ones showing "clear" sex differences. He concluded that the moral reasoning of males and females is remarkably similar.

Three additional points are worth noting in Walker's review. First, there is no information on race or class in the review, so we do not know whether these variables are potential confounds in the results--in either direction.

Walker himself raised this as an issue for the 13 studies focusing on adults (21-65 years old).

Second, Walker noted that Kohlberg had in fact introduced conceptual and scoring procedure changes in his theory. At least in part, these changes were intended to better differentiate content from structure. In line with this Walker pointed out that all but two of the studies finding sex differences in his review used earlier scoring systems. It may be that what Gilligan saw as deficiencies in Kohlberg's theory and methodology have been at least partially addressed if not completely corrected.

Third, Walker grouped the studies he reviewed roughly by developmental stages: (a) childhood and early adolescence; (b) late adolescence and youth (high school and university students); and (c) adulthood (21-65 years old). Grouping the studies this way revealed an interesting "trend". Of the 41 samples examining childhood and early adolescence, 5 showed small but significant differences in which the females were more "advanced." Of the 46 late adolescent and youth samples, 10 reported significant but small differences in which males showed more "mature" development. It is in the studies of the adults that the sex differences were more substantial than in the first two groups, and the men were found to have more "mature" development than the women. One could interpret this trend as the taking hold and solidifying of sex-role socialization. In fact, recent research by Gilligan (1990)

(also reported by Prose, 1990) supports this view. She notes a shift from a firm to a tentative voice as girls move well into adolescence.

Lifton (1985) reviewed 45 studies reporting sex differences in moral development. (Thirty of the studies used Kohlberg's scoring procedures.) Eighteen of the studies found a significant main effect for sex. Of those, 14 used Kohlberg's scoring procedures. Like Walker, Lifton found that when sex differences were reported, females tended to be more "advanced" in moral development in childhood, and males tended to be more "advanced" in adulthood. Lifton refers to adolescence as a "crossover" period--some studies found females more advanced and others found males more advanced. Lifton interpreted these results as being related to social roles and expectations, not biological sex.

Lifton's focus in studying moral development has been on individual differences in personality. He noted that 47% of the studies using Kohlberg's model reported sex differences. However, none of the six studies focusing on individual differences, or person/situation interactions, and using models other than Kohlberg's, found sex differences. Lifton concludes that sex differences are more the exception than the rule and are associated most often with Kohlberg's model.

Lifton's review also does not include data on race and class, so we do not know if those demographic characteristics influence the data or not.

Lyons (1983), working with Gilligan, explored the relationship between conceptions of self and types of moral reasoning. She identified two modes of self-definition, focusing on the self-in-relation-to-others: the self was rated as either separate/objective or connected/interdependent. The two modes of consideration in moral choice were: (a) "rights and justice"--in which reciprocity, rules and roles were important; and (b) "response and care"--in which response to others' needs, caring and interdependence were important. Those individuals identified as "connected/interdependent" tended to use consideratons of "response and care," while those individuals identified as "separate/objective" tended to use considerations of "rights and justice."

The data from the study were then examined with regard to gender differences in self-conceptions and bases of moral choice. While both males and females used both types of considerations in making moral choices, there were differences in frequency within each gender. Females more often used considerations of "response and care" than considerations of "rights and justice." Males more often used considerations of "rights and justice" than considerations of "response and care." With regard to modes of self-definition, females more often described themselves

in ways that could be characterized as "connected/interdependent," while men more frequently described themselves in ways that could be characterized as "separate/objective."

Gilligan's view need not be confined to moral development, however. Apart from whether there are differences in that dimension, there may be differences in other dimensions.

> In view of the evidence that women perceive and construe social reality differently from men and that these differences center around experiences of attachment and separation, life transitions that invariably engage these experiences can be expected to involve women in a distinctive way. (Gilligan, 1982, p. 171)

Death and dying is just such a life transition in which Gilligan might expect men and women to be involved in distinctive ways. To the extent that interpersonally and intrapersonally oriented individuals have different images of the self in relation to others, Gilligan maintains that experiences involving attachment and separation may be seen in different ways. For example, people with different orientations to the self in relation to others may have different responses to the idea of interacting with a dying person. If Gilligan's ideas are correct, the more interpersonally oriented individual might be more inclined to interact with a dying person feeling the responsibility of response and care and the importance of relationship and connection. The more intrapersonally oriented, by comparison, might be more inclined to see the situation in

terms of non-interference or maintaining separation and autonomy.

A limitation in Gilligan's work is the lack of explicit consideration of a structural interpretation for the differences she finds (see Epstein, 1988). She locates them in gender, or differing male and female experiences. There is, however, no sustained attempt to explain why male and female experience consistently differs. Every attempt to explain the difference approaches a more fundamental explanation, but a firm link with the structure of the social order is never quite made or fully explored.

Gilligan's methodology also ensured that a fuller explanation would not be made, because her sample consisted of a particular, homogeneous group within the social structure--white, middle- to upper-class, highly educated. The only category reflecting differences in status and power is gender--which is where Gilligan and Lyons find differences. (See Parlee, 1981, for a discussion of the relationship between control groups and theory.) A more heterogeneous sample with different racial and class categories may make evident that differences in conceptions of the self as "connected" or "separate" are a function of place in the social order (i.e., outsiders or insiders) and not a function of gender per se.

Limitations of the Gender-Linked Approach

> The quest to establish laws of social behavior lures scientists and other people to see patterns

> and uniformities which are artifacts of intervening variables. (Epstein, 1985, p. 34)

Many factors influence how we organize our perceptions of the world we inhabit. Some of them are quite idiosyncratic having to do with an individual's particular history. Others have to do with the various groups of which we are members--e.g., gender, class, age, ethnic or cultural--for each group has a particular kind of knowledge and experience associated with its place in society which can influence how the members of that group will perceive and structure any given experience, so that members of a group share, within a range, a set of experiences (Krauss, 1976; Matras, 1975; Smith, 1979; Turner, 1984). This occurs in a particular sociohistorical and economic context, which is always in the process of evolving (Berger & Luckmann, 1967; Shotter, 1983). (See Marks [1988-89] for a discussion of the relation between the structural parameters of race, sex, age and education on attitudes toward suicide, for example.)

Some social groups have higher status, power, prestige and access to material resources than others. They are "dominant." They occupy a higher place in the social hierarchy in relation to others. Other groups are "subordinate" and have less status, power, prestige, and access to material resources. Some characteristics that convey status, prestige and power can be acquired, or lost--e.g., money, education, occupation--allowing mobility

between strata in the society. Other characteristics conveying status in a society are ascribed--i.e., with one from birth--as in gender and race.

One can argue that those who are more intrapersonally oriented can "afford" to be that way--they are more dominant in the hierarchy and have the psychic and economic leisure to attend to their own needs and goals. Sampson (1978), for example, sees, on the one hand, the "intrapersonal" in the larger historical context of Protestantism, Capitalism, male dominance and the development of Science, whose values were individualism, achievement, mastery and detachment. On the other hand (argues Miller, 1976, for example), those who are more interpersonally oriented are more subordinate and "need" to attend to others, the dominants and each other, in order to survive. They do this either by pulling together or by currying favor with and rewards from the dominants.

The development, elaboration and acting out of sex-roles always takes place within a particular cultural, social, historical, political and economic context (e.g., Ortner & Whitehead, 1981). Given this, it is startling to note both the degree of similarity in "core" gender roles across cultures (Barry et al, 1957) and time (Bloch, 1978), as well as the fact that these are not at all immutable, but quite variable (Mead, 1935). The origins of these gender roles then can be attributed to the choices made by those in power in a society as to how to organize the various groups of members--who shall be dominant and hold authority, and

which traits will be linked to which gender in ways that will support the existing social order.

Even within western, industrial cultures there are differences in sex-role socialization across time and among subcultures or various ethnic groups. This is, in itself, an argument for a structural analysis of the distribution of the interpersonal/intrapersonal orientation. The fact that women are not universally interpersonally oriented and that men are not universally intrapersonally oriented opens up the possibility that these are not only gender issues but issues about dominance and subordination in the society--so that groups which may share subordinate positions, e.g., women, Blacks and the lower classes in the United States, for example, may also, theoretically at least, share some common experiences and thus a perspective for ordering their world. There is a small amount of evidence that this may be the case (Carlson & Levy, 1970; Haan, 1978; Stack, 1986).

Most theorists and researchers exploring the interpersonal/intrapersonal orientation acknowledge the importance of the socio-cultural, economic and historical context in influencing the development and maintenance of these opposing tendencies. However, they usually do not actually utilize an interpretation that takes into account power and authority in the social order and the link between the interpersonal/intrapersonal orientation and the existing social power structure. Chodorow (1974, 1978), Miller (1976), and Lykes (1985) are notable exceptions. They have

shown how the distribution of the interpersonal/intrapersonal orientation among different groups is both representative of that order and can be used to maintain it.

Since a great deal of psychological research (including the literature on gender differences) has been conducted with young, white, educated, middle class students (Carlson & Carlson, 1960; Grady, 1981; Schultz, 1969; Sherif, 1979; Smart, 1966; Wallston, 1981), it is necessary to raise the question of whether theories about gender differences developed in this particular group can be extended to other class, ethnic and cultural groups, and whether one can in fact speak of gender differences when the sample is so limited.

Theory and Research from a Social-Structural Perspective

Chodorow (1974, 1978) identifies her perspective as a sociological and psychoanalytic one, and she sets the development of the differences she sees between men and women firmly in a structural framework. She argues that women's mothering is part of the structure of the social organization of gender--part of how sexual inequality is produced and reproduced. Every society has a "sex/gender" system which is socially constructed and systematically reproduced. The reproduction of mothering "occurs through social structurally induced psychological processes" (1978, p.7).

Chodorow also argues that while society's arrangements of gender roles are analytically separate from the organizaton of production, in fact, they are intertwined. In a western, capitalist society, for example, the home and workplace are usually separate, and the mothers (or women) are usually home with the children, while the fathers are away at work.

Chodorow holds, with psychoanalysts, the idea that "personality" is the result of "social-relational experiences from earliest infancy" (1974, p. 45), but she argues that the social structure sets parameters for the kinds of experiences the child will have.

> Culture and personality theory has shown that early experiences common to members of a particular society contribute to the formation of typical personalities organized around and preoccupied with certain relational issues. To the extent that females and males experience different interpersonal environments as they grow up, feminine and masculine personality will develop differently and be occupied with different issues. The structure of the family and family practices create certain differential relational needs and capacities in men and women that contribute to the reproduction of women as mothers. (1978, p. 51)

For Chodorow, that women are universally responsible for child care is a structural issue--a historical fact that sets parameters on the kinds of experiences male and female children will have due to the nature of the development of gender identity. She argues that this is the case across many cultures, but focuses on white, middle-class western culture as a specific example and one from which psychoanalytic theory has derived. Boys and girls in

identifying themselves as male and female, respectively, will have different experiences growing up and therefore different ways of dealing with and resolving relational issues. (See also Gutmann, 1965.)

Chodorow maintains (like Miller, 1976) that females define themselves in relation and connection to other people more than males do. This is, at least partly, a function of the fact that males, in order to achieve their masculine gender identity, must separate from the mother with whom they have been identifying in their early infancy. With girls this is not the case. They continue to identify with the mother and take on those feminine aspects and female role activities they experience with her in their daily life.

Chodorow argues that because most fathers are usually not present during the majority of the child's waking time, the boy's identification with the father and masculine activities is usually of a fantasied masculine role, rather than of a close masculine, personal relationship. As a result, the boy tends to define masculinity largely as <u>not</u> feminine and not involved with women, with whom he spends a large part of his childhood. Concomitant with this is a denial of attachment and relationship. Thus, the boy's basic identity comes to be associated with separation and autonomy issues, and identification with a usually absent father--one who is, therefore, more abstract. The girl's basic identity, on the other hand, is a function of a continuing

real relationship with the mother and other women. Even though the girl must transfer her primary sexual object choice from mother and women to father and men, "issues of separation from and attachment to her mother remain important throughout a woman's life" (1974, p. 53).

Issues of attachment and separation are identified as central in Chodorow's argument. As a result of the structure of child care arrangements in contemporary western society and the postulated nature of the development of gender identity, males and females exhibit different ways of resolving the relationship of the self to others and society. To speak in extremes, if boys deny attachment and relationship, and girls are bound up in relationship, their ways of organizing meaning for death, which heightens issues of attachment and separation, should be different from each other.

In addition, Chodorow argues that most mothers experience and thus treat their boy and girl children differently. They are more likely to identify with a girl child (and also with their own mother) and to experience their daughters as like themselves, and thus to help them to differentiate less, while the son is defined as masculine, in opposition to her, and is pushed toward differentiation.

Socialization of boys and girls has been found to reinforce these basic differences in gender identification (Block, 1983). Socialization of boys pushes toward achievement and self-reliance in the public sphere, with

denial of emotional involvement and dependency. Socialization of girls emphasizes nurturance and responsibility in the private, domestic sphere with involvement with and connection to others.

Miller (1976) specifically linked the differences between men and women in interpersonal/intrapersonal orientation to questions of domination and subordination--or issues of power and authority in the social order. Although she focused on the psychology of women, she also noted that gender, race and class are all ascribed characteristics in which some groups of people in each category are subordinate to some other groups. In this way, she laid the theoretical groundwork for seeing that there may be something that various members of these groups may share by virtue of being subordinate to other groups in the social order.

Miller maintains that subordinates have to be very attuned to the dominants in order to survive, by pleasing them in order to get what they need. Miller argues that they end up knowing more about the dominants than they do about themselves. Another aspect of this is a tendency on the part of the subordinates to rely on and support each other, to have an awareness of what it takes to survive, and to have a subculture that contains hidden defiance. The

dominants who have the power to define social reality* are thus deprived of "knowing" the subordinates, and of getting feedback on their own actions and thus self-understanding.

The subordinates also become the "carriers" in society of certain aspects of human experience--usually those aspects that deal with "feelings of vulnerability, weakness, helplessness, dependency and the basic emotional connections between an individual and other people" (p. 22). These feelings, which have particular relevance for perceptions of death, are cultivated in women and denied and dreaded in men--partly because they are associated with being feminine. However, they are also feelings which we all as humans can expect to experience. Many men may feel them unmanly, while many women who feel them may be more comfortable with these feelings and have less need to deny them.

Silverberg's (1985) work with men confronting death confirms Miller's assertions on these points--at least with regard to men. The idea of death or dying can readily be expected to engender feelings of vulnerability, weakness and helplessness. In the face of this, people of both orientations might be expected to cling more tenaciously to their primary orientation with the more intrapersonally oriented people asserting mastery and control and the more

---

*Kearl (1986-87), in a provocative article examining structural issues in the reporting of deaths, analyzed obituaries from Time and Newsweek over a 56 year period looking at racism, sexism and ageism.

interpersonally oriented people being focused on loss and the other.

With respect specifically to the psychology of women, as one of the subordinate groups, Miller argues that the organizing principles around which men's and women's psychic structure is founded are different. Women's self-worth is concerned with taking care of and giving to others. Activities are seen as more satisfying when they take place in the context of relationships to other human beings. Women, therefore, often find ways in which to translate their motivations into a means of serving others. In fact, Miller maintains that the organization of one's life around serving others is so central to women that many other aspects of female life relate to it. "Eventually, for many women the threat of disruption of an affiliation is perceived not just as a loss of a relationship but as something closer to a total loss of self." (p. 83)

Men, by contrast, argues Miller, judge themselves by how well they measure up to the demands of their culture. To be a man means to separate oneself from women and girls and the things that they do. Men tend to be independent, to go it alone, to want to win, to be concerned with their own, not other's development. Men have delegated to women parts of their experience as humans that make them feel vulnerable. Men are as concerned about attachment and affiliation, but the concern is buried and affiliation can

seem an impediment, a loss, a danger. (See Pollak & Gilligan, 1982, for empirical support of this point.)

What are the implications of these differences for perceptions of death? If the intrapersonal are more concerned about the demands of the culture and the interpersonal are more concerned about the loss of a relationship, their concerns about death could very well be quite different--particularly if for the interpersonal the loss of the relationship approaches the loss of self, or at least a part of the self.

Lykes' (1984, 1985) work is a structural critique of the dominant view of the self in western society. This dominant view maintains that the self is autonomous and separate, and it ignores the socio-historical context of its subjects as well as the social context of the development of psychological knowledge. This autonomous self is primarily descriptive of white, middle-class, educated, American males. Lykes maintains that women, people of color and the working class are "not faithfully represented by self-theories that emphasize autonomy and individualism" (p. 357). This is a result of the cultural meaning of the self being determined by our society's resolution of the relationship between the individual and society, which reflects the dominant power structure and excludes the "self experience" of those who are not in power--i.e., women, people of color, and the working class.

Lykes proposes a concept of "social individuality" which includes a sense of the self as part of a community, interdependent with other selves, but is also a self whose individuality does not disappear in the group. In some ways this self parallels the woman in Gilligan's scheme of moral development who, while considering what is best for all, does not lose a sense of her own needs. It also resembles Bakan's ideal mix of agency and communion and Chodorow's wish that women in caring for and being connected to others not lose a sense of their own needs and sense of agency in the world. While similar to the above, Lykes' social individuality has a heavier emphasis on the social and political aspect--collective experiences embedded in a social context; group solidarity and responsibility; relatedness to family, friends, society.

As Lykes maintains that social individuality is a function of position in the social order held by those who are subordinate to the power structure, or by those who are involved in "socially responsible collective activities," it is a notion of the self in relation to others that can be held by people of color and the working class, as well as by women.

Lykes tested this conceptualization of the self empirically using four indices of social individuality. She expected them to be positively correlated, and she expected those persons from less powerful groups, as well as those involved in collective activities, to evidence more social

individuality than others. She selected her respondents to include persons from various socioeconomic groups, as well as those who engaged in collective activities, e.g., a tenants' organization.

Lykes found that the four social individuality measures were, in fact, interrelated and that they were associated with collective experience. She particularly examined the relationship between gender and social individuality and found that gender differences on the individual measures of social individuality were only slight. She also found that for women the four measures were positively and significantly correlated, while for men the intercorrelations among the four measures were weaker and mostly nonsignificant. Lykes conjectured that social individuality may operate in different ways for men and women, or that it may be less pervasive for men, or that it may exist at a different stage of development for men and women.

Lykes argued that differences in demographic characteristics or life experience may better explain social individuality than whether one is male or female. For example, she found that participation in collective activities, higher education and lower occupation are associated with higher scores on social individuality for women.

What Lykes' work has done is to test empirically the notion that the two opposing tendencies discussed here are

not linked to gender per se, but are linked to one's place in the social order and to collective experience. Her results support a structural interpretation of the data and not simply a sex-linked one. As all of Lykes' respondents were white, the relation of race to social individuality could not be determined.

Beyond the White, Middle-Class, Educated American

A few studies have looked at the relationship between race/ethnicity and class and the interpersonal/intrapersonal orientation. These studies have specifically examined sex roles, agency/communion differences, and moral reasoning, but their results are relevant for the self orientation distinctions examined here. Their results also lend support to the view that the interpersonal/intrapersonal orientation is related to place in the social structure and not gender alone.

Romer and Cherry (1980) examined ethnic and social class differences in children's sex-role concepts. Black, Italian and Jewish children (5th, 8th, and 11th grades) were asked to describe a typical male, a typical female and then themselves on a 10 item bipolar Likert scale. The females described themselves as more expressive and less competent than did the males. Females perceived greater differences in expressiveness between the male and female sex-role stereotypes, while males perceived greater differences in competence between the male and female sex-role stereotypes.

Italian males described themselves as significantly more expressive than did Jewish and Black males. Black children's descriptions of the male sex-role stereotype were significantly more expressive compared to Jewish and Italian children. Black children perceived male and female sex-role stereotypes to be most similar on the expressive dimension--significantly more than Jewish children and more than Italian children.

Middle class boys described themselves as significantly more expressive than did working class boys. For Blacks, middle class status brought greater sex-role differentiation than was found among working class Blacks. For Jews and Italians middle class status brought greater sex-role blending.

Romer and Cherry conclude that education as an indication of status tends to wash out ethnic differences (among white ethnics); that class tends to wash out ethnic differences; that in the middle class male and female roles are more blended together, except for Blacks; and that in the working class male and female roles are more traditional, except for Blacks.

Romer and Cherry's work strongly highlights the importance of considering race and class when examining such culturally laden issues as sex-role concepts and self-images.

Carlson (1971), in her empirical work on Gutmann's and Bakan's theories, noted that the agency/communion

differences believed to exist between men and women were more likely to be found in a white, "Protestant ethic" culture. She cited some examples of studies with Blacks in which the differences did not hold and both genders tended to have the interpersonal orientation.

Carlson and Levy (1970), in two studies on self, values and affects with Black college students, found that the differences between men and women in social versus personal orientation usually observed in white college students did not emerge with the Black students.

Gilligan has been criticized by some for proposing a general theory of gender differences in moral dvelopment when most of her research was done with young, white, educated, middle-class persons. Stack (1986), while appreciative of Gilligan's work, notes some interesting parallels with and differences from her own work with Black return migrants to the rural South.

> . . .[T]he caste and economic system within rural southern communities creates a setting in which Black women and men have a very similar experience of class, that is, a similar relationship to production, employment, and material and economic rewards. . . . The data suggest that under conditions of economic deprivation there is a convergence between women and men in their construction of themselves in relationship to others, and that these conditions produce a convergence also in women's and men's vocabulary of rights, morality and the social good. (pp. 322-323)

Stack has found that both Black men and Black women, whose ties to kin and community are very strong, speak in one voice about "concern for reciprocity, commitment to kin and community and belief in the morality of responsibility"

(p.324). These concerns would be those of most women in Gilligan's work.

Haan (1978), in investigating formal, logical principles of morality versus interpersonal morality taking place in a particular situation with particular persons, discovered an interesting difference between the all-White and all-Black groups playing a "last survivors on earth" game. One of the decisions to be made by each group involved whether or not to let a possibly contaminated survivor join them. All the White groups decided on rational, formal grounds not to let the possibly contaminated survivor join them, and did not consider that they themselves might be contaminated. All the Black groups decided on interpersonal grounds to let the survivor enter, and did consider the possibility of their own contamination. There were no reported differences between the male and female Blacks. Haan did report, however, that the White females initially disagreed but then capitulated to the White males' point of view.

Haan's results here assume a more coherent form in light of Stack's analysis of Black return migrants for whom the group or the community is highly salient. They depend on it for survival. Their morality, therefore, assumes a concern for reciprocity and a commitment to community. Might we not then find differences between Blacks and Whites with regard to (White) gender-linking of interpersonal concerns?

Previous Theory and Research:

Death and Ambiguity--The Construction of a Reality

In a very real sense, our task as social beings is to construct meaning in our lives. To make sense of our world is a constant, if not always conscious preoccupation, and it is very much a social process.

Ambiguity of One's Own Death

Unlike other animals, one of the things we "know" as minded humans is that we will, at some point, die. We are thought to be unique among animals in having this knowledge. In some basic way this knowledge defines our lives, if only by setting a time limitation on them. Even though we know we will die, it is a peculiar kind of knowledge in that we do not experience death, integrate it or not, and move on. Instead, death stops our experiencing and the observing ego who manages the experiencing is no longer. In this way, death is supremely ambiguous and often frightening.

Some argue that it is death that gives meaning and structure to life (Yalom, 1980; Becker, 1973). Yet how do we understand death, this basic fact of existence? We can never know it from experiencing it directly. At best our experience of our own death is indirect or vicarious. Freud (1959/1915) said of it:

> Our own death is indeed unimaginable, and whenever we make the attempt to imagine it we can perceive

> that we really survive as spectators. Hence the psychoanalytic school could venture on the assertion that at bottom no one believes in his own death, or to put the same thing another way, in the unconscious every one of us is convinced of his own immortality. (pp. 304-305)

Simone de Beauvoir (1977) noted:

> I may try to come closer to it by fantasies, by imagining my corpse and the funeral ceremonies. I may meditate upon my absence: but it is still I who meditate. (p. 491)

And Becker (1973) argued that in some basic, organismic way it is extremely difficult for us to understand the fact of our non-being. As humans, we have minds that are capable of imagining times and places our bodies will never see. And yet this mind is trapped in a limited animal body which eats and defecates and eventually rots. How do we make sense of this?

Lifton (1979) contributed a thoughtful point by questioning the literality of the "I" involved and raising the idea of connection in perhaps its largest sense.

> There is also the crucial question of the literality of the "I" involved. While "I" will cease to exist (which is why I cannot imagine my own death), elements of my "self"--of its (my) impact on others (children, students, friends, and, one may hope, readers)--will continue. These will exist not as a cohesive entity (the self as such) but as a part of a human flow that absorbs and recreates the components of that impact to the point of altering their shape and obscuring their origin. I can well imagine <u>that</u> process, and doing so contributes importantly to my acceptance of the idea of my own death. (p. 8)

<u>Ambiguity of Others' Death</u>

Death has been and in some ways still is a taboo topic in polite everyday conversation in this country. In spite

of the proliferation of literature on death and dying in the last twenty years, ours is a culture that glorifies youth and emphasizes productivity (the agentic mode). It has elaborated few norms that show us how to deal with the fact of death in our lives or that help us to accept the reality of death as a part of life. Aries' (1981) compendium on death shows us different cultures' and different eras' ways of confronting death through their writings, art and iconography. It gives us historical and cultural perspective in which to examine our culture's denial of death.

With the institutionalization and increased specialization of American medicine in the latter half of the 20th century (Starr, 1982), as well as the control of infectious disease with the introduction of miracle drugs, it is common for many Americans to reach adulthood without having witnessed the death of a relative or friend (Thomas, 1983). The death bed scenes common in 19th century novels (e.g., Tolstoy, The Death of Ivan Ilych) are not commonplace in this country today. There is less closeness with older family members and little direct experience of their death. Death, like other important life events, has become the province of the experts (Illich, 1976; Ehrenreich & English, 1979). It has moved out of the home and into the institutions, depriving the dying of control over the end of their lives--and depriving the rest of us of familiarity with a basic life experience and preparation for it. Since

we do not have a cultural structure on which to hang death experiences, how do we organize our images of death and what do they look like?

Because of its ambiguity, death can be the occasion for the observance of the construction of a reality. And because of its ambiguity, finality and importance to us all, most people experience fear, dread or anxiety about death at some point, if we do not avoid dealing with it altogether. But events conspire to make us confront death in some way, if only by seeing it in the media. Therefore, we must have some idea or image of what it is and what relevance it holds for our lives.

Sherif (1966) has shown that in the face of ambiguous situations, people work to create norms so that they can order their experience. Schachter and Singer (1962) demonstrated how we look for clues in the environment or immediate situation in order to define what is happening to us. In the absence of established norms to which we can turn, we may define the ambiguous situation with that which is pragmatic, familiar and near. In the case of ambiguous, normless death, the reliance on characteristic ways of organizing perceptions of ourselves in relation to others and society would not be surprising. People with systematically different social/interpersonal contexts for the organization of experience could be expected to have systematically different ways of organizing a meaning for death.

The Psychological Literature on Death

The psychological literature on death can be grouped into three main areas: (a) fear/anxiety studies; (b) cognitive, attitudinal studies; and (c) clinical studies. Several things are striking as one examines the literature in each area. The fear/anxiety studies are by far the largest group, certainly in terms of the empirical work done. They are also done almost exclusively by male researchers; they utilize a scale methodology with items that more often focus on the death of the self; and they focus on the degree of affect, not the content of the fears or anxieties about death.

The more cognitively focused attitudinal studies are small in number. In fact, Kastenbaum and Costa (1977) and Kastenbaum (1987-88) decried the lack of cognitive studies in the literature on death and dying and pointed out that the total human orientation to death is too complex to be subsumed under the concepts of fear and anxiety. The researchers who pursue cognitive studies seem to be more evenly mixed between male and female. Their methodology includes more open-ended and projective techniques, with a focus on exploring the content of people's thoughts and images of death and dying.

The more clinically oriented literature, which is also large, tends to be more often written by women (often nurses and other health care professionals) and often for women (also nurses, as well as other health care professionals).

The focus of this work is essentially interpersonal relationships--the psychological care and needs of the dying person, his/her family and friends, as well as the needs of the health care professionals whose work constantly involves them with dying people. The methodology of this literature is sometimes within the scope of the more traditional scientific paradigm, but more often it is based on anecdotal and case history evidence. This is more in the tradition of the psychoanalytic literature in which years of concrete "hands on" experience, mixed with creative intelligence can result in thoughtful and insightful ways of looking at and dealing with a particular reality. Kübler-Ross' (1969) work with dying patients, Silverberg's (1985) focus on the special needs of the dying male patient, Benoliel's (1972) work on nursing care for the dying, and Miles' (1980) work on nurses' attitudes toward dying patients are good examples of the mix in this literature, both in the content and the methodology.

What we can see here is a split in the psychological literature on death that itself approximates the split between the interpersonal and intrapersonal orientations. The more intrapersonal studies are the fear/anxiety studies with a focus on control, objectivity, separation. The more interpersonal studies are the clinical ones with the needs of the other and interpersonal relationships being primary.

Gender differences in the literature on death. As there are as yet no studies looking at the connection

between the self in relation to others and concerns about death, we will turn to an examination of gender differences in the psychological literature on death.

If Gilligan, Bakan, and Spence and Helmreich are right in linking the interpersonal/intrapersonal orientation to gender, it would be surprising for there not to be differences between men and women in the concerns they have about death. Yet the death attitudes literature is inconclusive at best about these gender differences. A review of the literature on gender differences in attitudes toward death (Lester, 1967; Kastenbaum & Costa, 1977; Durlak & Kass, 1981-1982; Pollak, 1979-1980; Conte Weiner & Plutchik, 1982) reveals a paucity of research focusing on gender differences in death attitudes. Even many of those studies that do address gender differences simply include gender as one of a number of demographic variables examined.

Conflicting results are reported in those studies that do examine gender as a variable in death attitudes. For example, women are reported to be more anxious about or fearful of death than men (Iammarino, 1976; McDonald, 1976; Ray & Najman, 1974). Men are more threatened by death than women (Krieger, Epting & Leitner, 1974). There are no gender differences in anxiety about or fear of death (Dickstein, 1972, 1978; Templer, 1970; Rhudick & Dibner, 1961; Marks, 1986-87). The conflicting results are found primarily in the fear/anxiety studies. The more cognitively oriented studies generally support the differences we would

expect from the interpersonal/intrapersonal orientation literature. This is directly due, I believe, to the use of scores indicating degree of affect in the fear/anxiety studies in contrast to a focus on content of death concerns in the more cognitive studies.

Death fear and death anxiety. In researching death fear and anxiety, scales have been developed to measure these constructs--for example, Templer's Death Anxiety Scale (1970) and Collett and Lester's Fear of Death scale (1969). Krieger, Epting, and Leitner (1974) developed the Threat Index utilizing a personal construct approach in an attempt to give personal meaning to the concept of death threat. This new methodology has not, however, clarified the lack of conclusive results with regard to gender differences. Krieger, Epting, and Leitner (1974) found men to be more threatened; Neimeyer, Dingemans, and Epting (1977) found women scored higher on the Threat Index; and others found no differences (Rigdon, Epting, Neimeyer & Krieger, 1979).

In looking for gender differences in the death fear/anxiety studies there are, I believe, three problems. The first is a general problem affecting consistency of results in the death literature in general. A number of different scales are used, some of which have been modified; and different populations are used, so that there is little opportunity to discover possibly consistent results.

The second problem has to do with scale scores. Unidimensional scale scores can often hide an area of

difference. The obvious way to deal with that problem is to factor the scale and look for differences in the various factors. Work of this sort has been done in the death anxiety and fear of death literature, although the results with regard to gender differences are still confusing. Collett and Lester (1969) have factored their Fear of Death scale into "death of self," "dying of self," "death of others" and "dying of others" and have found low intercorrelations among these four factors. Lester (1972) found that females had a greater fear of death only in specific areas of concern: e.g., death of self, death of others and dying of self, but not in fear of dying of others and general fear of death.

The third problem is far more limiting. Most studies looking at gender differences in death attitudes seem not to have utilized any theoretical or conceptual basis for their examination of possible differences. For the most part, neither the factors nor the larger constructs in this literature allow gender differences to emerge. They simply do not measure the areas in which we might expect to find differences between men and women in death attitudes. One could expect men and women to be equally afraid of or anxious about death but to express that fear/anxiety in different ways. The content or focus of their concern and the meaning death has for them might be different. For example, women might be more focused on the loss of loved ones in thinking about death, while men might be more

focused on their own death and goals they have yet to achieve in life.

Most recently Florian and Kravetz (1983) have developed a Fear of Personal Death scale. This scale differs from its predecessors in two respects. First, it focuses on fear of personal death as opposed to death in the abstract and death of others. Second, conceptually of interest for this study, it has considered the different qualitative meanings people could attach to their death. This multi-dimensional scale has three major components: the intrapersonal, interpersonal and transpersonal consequences of death. That is, they are looking at people's concerns about mind and body issues, about impact on friends and relatives, and about beliefs concerning transcendence of the self.

It looks promising but has its own limitations. First, the scale was developed on an all male Israeli sample. Second, and of more immediate conceptual importance to the interpersonal/intrapersonal construct, the scale focuses on fear of personal death only, so there is no possibility of expressing fear of loss of the other.

Cognitive studies of death. A few studies in the literature on death point to perhaps more fruitful methods and areas of investigation. Lowry (1965) in an unpublished dissertation examined male-female differences in attitudes toward death. He was looking at content images about death and the projective techniques he used--TAT stories--uncovered consistent differences between men and women. For

men, the dominant theme in the stories constructed was of violence and mutilation. For women, the dominant theme was of loss. A secondary theme for men was failure and frustration, and for women it was being deeply mourned. Lowry saw these differences in attitudes toward death as being extensions of male-female differences in general and adopted the terms from Bakan of "agency" and "communion" as descriptive, respectively, of male and female strategies for the conduct of life and thus attitudes toward death.

Lowry's methodology allowed these differences to emerge. As part of his original study he had directly questioned his subjects (10 male and 12 female college students) as to their attitudes toward death. These questions elicited expressions of indifference. However, when asked to construct stories about death to seven cards (with no obvious death themes) of the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT), and one card of a gravestone with indistinct markings, the expressions and images in the stories were rich and vivid.

Lowry did a second study to confirm his results and check on some aspects of interpretation of those results. Sixteen male and sixteen female college students were given the same projective materials as in the first study. Additionally, they were asked to construct stories about "a person in a hospital," "love and death," "a male who dies," and "a female who dies."

Lowry concluded that his results indicated basic male/female differences in dealing with feelings of helplessness. Males assert themselves with violent images and females search for a love object. It is an inference on Lowry's part that the differences had to do with feelings of anxiety and helplessness. It is perphaps more accurate to simply see them as differences in the organization of experience in a particular context.

Selvey (1973) partially replicated Lowry's study utilizing death stories to the TAT cards and also found that women had more stories with loss themes than did men. However, there were no differences between men and women on themes of violence and mutilation. Selvey, like Lowry, found that in both men's and women's stories the sex of the person who dies was more often male than female: males' stories--67% male deaths, 10% female deaths; females' stories--54% male deaths, 20% female deaths. Selvey also reported that women "generally seem to associate the topic of death with thoughts of others dying. Males, on the other hand, seem more likely to personalize their concerns about death" (p. 217).

In a more recent study in a similar vein, Weller, Florian and Tenenbaum (1988-89), examined perceptions of masculine and feminine attributes in the concept of death. Israeli college students were asked to relate sex traits to their concept of death. The authors found that death was

seen in overwhelmingly "masculine" terms for both males and females, but more so for females.

Schneidman (1973) in a national survey (30,000 responses) of attitudes toward death conducted by Psychology Today did not find many differences in attitudes about death between men and women. What he did find, however, is consistent with Lowry's and Gilligan's findings. He found that men were more willing to sacrifice their lives for an idea or moral principle while women were more willing to sacrifice their lives for loved ones. Of those people who knew whether or not they wanted to outlive their spouse, 33% of the men said "yes" while only 18% of the women said yes. When asked to give reasons for suicide, women cited loneliness, loss of loved one, atomic war. Men cited failure, disgrace and the avoidance of physical pain and sickness. One can infer from this that for many women, the loss of a primary relationship appears as traumatic as death.

Kübler-Ross & Worden (1977) asked attendees at workshops and lectures on death and dying given by Dr. Kübler-Ross to complete a questionnaire assessing various aspects of death experience. Women comprised 82% of the 5,274 men and women completing the questionnaire. (The questionnaires were filled out by 85-100% of the workshop attendees.) Seventy-six per cent of the women were nurses.

Perhaps because of the relatively small number of men in the Kübler-Ross and Worden study, only two areas of sex

differences were noted. "Present concept of death" was seen by men as being associated with God and heaven while for women it was associated with great emotional pain. Men's "concerns as death approaches" focused on having their affairs in order, while women focused on loneliness and saying goodbye.

Interaction with the dying. In the large clinical and sociological literature on death and dying there is a recurring theme--the isolation and loneliness of the dying person. They are often segregated not only from healthy people, but also from the familiar context of their lives. Wortman and Dunkel-Schetter (1979), Quint (1965) and Glazer and Strauss (1965) document the unwillingness of many medical professionals to talk to the dying about their impending death. The families of the dying patients are also often too threatened to talk about it with them. All this makes it very difficult for the dying to have the opportunity to work through their dying and death in order to gain as much control and integrity over it as their life had had (e.g., Kübler-Ross, 1969).

Silverberg (1985) in a thoughtful article on "men confronting death" discussed how masculine sex-role socialization and values can affect a man's behavior as a dying patient or as the family member of a dying patient. What Silverberg highlights in his discussion is the conflict between the masculine value system and the situation of dealing with death and dying in which masculine values are

often either abrogated or are sometimes dysfunctional. For example, the masculine sex-role emphasizes control, power and competition (O'Neil, 1981), while the reality of the dying person, particularly if he is hospitalized, gives him very little opportunity to exercise any kind of control over his life without the concerted and conscious effort of health care professionals. His power and his ability to compete are diminished. Success and achievement are highly valued but the dying man is often faced with a sense of declining self-esteem and feelings of inadequacy--Have I achieved enough? Also discussed is the inhibiting effect of the masculine value of "constrained emotionality." It is considered "feminine" to cry or be emotional, thus inhibiting interaction and working through with loved ones whether the man is the dying patient or the relative of the dying patient.

Silverberg emphasized that these conflicts in dealing with death are real threats to the man's identity as a man--and that there is, therefore, a need to validate the male patient's right to behave within the boundaries of traditional masculinity.

The Silverberg article highlights by contrast the ways in which traditional female sex-role socialization would make many women more "at home" in the context of death. In their world dependency, emotions, relationships with others, intimacy, and talk about personal feelings are the norm. Whatever conflicts exist would seem to focus less on a

woman's identity as a woman and more on the reality of loss in death. Traditional American female sex-role socialization is, therefore, more congruent with the tasks of dealing with death and dying, while traditional American male sex-role socialization is often in conflict with the tasks and reality of death and dying in our culture.

While Silverberg focused on masculine sex-role socialization as it impacts on a man's behavior in confronting death and dying, it is also likely that a man's perceptions about death would be similarly influenced by his sex-role values.

There is anecdotal and case history evidence that breaking the fear and communication barrier between the "living" and the "dying" has enormous benefits for both (see Bard, 1966; Bursztajn et al., 1981). In Bursztajn et al. (1981) a case history of a death in the home is presented and the impact on the family is discussed a year later:

> "For me this has been a new part of life that I'm learning about. As I get older I'm trying to adjust to death myself. It seems it's not as terrible as I thought it was. It's just another thing that we go through. We're born, we live, and we die." (p. 344-45)

> "When I watched my mother take care of my grandmother, I pictured myself doing the same for my mother in thirty or forty years." (p. 345)

Interestingly enough, the first quote is from a man, and the focus is on his thinking about his own death. The second quote is from a woman and focuses on the relationship with

the dying person and the caretaking activity being passed on through generations of women.

What seems to be lacking too often in the lives of dying patients is someone who can hear them and be with them as they struggle to come to grips with their life's end. Lewis (1982), a psychotherapist, describes his experiences with dying friends and reflects upon the impact of those experiences on his functioning as a psychotherapist. His comments describe implications for therapy, but they could as easily describe implications for interactions with the dying:

> What may be different is the capacity to hear and be with patients as they struggle in psychotherapy with the same issues [e.g., life's meaning and running out of time]. Although my experiences with dying friends have not changed the sense of my accustomed self, nor the feedback from intimates about who I am, it seems to have increased my freedom to hear and to help others frame for themselves the conflicting polarities of this issue. I am not at all certain as to how the experiences have increased this capacity, but there is a sense of greater availability. Perhaps it is something like, having once stood next to the tiger, one has a few micrograms less fear. Not enough to reorient one's total life style--if one chose to, but enough to stand with one's patient as he or she looks the tiger in the eye. (p. 265)

Wangerin (1978) in a book of science fiction aptly describes an instance of profound empathy and its healing power. Chauntecleer's sons have just been murdered:

> Chauntecleer watched his own desolation appear in the brown eyes of the Cow, then sink so deeply into them that she shuddered. Her eyes pooled as she looked at him. The tears rose and spilled over. And then she was weeping even as he had wept a few minutes ago--except without the anger. Strangely, Chauntecleer felt an urge to comfort her, but at this moment he was no Lord, and the initiative was not in him. A

> simple creature only, he watched--felt--the miracle take place. Nothing changed: The clouds would not be removed, nor his sons returned, nor his knowledge plenished. But there was this. His grief had become her grief, his sorrow her own. And though he grieved not one bit less for that, yet his heart made room for her, for her will and wisdom, and he bore the sorrow better. (p. 140)

Given this problem of the physical and psychological isolation of the dying, one can ask if the emphasis by those with an interpersonal orientation on issues of responsibility, relationships, and caring for the other, might influence their willingness to interact with the dying. Dealing with death with a dying person can be very intimate.

Pollak and Gilligan (1982) found men to react frequently with images of violence to situations of affiliation. In this study 138 university men and women were presented with four TAT pictures. Two were chosen to represent situations of achievement and two to represent situations of affiliation. The stories written to the four pictures were then analyzed for the presence or absence of violent imagery by male and female in each type of situation--affiliation or achievement. A significantly greater proportion of men (25%) than women (6%) wrote about violence in situations of affiliation. The reverse was true for women. Sixteen percent of the women wrote violent stories in situations of achievement in contrast to 6.8% of the men. A content analysis of the stories showed that for men the danger in affiliation was a danger of entrapment,

rejection or betrayal. For women, the danger in achievement situations was of isolation--they feared being set apart and left alone.

The authors interpret these results to indicate that men and women perceive danger in different situations and construe it in different ways. For men, the situation of achievement is familiar, congruent with and valued in their sex-role, while that of affiliation is not. Their gender identity is forged in separation, making autonomy highly valued. For women, their gender identity is forged in continued attachment, making situations of affiliation highly valued and familiar.

Men's reaction to situations of affiliation with violent imagery could be seen as an argument against their willingness to interact with the dying. Do the interpersonally and intrapersonally oriented differ on this issue where morality and death join? Or is it simply too threatening for all of us and the ability to overcome the threat is a character issue, not a question of how one perceives the self in relation to the other?

There is some evidence in the literature on death attitudes that hints at possible male/female differences in willingness to interact with the dying. "Reluctance to interact with the dying" is one factor examined by Nelson and Nelson (1975) and Nelson (1979-80) as part of the multi-dimensionality of death anxiety. Durlak and Kass (1981-82) in a factor analytic evaluation of fifteen self-report death

scales found some evidence that being female was associated with less reluctance to interact with the dying. The fact that the vast majority of people attending Kübler-Ross' workshops on death and dying were women could be seen as further support for male/female differences in this area.

Statement of the Problem and Hypotheses

The Problem

First, do people with systematically different relationships to the power structure of the social order have systematically different notions of the self-in-relation-to-others? Specifically, do women, people of color, and members of the working class focus on more interpersonal issues involving attachment and connection in constructing meaning in their world? Correspondingly, do men, whites, and members of the middle and upper classes focus on more intrapersonal issues involving autonomy and separation in their constructions of reality?

Second, do people with systematically different notions of the self-in-relation-to-others have systematically different concerns about death? Specifically, do people who are primarily oriented toward interpersonal issues focus on the death of the other and loss? Correspondingly, do people who are primarily oriented toward intrapersonal issues focus on the death of the self and missed accomplishments?

The Issues

It is posited here that relationship to the social order, whether one is an insider or an outsider, will influence perspective, or way of organizing meaning, in one's world. The context for the organization of meaning being focused on here is one's self in relation to others--whether one is more interpersonally or intrapersonally oriented. Previous literature, discussed above, makes a strong case for the salience of gender in determining interpersonal or intrapersonal orientation. The argument is made here, however, that gender is an intervening not an explanatory variable, and as such it is one way of representing place in the social order. (See also Epstein, 1988; Crawford & Marecek, 1989; and Hare-Mustin & Marecek, 1988.)

Two other representations of place in the social order are race and class. Stack (1986) makes the case that Blacks, at least, tend to be more communal, partly as a function of their role as outsiders. Romer and Cherry (1980) stress the importance of class in washing out some ethnic differences. Richardson and Sands (1986-87), for example, also discuss the influence of income on attitudes toward death.

The salience of gender, race or class in organizing experience is very much dependent on the context under observation. We do not know which of these variables is more important in determining the inter/intrapersonal

orientation, but there is literature to support the importance of gender, and very little to differentiate between race and class at this point in this research. An argument can then be made that we might expect gender to be highly influential as a main effect, and race and class to contribute to interaction effects.

Theoretical Hypotheses

1. Outsiders, in comparison with insiders, will have a more interpersonal orientation in organizing experience.

2. Insiders, in comparison with outsiders, will have a more intrapersonal orientation in organizing experience.

3. Those people whose notion of the self in relation to others is primarily interpersonal will:

a. have more interpersonal concerns about death than those whose self-orientation is primarily intrapersonal;

b. and express less reluctance to interact with the dying than those with an intrapersonal orientation.

4. Insiders, in comparison with outsiders, will:

a. have more intrapersonal and less interpersonal concerns about death;

b. and express more reluctance to interact with a dying person.

CHAPTER 2: GENERAL METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

Overview

The research was divided into three parts: (a) construction of a Death Concerns Scale; (b) assessment of the reliability and validity of the Death Concerns Scale; and (c) testing of the hypotheses. The methodology for each part will be addressed in turn. First, some methodological issues that are relevant for all the research will be addressed.

Respondents

As one of the main points of this study was to examine the influence of place in the social structure on the interpersonal/intrapersonal orientation, and a major criticism of previous work was the homogeneity of the respondents, the primary emphasis in obtaining respondents for this research was to have a mix of gender, race (white/people of color), and class (upper- and middle-class/working class). The primary source of respondents was several colleges of the City University of New York, whose students are racially, ethnically, and economically mixed. A group of students from the University of North Carolina at Greensboro also participated.

Measurement of Race/Ethnicity

Race/ethnicity was measured by asking the respondents, "What is your racial or ethnic background? For example, are you White, Black, Puerto Rican, Chinese, Haitian, or something else?" In order to minimize ambiguity, respondents were also asked what countries or part of the world their parents came from, their first language, and where they lived when they were 16 years old (Sudman & Bradburn, 1982).

Race and ethnicity were combined into one variable for both practical and theoretical reasons. Practically, it is difficult to measure and code fine gradations of both race and ethnic divisions. It is also difficult to know what fine distinctions might mean in terms of behaviors and attitudes. This is not a study in those fine distinctions.

Theoretically, interest was focused on place in the social order, but in fairly crude, almost dichotomous terms --as in those highly placed in the social order versus those in the lower ranks. Historically in the United States, people of color and "foreigners" have tended not to be highly placed. For the most part they have not been in control, either politically or financially. This study has looked at how not being a part of the "powers that be" can influence how we organize and interpret our world.

Measurement of "Class"

Class has been variously defined in the sociological literature, from the more Marxist definitions of "conflict

groups" challenging the existing authority (e.g., Krauss, 1976) to more "cultural" definitions which talk about life style and similar world view (e.g., Matras, 1975). While there seems to be little agreement about which combinations of which characteristics determine class, and whether or not one has to be conscious of one's class, there does seem to be agreement that the notion of class is primarily economic. When it comes to operationalizing class, or socioeconomic status, the single most frequently used variable is occupation (e.g., Nam & Powers, 1983; Powers, 1982).

Nam and Powers (1983) reviewed previous measures of socioeconomic status and presented the work of the Census Bureau in the development of an updated measure of occupational status. They noted that occupational status refers to the objective socioeconomic conditions associated with holding a particular occupation, not the prestige. The status levels are determined primarily by the educational and income levels of the occupations in question. These scores were calculated for males in the civilian labor force in 1950 (and updated in 1970). The scores ranged from 0-100 and indicated an approximate percentage of males in the civilian labor force who had combined average levels of education and income below that of the given occupation.

Powers and Holmberg (1982) discussed the changes in occupational status scores introduced by the inclusion of women. They compared the 1970 occupational status scores for men with the 1970 occupational status scores for the

total population, men and women. The correlation between the two was +.98. In general, the impact was insignificant for the 589 detailed occupatons. However, there were significant negative differences for 26 of the detailed occupations. These were primarily traditional female occupations employing high proportions of women, and when women were included in the sample, because they are paid less than men, the status of those occupations dropped significantly. Powers and Holmberg argued that at this point in time, we should have a realistic assessment of occupational status by including women in the base, and that their contribution to the class position of their family should be taken into account.

The occupational status scores advocated by Powers and Holmberg (and by Nam & Powers, 1983) have recently been updated for the 1980 census by Nam & Terrie (1988). This study has utilized these most recent occupational status scores as an indication of class. Occupational status was determined for the parents of the respondents as they were college students. Both mother's and father's occupations were elicited, and the higher occupational status of the two was used to classify the respondent.

Grouping of the Occupational Status Scores

In deciding how to group the occupational status scores, a combination of considering (1) roughly how the types of occupations sorted by scores and (2) the percentage of the sample falling into the groupings was used. This

resulted in the following three groups, each comprising approximately one-third of the sample: 1-45; 46-75; 76-100. The first group comprised menial and unskilled labor, many unskilled service occupations, the lower range of white collar workers, the lower range of precision or craft and construction workers, and many sales workers. The second group included solid white collar positions, administrative support, precision production, craft and repair occupations and their supervisors, and many technical workers. The third group was primarily professional, administrative and managerial.

Procedures and Ethical Considerations

In each of the three parts of the research data were collected by means of a self-administered questionnaire. Participation was entirely voluntary and all respondents signed informed consent forms (Appendix A). Respondents were solicited in several ways:

1. We requested volunteers at the end of a class and offered them an incentive in the form of a choice between an instant lottery ticket and $1 in cash. They were given the incentive when they returned the questionnaire at the next class.

2. We scheduled groups of volunteers to fill out the questionnaire as part of "subject pool" procedures. They either received extra credit or fulfilled some part of their psychology course requirement by volunteering.

3. A group of sociology students was given extra credit for their voluntary participation.

In all cases (except for the UNC, Greensboro, group), the author was present to introduce the study, go over the points in the cover letter (Appendix A), and answer any questions. For the subject pool administration, when the respondents were finished filling out the questionnaire, the purpose of the research was explained in more detail, and the respondents were encouraged to ask questions and to discuss their reactions to the questionnaire and the study.

In the cover letter respondents were informed that if they wished to be sent a summary of the results at the conclusion of the study, they should put their name and address on an envelope, which we supplied, and turn in the envelope separately from their questionnaire.

As the research dealt with a sensitive topic, more consideration than usual was given to emphasizing to respondents that their participation was entirely voluntary. We were also concerned that for some respondents, answering some of the questions could be emotionally upsetting by recalling the death of someone to whom they were close. Therefore, during the subject pool administration, the author was present during the entire administration and attentive to possible emotional upset. If this had occurred, the author was to approach the respondent, inquire if they wished to cease participating in the study, and whether or not they wished to talk about what was upsetting

them. Referral to appropriate counseling centers was to be offered. The emphasis in any instance was on sensitivity to the needs of the respondent at the time. There were no dramatic occurrences, but there were several thoughtful and painful post questionnaire discussions which helped to ground the author in the reality of the experiences out of which the death concerns scale had grown.

CHAPTER 3:

CONSTRUCTION OF A DEATH CONCERNS SCALE

Development of the instrument

The Death Concerns Scale (DCS) is theoretically focused on two main subscales: Interpersonal and Intrapersonal concerns about death. A third subscale, "Reluctance to Interact with the Dying" (RID), consisting of three items (Nelson & Nelson, 1975), has been shown to demonstrate gender differences in other research (Durlak & Kass, 1981-82) and is included here as part of the Death Concerns Scale. The items are:

"I would not mind working with dying persons."

"I would willingly talk to a dying person about his/her coming death if s/he wished to discuss it."

"I would hate to visit a dying friend."

Interpersonal concerns about death are focused on concerns about the death of the other and the loss of relationship and connection. Intrapersonal concerns about death are focused on the death of the self and missed accomplishments. The items for the two subscales were generated from a variety of sources. Approximately one third of the items were inspired by or directly taken from the Florian and Kravetz Fear of Personal Death Scale (1983). Three items were inspired by Dickstein's Death Concerns

Scale (1972), and four were inspired by Conte, Weiner & Plutchik's Death Anxiety Questionnaire (1982). The remainder grew out of the following sources: theoretical conjecture; things people have said to the author; conversations overheard; novels, books and articles on death and dying; quoted responses to questions in other studies on death; newspaper articles with quotes on death and dying. A total of thirty-seven items were generated to represent the interpersonal and intrapersonal concerns about death (see Appendix B).

Three judges (psychologists), after being instructed in the definitions of the interpersonal and intrapersonal orientations, were asked to sort the items in the Death Concerns Scale into categories labeled Interpersonal, Intrapersonal or neither/either. There was complete agreement on 26 of the 37 items (70%) in the appropriate category. On an additional 8 items (22%), two of the three judges agreed on the appropriate category. For the remaining three items, there was either complete disagreement, or two of the three judges placed the item in the either/neither category. It was decided that there was sufficient agreement on 92% of the items to warrant using all 37 items in the factor analysis, letting the analysis itself determine appropriate inclusion in the final scale.

Respondents

There were 230 respondents to the scale construction questionnaire. Their distribution among the four colleges

was as follows: City College (100), Brooklyn College (70), Baruch (19), Greensboro (41).

Questions on gender, age, race/ethnicity, and occupation yielded the following information. There were 77 males (34%) and 152 females (66%). (One student did not identify his or her gender.) The age of the respondents ranged from 17 to 52. Eighty-four percent of the respondents were in the age range 17 to 25. Fifty percent of the respondents were White; 16% were Hispanic; 26% were Black; 2% were East Asian; and 4% were "other" (primarily from India and the Middle East).

The distribution of occupational status scores by race/ethnicity and gender for the sample is presented in Table 1. As can be seen, there is a relationship between race/ethnicity and occupational status. More whites than people of color are represented in the higher occupational status categories; and more people of color than whites are represented in the lower occupational status categories. Additionally, the Blacks in this sample are more evenly distributed over the three occupational status categories than are the Hispanics who are clustered in the two lower categories. When the table is collapsed into occupational status by whites and people of color (Table 2), the inverse relationship between race and occupational status can be seen most clearly.

The above data demonstrate that a mix of gender, race/ethnicity and class, or occupational status scores, was

Table 1

Demographics of the Scale Construction Sample:

Occupational Status Broken Down by Race/Ethnicity and Gender

Occup'l Status[a]	White	Hispanic	Black	E. Asian	Other
		Male (N=72)			
1-45	10	6	4	1	1
46-75	11	5	2	1	2
76-100	23	1	3	0	2
		Female* (N=142)			
1-45	11	15	17	1	1
46-75	31	5	13	1	1
76-100	26	2	15	1	2

[a]Higher numbers indicate higher occupational status.

* Pearson Chi Square = 23.39 (8 d.f.), $p < .01$

Table 2

Occupational Status Broken Down by Race:

Scale Construction Study

Occup'l Status[a]	Whites	People of Color
1-45	21	46
46-75	42	30
76-100	49	26

Note: N=214
Pearson Chi Square = 17.95 (2 d.f.), p < .001

[a] Higher numbers indicate higher occupational status.

achieved with the group on which our construction of the death concerns scale was based.

Factor Analysis of the Death Concerns Scale

The 40 items were administered to the sample of 230 college students. The items were completions of the statement "What concerns me most about death is _____." The respondents indicated on a Likert-type scale how correct the statement was for them, from "1" (totally incorrect for me) to "7" (totally correct for me).

The 40 initial items in the Death Concerns Scale were subjected to a principal components factor analysis (SPSSX, Norusis, 1985) using listwise deletion of missing values. The resulting number of cases analyzed was 215. Oblique rotation was employed (Rummel, 1970) because it does not force orthogonality and allows the natural correlations (or lack thereof) between factors to emerge. Analysis with varimax rotation yielded similar results. The goal of these analyses was a scale of 20-30 items.

In the initial extraction, eleven factors had eigenvalues higher than one, but a plot of the eigenvalues showed the scree beginning after the third factor (Norusis, 1985). Therefore, an oblique rotation was run extracting three factors. Three factors were predicted: Intrapersonal concerns, Interpersonal concerns and reluctance to interact with the dying. The three factors resulting from the oblique rotation conformed to these expectations. The eigenvalue for factor one (Intrapersonal concerns) was 9.32,

accounting for 23.3% of the variance. The eigenvalue for factor two (Interpersonal concerns) was 3.67 accounting for 9.2% of the variance. And the eigenvalue for factor three (Reluctance to Interact with the Dying) was 2.35, accounting for 5.9% of the variance. The three factors accounted for 38% of the total variance in the analysis of the 40 items. The inter-factor correlations were: factors one and two, -.27; factors one and three, .09; and factors two and three, -.08. The Interpersonal and Intrapersonal factors were expected to be primarily independent, but if there were any relationship it was expected to be negative. The correlation of -.27 between factors one and two conformed to these expectations.

Ten items each from the Intrapersonal and Interpersonal factors with the highest factor pattern loadings were selected for inclusion in the final scale (see Appendix B), as well as the three items for the "reluctance to interact with the dying" factor. All items had loadings of .50 or higher. See Table 3 for the items and their loadings on the three factors. Table 4 presents the correlations between the items and the scale. They range from .44 to .67. See Table 5 for the means and standard deviations for the individual items. A factor analysis of the 23 selected items demonstrated that the three factors accounted for 47% of the variance in the final scale.

There was very little overlap between the factors. This is meant in two ways. First, almost all items in

Table 3

Death Concerns Scale Factor Pattern Loadings

DCS Items	Intrap	Interp	RID
(1) Not left mark on world	.706	.101	-.181
(2) End creative activities	.659	.011	.161
(3) Work potential unrealized	.651	.126	-.050
(4) Not able to do things	.643	-.157	.140
(5) Living on through fame	.609	.153	-.101
(6) Not achieving work goals	.600	-.026	-.123
(7) Remembered by accomplishments	.582	-.198	-.158
(8) Not missed in world at large	.572	-.094	.077
(9) Ending plans activities	.552	-.117	.145
(10) Losing chance to stand out	.524	.044	-.022
(11) Being needed by family	.017	.754	-.117
(12) Sorrow to relatives/friends	-.027	.717	-.012
(13) End ties with loved ones	.023	.673	.184
(14) Losing someone close to me	-.204	.655	.137
(15) Missing close when they die	-.131	.654	.079
(16) What do when lose close	.142	.630	.269
(17) Not able to care for family	.037	.629	-.168
(18) Being missed by close others	.166	.556	-.116
(19) Not said what wanted	.006	.547	.243
(20) Unresolved problems	.095	.546	.133
(21) Not be around dying persons	.087	-.018	.686
(22) Not visit dying friend	.058	.018	.684
(23) Not talk to dying re death	.063	-.230	.505

Table 4

Death Concerns Scale: Correlations between Items and Scale

DCS Items	Corrected Item-Total Correlation
(1) Not left mark on world	.55
(2) End creative activities	.62
(3) Work potential unrealized	.49
(4) Not able to do things.	.61
(5) Living on through fame	.49
(6) Not achieving work goals	.55
(7) Remembered by accomplishments	.52
(8) Not missed in world at large	.50
(9) Ending plans activities	.58
(10) Losing chance to stand out	.44
(11) Being needed by family	.64
(12) Sorrow to relatives/friends	.67
(13) End ties with loved ones	.63
(14) Losing someone close to me	.52
(15) Missing close when they die	.53
(16) What do when lose close	.52
(17) Not able to care for family	.51
(18) Being missed by close others	.53
(19) Not said what wanted	.51
(20) Unresolved problems	.52
(21) Not be around dying persons	.62
(22) Not visit dying friend	.54
(23) Not talk to dying re death	.45

Table 5

Death Concerns Scale Means and Standard Deviations

DCS Items	Mean	S.D.
(1) Not left mark on world	3.86	2.02
(2) End creative activities	4.27	1.79
(3) Work potential unrealized	3.64	1.91
(4) Not able to do things	4.46	1.90
(5) Living on through fame	3.06	1.80
(6) Not achieving work goals	4.53	1.93
(7) Remembered by accomplishments	4.78	1.78
(8) Not missed in world at large	3.39	1.96
(9) Ending plans activities	4.67	1.89
(10) Losing chance to stand out	2.55	1.71
(11) Being needed by family	5.40	1.48
(12) Sorrow to relatives/friends	5.60	1.54
(13) End ties with loved ones	5.61	1.49
(14) Losing someone close to me	6.36	1.11
(15) Missing close when they die	6.43	0.88
(16) What do when lose close	5.33	1.58
(17) Not able to care for family	5.58	1.53
(18) Being missed by close others	5.34	1.49
(19) Not said what wanted	5.59	1.47
(20) Unresolved problems	5.33	1.69
(21) Not be around dying persons	3.47	1.58
(22) Not visit dying friend	2.80	1.57
(23) Not talk to dying re death	3.51	1.85

factors one and two were intended to be in the factors in which the analysis placed them. That is, the Intrapersonal factor, for example, had almost exclusively Intrapersonal items. The same was true for the other two factors. Second, items with high factor loadings in one factor had low loadings in the other two factors. This was particularly true for items with factor loadings over .50. Of the 23 retained items and therefore 46 possible loadings on the two factors not their own, only 4 loadings exceeded .20, and these four were between .20 and .27.

CHAPTER 4:
RELIABILITY AND CONSTRUCT VALIDITY OF THE DEATH CONCERNS SCALE

Reliability

The reliability of the three subscales for the scale construction study was determined by coefficient alpha (Nunnally, 1967). The alpha for the Intrapersonal subscale was .84, and for the Interpersonal subscale it was .85, acceptably high and indicating relative internal consistency of the scales. The alpha for the RID subscale was somewhat lower at .71, but acceptable for a three item scale.

Construct Validity

In creating a scale to measure a psychological attribute, a major concern is whether the scale in fact measures what it purports to measure. The problem in measuring a psychological attribute is that there is no specific criterion against which to judge the new scale. The scale, and any attempt to validate it, is trying to measure a hypothesized dimension which can only be approximated. "Construct validity" attempts to deal with this problem by using a number of indirect measures and assessing the pattern of results. (See Cronbach and Meehl, 1967, for a detailed discussion of construct validity.)

The construct validity of the death concerns scale was addressed by attempting to pull together evidence from a number of different sources. First, a study of group differences, in which two target groups were expected to score differently on the dimension, was conducted. Second, before responding to the Death Concerns Scale, respondents were asked to list their concerns about death to see if they in fact did list concerns that were measured in the Death Concerns Scale and if those freely-listed concerns were related to the Interpersonal and Intrapersonal factors. Third, correlations between the DCS and existing scales that measure a similar but more general dimension of Interpersonal and Intrapersonal concerns were examined. Fourth and last, was a consideration of whether the DCS acted as it was predicted to act in theory.

Group Differences

Two groups--37 hospice workers and music therapists who work with the terminally ill and 31 undergraduate and graduate engineering students--who might be expected to score differently on the death concerns scale were tested. Hospice volunteers were expected to be more interpersonally oriented and thus to have more interpersonal concerns about death. Engineers, or engineering students, were expected to be more intrapersonally oriented and thus to have more intrapersonal death concerns.

Roe (1956) in her studies of the psychology of occupations noted about those in engineering and the

physical sciences: "[Their] interest in personal interactions is generally low, perhaps at the lowest for all the Groups, although Group V [outdoor occupations] may be about the same in this respect and Group VI [science, except psychology and anthropology] is not much above it." (p. 317) If the two groups scored on the scale as expected, that would be considered one piece of evidence for the construct validity of the scale.

A multivariate analysis of variance was conducted comparing the engineering students and the hospice workers on the three subscales of the Death Concerns Scale (Table 6). There was a significant difference between the groups on the DCS. The effect was due entirely, however, to differences on the Reluctance to Interact with the Dying (RID) subscale. There were no differences between the groups on the Interpersonal and Intrapersonal subscales. The hospice workers were expected to be more Interpersonal and the engineering students to be more Intrapersonal. (The reliability coefficients [Cronbach's alpha] for the three subscales for this study were as follows: Interpersonal, alpha = .75; Intrapersonal, alpha = .83; RID, alpha = .82.)

Table 7 presents the demographic characteristics of the hospice workers and the engineering students. There were significant differences between the two groups for gender, race, and age. There were more females among the hospice workers and more males among the engineers. Hospice workers were primarily white and the engineers were mixed.

Table 6

Mean Scores for Engineering Students and Hospice Workers on the Death Concerns Scale[a]

Death Concerns Scale	Hospice Workers (N=37)	Engineering Students (N=31)
Interpersonal Scores	5.11	5.31
Intrapersonal Scores	3.50	3.83
Reluctance to Interact with the Dying	1.57*	3.06*

[a] Multivariate F (1,.5,30.5) = 9.97, $p < .001$, for the effect of the groups on the DCS.

* Univariate F (1,65) = 29.89, $p < .001$.

Table 7

Demographic Characteristics of the

Hospice Workers and the Engineering Students

Demographics	Hospice Workers	Engineering Students	p
Gender			
Male	3	24	.001
Female	34	7	
Race			
White	33	16	.001
People of Color	4	15	
Occup'l Status			
1-45	8	3	
46-75	10	7	n.s.
76-100	18	20	
Age			
25 & under	2	24	
26-35	14	5	.001
over 35	21	2	

Note: Analyses were Chi Squares.

Ninety-five percent of the hospice workers were over 25 and 77% of the engineers were under 25. There were no significant differences for occupational status between the two groups. Given the differences between the two groups, a multiple regression analysis was conducted examining the effects of gender, race, occupational status and age on the DCS scores. None of these variables explained a significant proportion of the variance on any of the three subscales of the Death Concerns Scale.

That which differentiated the hospice workers and the engineers was Reluctance to Interact with the Dying. It seems self-evident that in having an occupation that requires constant work with the terminally ill, one's Reluctance to Interact with the Dying would be very low. Perhaps the mistake was in assuming a connection between RID and Interpersonal and Intrapersonal orientations. Evidently they are quite separate. A low RID does not necessitate a high Interpersonal orientation nor a low Intrapersonal orientation. In fact the correlations between the RID factor and the Interpersonal and Intrapersonal factors were close to zero.

The hospice workers' Interpersonal scores were somewhat, but not significantly, lower than the engineers' Interpersonal scores. That, in combination with the engineers' higher RID scores, is consistent with a nonsignificant tendency in the hypothesis testing study. Those who scored highly Interpersonal tended also to score

higher on Reluctance to Interact with the Dying (see Table 20, below). Perhaps being highly Interpersonal makes interaction with the dying more difficult or painful, and a tendency to limit or contain one's Interpersonal orientation in certain circumstances is functional or necessary for work that would seem to be inherently painful.

It may be also that low scores on both Interpersonal and Intrapersonal orientations combine to make possible an ability to be with an other (and less focused on one's own intrapersonal needs), while still maintaining separateness (and not being too interdependent).

Freely Listed Concerns about Death

A separate open-ended question addressing concerns about death was part of both the scale construction and the hypotheses testing studies. Respondents were asked to list the five things that concerned them most about death. They were then asked, "Which of these is most important?" It was left deliberately vague as to whether the death was of the self or the other. Concerns about the process of dying were also not excluded from consideration. In fact many respondents listed concerns that focused on this process.

Is the interpersonal/intrapersonal aspect of concerns about death salient and valid? Did people freely list interpersonal/intrapersonal concerns? If those who scored at the interpersonal end of the death concerns scale also listed interpersonal concerns about death on the open-ended question (similarly for those who scored at the

intrapersonal end), that would constitute further support for the construct validity of the scale.

Fifty questionnaires were selected at random from the scale construction study. The almost 200 responses to the freely listed death concerns were each put on separate cards with no identifying information and then sorted by the author into groups that seemed to go together. Nine categories of concerns about death emerged. (See Appendix C for an elaboration of these categories.)

1. Afterlife: What happens after death?
2. Timing and physical circumstances of own death.
3. Inevitability and uncontrollability of death.
4. My accomplishments, goals, experiences and contributions.
5. Being in connection: focus on connection itself; e.g., never see family and friends.
6. Loss of loved ones: focus on specific person and how to cope.
7. Concern for well-being of those left behind.
8. Reactions and feelings of those left behind.
9. Will I be remembered/forgotten?

As a check on the stability of these categories, a graduate student in psychology with an interest in death and dying who was blind to the hypotheses of this research was asked to generate seven to eleven categories from the same set of almost 200 responses. She generated 10 categories very similar to the author's.

The author's categories were then used to code the responses in the open-ended death concerns question of the hypotheses testing study. Each questionnaire was coded for the presence or absence of each of the nine themes. If a theme occurred five times, it was coded only once. If "one" response had two themes in it, both themes were coded present. The most important concern about death was also coded as belonging to one of the nine themes.

As a check on inter-coder reliability for this qualitative data, a psychologist was trained in the nine themes of the open-ended concerns about death. She did a trial coding on a selection of 23 questionnaires from the scale construction study. Questions and ambiguities were clarified. She then coded the responses to the concerns about death question from 10% (25) of the questionnaires randomly selected from the hypotheses testing study.

The agreement between the two coders ranged from 72% to 100% for the nine themes, with agreement on 7 of the 9 themes being 88% or above. The agreement on identifying the most important concern about death was 80%.

Additionally, a formula developed by Scott (1955) was used to rate inter-coder reliability. This formula was developed specifically for use with mutually exclusive nominal categories (in this case present/absent for each of the nine themes), and was meant to correct for the number of categories to be coded and the frequency of their occurrence in the population. (Frequency of occurrence was determined

by the percentage of presence/absence for the entire sample of 255 respondents.) Scott's index of reliability may be seen as representing the extent to which the percentage agreement exceeds chance. Scott's pi for all nine themes on the 25 questionnaires was .86. Overall, reliability for the qualitative coding was seen as moderate. Additional training in the qualitative categories, or further refinement of the categories themselves may lead to increased reliability.

Frequencies of occurrence of the various themes in the open-ended death concerns question are presented in Table 8. These themes indicate that while respondents have concerns about death that are independent of the Inter/Intrapersonal orientation (e.g., concerns about an afterlife and the inevitability of death), they do independently list many concerns that focus on Interpersonal and Intrapersonal issues about death.

The themes that were seen as most unambiguously Interpersonal were: connection, loss of loved ones, and concern for others. Those themes that were considered most unambiguously Intrapersonal were: physical circumstances of one's own death, accomplishments, and remember me. The respondents were classified as high and low on both the Interpersonal and Intrapersonal death concerns subscales. For each subscale we selected approximately 25% of those scoring high and then 25% of those scoring low and classified them as high and low Interpersonal and high and

Table 8

Percent of Respondents Choosing Themes about Death and "Most Important Death Concerns"

Themes	Freely Listed Death Concerns (N=246)	Most Important Death Concern (N=226)
Afterlife	53%	28%
Physical Aspects	58%	16%
Inevitability	24%	8%
Accomplishments	21%	5%
Connection	34%	11%
Loss Loved Ones	30%	15%
Concern Others	42%	12%
React My Death	7%	0
Remember Me	11%	0
Can't Categorize	-	4%

Note: Percents in the first column are not mutually exclusive. Percents in the second column do not add to 100 due to rounding.

low Intrapersonal, respectively. Chi Square analyses were then conducted with these two groups and the open-ended death concerns themes. The results are presented in Table 9.

For the freely listed death concerns, only those themes considered unambiguously Inter- or Intrapersonal are presented. There were significant differences in the predicted direction between those scoring high Interpersonal and those scoring low Interpersonal on "connection" and "concern for others." That is, for two of the three Interpersonal themes, there were significant differences between the high and low Interpersonal groups in the predicted direction. Likewise, for those scoring high and low on the Intrapersonal DCS subscale, there were significant differences in the predicted direction for two of the three Intrapersonal themes, "accomplishments" and "remember me."

For the "most important death concern," there were no significant differences on choice of the themes for those scoring high and low on the Interpersonal DCS subscale. There was a significant difference between high and low Intrapersonal groups for this question, though. The two themes that had differences in the predicted direction for this question were "accomplishments" and "connection." High Intrapersonal scorers chose "accomplishments" more frequently than low Intrapersonal scorers. Low Intrapersonal scorers chose "connection" more frequently

Table 9

Percent Highly Inter/Intrapersonal Respondents (on the DCS) Choosing Freely Listed Death Concerns

Freely Listed Death Concerns	Interpersonal High (N=68)	Interpersonal Low (N=61)	Intrapersonal High (N=61)	Intrapersonal Low (N=60)
Physical Aspects	56%	54%	64%	53%
Accomplishments	22%	20%	31%[a]	7%[a]
Connection	43%[b]	26%[b]	26%	33%
Loss Loved Ones	34%	21%	31%	32%
Concern Others	54%[c]	28%[c]	48%	35%
Remember Me	15%	7%	13%[d]	3%[d]

Most Important Death Concern	Interpersonal High (N=63)	Interpersonal Low (N=55)	Intrapersonal[e] High (N=58)	Intrapersonal[e] Low (N=54)
Physical Aspects	11%	20%	12%	17%
Accomplishments	3%	7%	10%	0
Connection	11%	7%	5%	13%
Loss Loved Ones	14%	15%	19%	13%
Concern Others	19%	4%	17%	7%

Note: Analyses were Chi Squares.

[a] $p < .001$ [b] $p < .05$ [c] $p < .01$ [d] $p < .05$ [e] $p < .05$

than high Intrapersonal scorers.

Analyses of variance were conducted examining differences on Interpersonal and Intrapersonal DCS scores between those respondents who listed a particular concern about death and those respondents who did not list the concern. These data are reported in Table 10. Those respondents who listed "accomplishments" and "remember me" had significantly higher Intrapersonal scores than those respondents who did not list those concerns about death. Those respondents who listed "connection" and "concern for others" had significantly higher Interpersonal scores than those respondents who did not list the concerns. These differences are in the predicted directions.

The two qualitative data analyses seem to suggest some evidence for the construct validity of the Death Concerns Scale. That is, independently chosen concerns about death were somewhat related to scores on the DCS and in the predicted directions.

Relationship with Existing Scales

Further evidence for the validity of the Death Concerns Scale may be inferred from its relationship with existing scales that measure a similar but more general dimension. Respondents'general interpersonal/intrapersonal orientation was assessed by a score on each of the following instruments.

Carlson Adjective Checklist. This is a brief measure of social-personal orientation. It measures the "tendency

Table 10

Comparison of Interpersonal and Intrapersonal DCS Scores Between Those Who Listed Specific Death Concerns and Those Who Did Not

Freely Listed Death Concerns	Interp'l DCS Scores Listed Concern		Intrap'l DCS Scores Listed Concern	
	Yes (N)	No (N)	Yes (N)	No (N)
Physical Aspects	5.54 (137)	5.41 (103)	3.94 (137)	3.69 (103)
Accomplishments	5.54 (52)	5.46 (188)	4.45[a] (52)	3.66[a] (188)
Connection	5.69[b] (81)	5.37[b] (159)	3.74 (81)	3.88 (159)
Loss Loved Ones	5.62 (74)	5.42 (166)	3.75 (74)	3.87 (166)
Concern Others	5.75[c] (102)	5.28[c] (138)	3.93 (102)	3.76 (138)
Remember Me	5.79 (26)	5.44 (214)	4.55[d] (26)	3.74[d] (214)

Note: Analyses were analysis of variance.

[a] $F = 17.3$, $p < .001$

[b] $F = 4.6$, $p < .05$

[c] $F = 11.0$, $p < .001$

[d] $F = 10.1$, $p < .01$

to define one's self-concept either in terms of social relationships or in terms independent of social relationships" (Carlson & Levy, 1968). It consists of 30 adjectives, half of which do not require an implicit social object (personal) and half of which do require an implicit social object (social). (See Appendix D.)

Carlson and Levy presented two kinds of construct validity for their scale: (a) previous theoretical and empirical work supporting the rationale for the measure; and (b) correlation in the appropriate direction with the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. More compelling in terms of this study is the evidence that the Carlson Adjective Checklist discriminated males and females in a white, middle class sample (Carlson & Levy, 1968; Carlson, 1971), and did not discriminate males and females in a sample of Blacks (Carlson, 1971; Carlson & Levy, 1970).

As in the earlier studies using the Carlson checklist, the respondents in this study were requested to pick 10 (out of the 30) adjectives that best described themselves. They were then requested to pick 5 of those 10 that were most descriptive. The adjectives were scored "0" (not selected), "1" (descriptive), or "2" (most descriptive). As there were 15 adjectives each in the social and the personal subscales, and only 10 selections, five of which scored 2 each, the maximum possible score on either subscale was 15.

Each respondent received a score on each of the subscales, but it quickly became evident that using both

scores in the multivariate analyses created spurious significant results as the two scales were dichotomous and negatively related to each other. The choice of an adjective in one scale by necessity lowered the score in the other scale. One of the subscales, i.e., the personal, was then eliminated. If someone scored high in the social subscale, they were considered social; if they scored low in that scale they were considered more personal; and if they scored in the middle, they were considered both.

Spence and Helmreich's (1978) Personal Attributes Questionnaire. Two of the three subscales were used: "Masculinity"--male-valued attributes that are not sex-specific; and "Femininity"--female-valued attributes that are not sex-specific. They noted that the male-valued and female-valued items are very much like Bakan's notions of agency and communion. There are 16 items, 8 for each subscale. (See Appendix E.) Spence and Helmreich's empirical data with this scale have indicated that the two dimensions exist independently of each other (as we would predict is also true of the interpersonal and intrapersonal orientations) and are distinguished from sex-role stereotypes.

The PAQ was set in a semantic differential format, with a 7 point scale, (0 to 6). Each respondent received a mean score for "masculinity" and a mean score for "femininity," with zero as the possible low score and 6 as the possible high.

Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (Edwards, 1959). This instrument was modified in the following way. Of the 15 variables ("manifest needs") of the EPPS, only items from the following were used as most closely representing the interpersonal/intrapersonal orientation under study here: five items each from "affiliation" and "nurturance" for interpersonal; and five items each from "achievement" and "autonomy" for intrapersonal. The EPPS used a forced choice format, as did this study. An affiliation or nurturance item was paired with an achievement or autonomy item forcing the respondents to choose between the interpersonal and intrapersonal orientations. (See Appendix F for the affiliation/nurturance and achievement/autonomy items.)

In each pair of items the one chosen was given a score of one and the item not chosen was given a score of zero. As there were ten pairs, the score for either interpersonal or intrapersonal had a possible range of 0 to 10. Because of the forced choice format the two subscales were not independent of each other and only one was used to rate how inter- or intrapersonal the respondent was. As with the Carlson Adjective Checklist, scoring high on the one subscale meant scoring low on the other and vice versa. Scoring in the mid-range indicated a mix of inter- and intrapersonal orientations.

Reliability of the personality measures. The internal consistency of the PAQ subscales was assessed by the coefficient alpha. For the Masculine PAQ coefficient

alpha = .73. For the Feminine PAQ coefficient alpha = .79. The internal consistency of these two subscales was judged to be only moderate.

Coefficient alpha was not an appropriate reliability measure for the EPPS and the Carlson because of the nature and structure of their scales. (See Anastasi, 1982.) Instead, a test-retest was conducted for these two personality scales. A total of 29 undergraduate and graduate students at Brooklyn College completed both the EPPS and the Carlson personality scales twice.

The correlation coefficients were computed for the two administrations of the two personality measures: for the EPPS, r = .82; for the Carlson Adjective Checklist, r = .90. Twenty of the students completed the measures three weeks apart, and nine of the students completed the measures two weeks apart. There was no obvious effect or advantage to either timing. For the group that completed the scales two weeks apart, r = .80 for the EPPS and r = .96 for the Carlson. For the group that completed them three weeks apart, r = .90 for the EPPS and r = .88 for the Carlson. The reliability of these two scales was judged acceptably high.

The Death Concerns Scale's relationship to the personality scales measuring the general Inter/Intrapersonal orientation was examined. (These data were taken from the hypothesis testing study described below.) Table 11 reports the correlations between the personality measures of the

Table 11

Correlations between the DCS and the Personality Scales

	Personality Measures			
DCS	EPPS	Carlson	Masc PAQ	Femin PAQ
Interp'l	.058 n.s.	.103 p=.054	-.071 n.s.	.161 p<.01
Intrap'l	-.151 p<.01	-.075 n.s.	.040 n.s.	.044 n.s.
RID	.001 n.s.	.064 n.s.	-.182 p<.01	-.113 p<.05

Note: N=244 for all cells except the EPPS cells. Their cells were all N=241.

inter/intrapersonal orientation and the Death Concerns Scale. The Feminine PAQ is significantly correlated with the Interpersonal DCS subscale in the predicted direction. The Carlson checklist is almost significantly correlated ($p = .054$) with the Interpersonal DCS in the predicted direction. The EPPS is significantly correlated with the Intrapersonal subscale in the predicted direction.

Additionally, regression analyses demonstrated that the Feminine PAQ explained a significant proportion of the variance on the Interpersonal DCS in the predicted direction, and the EPPS explained a significant proportion of the variance on the Intrapersonal DCS in the predicted direction. There were also nonsignificant multivariate trends for the more interpersonally oriented respondents (as measured on the personality scales) to have higher Interpersonal scores on the DCS, and the more intrapersonally oriented respondents to have higher Intrapersonal scores on the DCS. For more detail on these analyses see the section on Hypotheses 3a-1 and 3b-1 in the Results section of Chapter 5.

Does the DCS act as it was predicted to act?

Further evidence for construct validity may be inferred from the results of the hypotheses testing study relating the construct to other variables. If the construct "acted" as it was expected to "act" based on the theory of which it is a part, and the hypotheses were supported, that would lend further support to the construct validity of the scale.

The implications of the hypothesis testing results for the construct validity of the DCS will be addressed in the Discussion in Chapter 6 below.

CHAPTER 5: TESTING THE HYPOTHESES

The main study tested the hypotheses concerning the influence of place in the social structure on interpersonal/intrapersonal orientation and the influence of that orientation on concerns about death.

Methodology

Respondents

The respondents for this study were also drawn from the City University of New York and U. N. C., Greensboro. The 255 respondents were distributed among the four colleges as follows: City College, 68; Brooklyn College, 34; Greensboro, 50; and Hunter College, 103.

Thirty-two percent (82) of the respondents were male, and 67% (171) were female. (Two respondents did not report their gender.) The age range of the respondents was 17 to 65. Eighty-three percent of the college students were between 17 and 25 years of age. The race/ethnicity distribution of the sample was as follows: White, 44% (112); Hispanic, 18% (46); Black, 18% (47); East Asian, 15% (36); and Other, 4% (10). (There were missing data for 1%.)

The distribution of occupational status scores by race/ethnicity and gender is presented in Table 12. As in

Table 12

Demographics of the Hypothesis Testing Sample:

Occupational Status Broken Down by Race/Ethnicity and Gender

Occup'l Status[a]	White	Hispanic	Black	E. Asian	Other
		Male (N=78)			
1-45	5	7	4	8	1
46-75	8	3	4	3	2
76-100	18	2	3	7	3
		Female* (N=150)			
1-45	8	11	10	8	0
46-75	35	8	10	5	1
76-100	30	5	11	6	2

[a]Higher numbers indicate higher occupational status.

* Pearson Chi Square = 19.51 (8 d.f.), $p < .05$

the scale construction study, there is a relationship between race/ethnicity and occupational status. More whites than people of color are represented in the higher occupational status categories; and more people of color than whites are represented in the lower occupational status categories. As in the scale construction study, the Blacks in this sample are more evenly distributed over the three occupational status categories than are the Hispanics who are clustered in the two lower categories. Additionally, there are more East Asians in this sample who are more or less equally represented in the upper and lower occupational status categories. When the table is collapsed into occupational status by whites and people of color (Table 13), the inverse relationship between race and occupational status, again, can be seen most clearly.

As in the scale construction study, there was an adequate mix of gender, race/ethnicity and class. The distribution of respondents among the demographic categories in both samples was comparable. The only noticeable difference was a larger percentage of East Asians (15% against 2%) and smaller percentage of Blacks (18% against 26%) in the hypotheses testing study as opposed to the scale construction study.

Measurement of Interpersonal/intrapersonal orientation

A person's interpersonal/intrapersonal orientation was assessed by a score on each of the personality instruments

Table 13

Occupational Status Broken Down by Race:

Hypothesis Testing Study

Occup'l Status[a]	Whites	People of Color
1-45	13	49
46-75	43	36
76-100	48	39

Note: N=228
Pearson Chi Square = 20.86 (2 d.f.), $p < .001$

[a]Higher numbers indicate higher occupational status.

(Masculine and Feminine PAQ, Carlson, and modified EPPS) described in Chapter 4.

Concerns about Death

Concerns about death were measured by the Death Concerns Scale whose development was described above. The open-ended question on death concerns was also utilized in analyzing respondents' concerns about death.

Reluctance to Interact with the Dying

This construct specifically looked at an individual's willingness to confront dying directly and interpersonally by interacting with a dying person. It was measured by:

1. Three items (Nelson & Nelson, 1975) inserted into the Death Concerns Scale:

"I would not mind working with dying persons."
"I would willingly talk to a dying person about his/her coming death if s/he wished to discuss it."
"I would hate to visit a dying friend."

2. A paper and pencil test of behavioral intention. A scenario (Appendix H) describing a dying person's desire to talk about his/her impending death was presented to the respondent, who was asked if s/he would be willing to talk to that person about his/her death.

Personal Experience with Death

In order to control for the possible influence of experience with death on the dependent variables, personal experience with death was checked by direct questions. The respondents were asked how many times they had experienced

the death of someone very close to them. The responses were scored from "0" to "8 or more".

Results

Organization

The results are organized in the following way. Results relevant to the entire study are presented first as background. Then the results for each of the hypotheses are presented. The hypotheses group the data by examining the effects of a) gender, race, and class on the general inter/intrapersonal orientation (as measured by the personality scales); b) the inter/intrapersonal orientation on the Death Concerns Scale; and c) gender, race, and class on the Death Concerns Scale.

Background

The second sample of 255 respondents was used to test the hypotheses. Table 14 presents the mean scores for each of the scales used in the analyses. The sample as a whole tended to score higher on the Interpersonal part of each measure. This was particularly true for the Death Concerns Scale--the mean on the Interpersonal subscale was 5.47 for a scale whose scores ranged from one to seven. The mean on the Intrapersonal subscale of the DCS was 3.85. Respondents

Table 14

Mean Scale Scores, S.D.s, and Reliability Coefficients

Scale	Mean	S.D.	N	Reliab.[a] Coeff.	N
Death Concerns[b]					
Interpersonal	5.47	1.10	249	.85	238
Intrapersonal	3.85	1.27	249	.85	238
RID	3.21	1.31	249	.69	238
Personality Measures					
Modified EPPS[c]	5.45	2.08	246	.82	28
Carlson Checklist[d]	8.55	2.74	250	.90	29
PAQ Masculine[e]	3.73	0.88	249	.73	233
PAQ Feminine[e]	4.44	0.81	249	.79	233

Note. The higher the score, the more of the dimension, except for the EPPS and the Carlson (see c & d, below).

[a] Alpha coefficients were used for all subscales of the DCS and the PAQ. Pearson's R, test-retest was used for the EPPS and the Carlson.

[b] The range for all three subscales was 1-7, with higher numbers meaning more of the dimension.

[c] The range was 0-10, with over 5 being more interpersonal, and less than 5 being more intrapersonal.

[d] The range was 0-15, with over 7.5 being more interpersonal, and less than 7.5 being more intrapersonal.

[e] The range was 0-6, with higher numbers meaning more of the dimension.

scored low on Reluctance to Interact with the Dying (RID), with the mean of 3.21 being less than the midpoint of the scale.

Table 14 also presents the data on the reliability of the scales using Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the DCS and the PAQ, and Pearson's correlation coefficient (test-retest) for the EPPS and the Carlson. The internal consistency for both the Interpersonal and Intrapersonal subscales of the Death Concerns Scale was satisfactory (alpha = .85 for both). The internal consistency of the Reluctance to Interact with the Dying subscale was less satisfactory (alpha = .69) but probably adequate given that it is only a three item scale. The reliability of the personality measures was discussed in Chapter 4.

In looking at the background questions on experience with death, it was noted that approximately one third of the sample had not experienced the death of someone very close to them. Almost 50% of the respondents had experienced the death of one or two persons very close to them. And approximately 20% had experienced the death of three or more persons very close to them. Initial multivariate analyses (both regression and MANOVA) examined the impact of the respondent's quantity of experience with death on both death concerns and personality variables. There were no significant differences on the dependent variables by the level of experience with death (see Table 15), so it was dropped from further analyses.

Table 15

Effect of Experience with Death on

Death Concerns Scale Scores

Death Concerns Scale	Experiences with Death	
	None (N=82)	1 or more (N=167)
Interpersonal	5.54	5.44
Intrapersonal	3.86	3.84
Reluctance to Interact with Dying	3.26	3.19

Note: Multivariate analysis of variance was conducted and the differences between the two groups were not significant.

This is not, at all, to say that experience with death does not have an effect on someone, possibly even altering his or her way of experiencing the world. It is to say, however, that the effect was not to be measured by these scales. (Frank and Durlak [1990] note that the death of a significant other tends to have "mixed effects across individuals" [p. 41].) Experience with death was not expected to change one's orientation from interpersonal to intrapersonal or vice versa, but instead, perhaps, to intensify an existing orientation--a possible "before/after" effect that could not emerge in this study of group differences.

Multivariate analyses (primarily MANOVAs*, SPSSX [Norusis, 1985]) were conducted, because of possible interrelationships among the dependent variables and because of the conservative nature of the test.

Separate analyses were conducted for two age groupings: (1) the entire sample, including all ages; and (2) those 17-25 years old. We were controlling for age, as approximately 15% of the sample were over 25. In all cases, results for both age groups were similar. Therefore, results are reported for the entire sample only.

Possible differences among the various race/ethnic groups on the dependent variables were examined in initial multivariate analyses, but no significant differences were

---

*Pillai's test of significance was used for all MANOVAs.

found. Therefore, the race/ethnicity groups were collapsed into white and people of color for all analyses. See Appendix G for Tables of the analyses with the means for the separate race/ethnic groups broken out.

Hypotheses

The theoretical hypotheses in Chapter 1, above, have been stated in operational terms below.

Hypotheses 1 and 2: Effect of Gender, Race, and Class on General Inter/Intrapersonal Orientation

Women, people of color, and members of the working class in comparison with men, whites and members of the middle and upper classes, will have a more interpersonal orientation, as measured by the personality scales, in organizing experience. Correspondingly, men, whites, and members of the middle and upper classes in comparison with women, people of color and members of the working class will have a more intrapersonal orientation in organizing experience.

Multivariate analyses of variance were conducted with the personality scales as dependent variables and the demographic variables as independent variables. The personality scale scores are in standard score form to allow comparability among the measures. Tables 16, 17, and 18 present the results for the effects of gender, race and occupational status, respectively, on the personality scales.

Table 16

Personality Scale Scores Broken Down by Gender

Personality Scale	Female (N=140)	Male (N=74)	F[a]	p
EPPS	.11	-.14	4.53	.05
Carlson	.15	-.26	12.36	.001
Masculine PAQ	-.17	.25	10.63	.001
Feminine PAQ	.12	-.14	1.87	n.s.

Note: The scores are in Z (standard) score form to allow comparability among the various measures. For the EPPS and the Carlson, + means more interpersonal and - means more intrapersonal.

[a]These are univariate Fs indicating the effect of gender on the specific subscales.

[b]The multivariate F (1,1,98.5) = 5.01, $p < .001$, for the main effect of gender.

Table 17

Personality Scale Scores Broken Down by Race

Personality Scale	White (N=98)	People of Color (N=116)
EPPS	-.07	.10
Carlson	-.03	.04
Masculine PAQ	-.01	-.05
Feminine PAQ	.10	-.02

Note: The scores are in Z (standard) score form to allow comparability among the measures. There were no multivariate or univariate significant differences for race.

Table 18

Personality Scale Scores Broken Down by Occupational Status

Personality Scales	Occupational Status Scores 1-45 (N=61)	46-75 (N=75)	76-100 (N=78)
EPPS	.07	-.00	.02
Carlson	.08	.01	-.12
Masculine PAQ	-.20	-.15	.24
Feminine PAQ	-.02	.10	.03

Note: Z (standard) scores are used to allow comparability among the personality scales. There were no multivariate or univariate significant differences for occupational status.

Both the EPPS and the Carlson are represented by the Interpersonal halves of their scales, for reasons discussed above. Using standard scores sets the mean to zero and the standard deviation to one. Then the positive or negative scores indicate how much of a standard deviation the respondent's score is from the mean. Therefore, for these data a positive score indicates a more Interpersonal response and a negative score indicates a more Intrapersonal response. However, a perusal of Table 14 shows that the sample mean for both scales is in the interpersonal end of the scale, more so for the Carlson than the EPPS. In other words, we will be speaking in relative terms--the scores are relatively more inter- or intrapersonal, not necessarily literally intrapersonal.

Table 16 reports a significant main effect for gender on the personality scales, (F [1, 1, 98.5] = 5.01, $p < .001$). The Feminine PAQ was the only personality scale that did not have significant differences between males and females, although the scores were in the predicted direction. For the EPPS and the Carlson, the females scored more interpersonally, and the males scored more intrapersonally. On the Masculine PAQ, the males had higher scores (more intrapersonal) and the females had lower scores (less intrapersonal).

Table 17 presents the data for the effect of race on the personality scale scores. There were no multivariate or univariate significant differences for race. Also, there

were no significant multivariate or univariate differences for occupational status (Table 18).

Table 19 presents the mean scale scores for each of the cells in this same set of analyses. There was a significant multivariate interaction effect for gender, race and occupational status on the personality scales. This was due primarily to the Carlson (univariate F (2,202) = 4.21, $p < .05$). None of the other personality scales achieved significant univariate interaction effects for this analysis, but an examination of the data hint at different scoring patterns for the different subgroups, particularly the Masculine PAQ (in addition to the Carlson).

For the Carlson, white females in the lowest occupational status group had higher interpersonal scores than white females in the highest occupational status group. Black females showed a similar pattern, but their interpersonal scores were higher than the white females in general. White males in the lowest occupational status group had the lowest interpersonal scores (with an N of 5, however, these results must be interpreted with caution). White males in the highest occupational status group had higher interpersonal scores, near the mean of the sample. Males of color in the lowest occupational status category had interpersonal scores near the mean of the sample. However, males of color in the highest occupational status category had very low interpersonal scores.

Table 19

Personality Scales by Demographic Variables,

Race/ Occup'l Status	Female (N)	Male (N)	Female (N)	Male (N)
	Masculine PAQ		Feminine PAQ	
White				
1-45	-.38 (8)	.51 (5)	-.01 (8)	-.23 (5)
46-75	-.29 (34)	.39 (7)	.27 (34)	-.36 (7)
76-100	.20 (27)	.16 (17)	.34 (27)	-.27 (17)
People Of Color				
1-45	-.29 (28)	-.17 (20)	.11 (28)	-.15 (20)
46-75	-.38 (22)	.33 (12)	.00 (22)	.05 (12)
76-100	-.00 (21)	.79 (13)	-.21 (21)	.14 (13)
	EPPS		Carlson[a]	
White				
1-45	.21 (8)	-1.08 (5)	.21 (8)	-1.22 (5)
46-75	-.03 (34)	.20 (7)	.05 (34)	-.36 (7)
76-100	.11 (27)	-.36 (17)	.02 (27)	.10 (17)
People of Color				
1-45	.28 (28)	.00 (20)	.36 (28)	-.05 (20)
46-75	.05 (22)	-.14 (12)	.10 (22)	-.05 (12)
76-100	.15 (21)	.12 (13)	.24 (21)	-.82 (13)

Note: Analysis is in Z (standard) score form to allow for comparability among personality measures.
Information on significance for main effects of gender, race, and occupational status may be found in Tables 16, 17, and 18.
The multivariate F (2,.5,98.5) = 2.13, $p < .05$, for the interaction effect of gender, race and occupational status.

[a] The univariate F (2,202) = 4.21, $p < .05$, for the Carlson.

For the Masculine PAQ, white females in the lowest occupational status category had very low intrapersonal scores. White females in the highest occupational status category had higher intrapersonal scores. Females of color had scores similar to white females. White males in the lowest occupational status category had among the highest intrapersonal scores, but white males in the highest occupational status category had lower intrapersonal scores. In contrast, black males in the lowest occupational status category had among the lowest intrapersonal scores, but black males in the highest occupational status group had the highest intrapersonal scores.

Summary. Hypotheses 1 and 2 were only partially supported. Conducting MANOVAS with the demographic variables as the independent variables and the personality scales as the dependent variables, there was some support for Hypotheses 1 and 2. There was a significant multivariate main effect for gender on three of the personality measures: Females had higher interpersonal scores and males had higher intrapersonal scores (EPPS, Carlson, Masculine PAQ). There were no main effect differences for occupational status or for race. However, there was a multivariate interaction effect for gender, race and occupational status that lent some support to the hypotheses, but also contributed some idea of the complexity of assessing the relative impact of each of the demographic variables on any one group.

Hypotheses 3a-1 and 3b-1: Effect of Inter/Intrapersonal Orientation on Death Concerns Scale Scores

Those people whose notion of the self in relation to others is primarily interpersonal will have a higher score on the Interpersonal concerns about death subscale than those whose self-orientation is primarily intrapersonal; and will express less reluctance to interact with the dying on the RID scale than those with an intrapersonal orientation.

First, the correlations between the Death Concerns Scale and the personality measures were examined. These correlations were presented in Table 11, above. The Carlson (high scores indicate more Interpersonal) approached a positive, significant correlation (r = .103, p = .054) with the Interpersonal DCS. The Feminine PAQ was positively and significantly correlated with the Interpersonal subscale of the DCS (r = .161, p < .01). The EPPS (high scores indicate more Interpersonal) was negatively and significantly correlated with the Intrapersonal subscale of the DCS (r = -.151, p < .01). Both the Masculine (r = -.182, p < .01) and Feminine PAQ (r = -.113, p < .05) were negatively and significantly correlated with Reluctance to Interact with the Dying. All significant correlations were in the predicted direction except for the negative correlation between the Masculine PAQ and the RID.

Multiple regression analyses (SPSSX) were conducted assessing the relationship between the personality measures and the Death Concerns Scale. One analysis entered the

personality measures all at once as the independent variables to assess the ability of the personality scales to predict the DCS subscales. Together the personality scales approached significance in predicting the Interpersonal subscale: $R^2 = .038$, $F(4,227) = 2.21$, $p = .069$. This was due primarily to the Feminine PAQ, whose beta was .17, in the predicted direction. The personality scales also approached significance in predicting the Intrapersonal subscale of the DCS: $R^2 = .035$, $F(4,227) = 2.04$, $p = .09$. This was due primarily to the EPPS, whose beta was -.15, in the predicted direction. Together the personality scales approached significance in predicting the RID subscale: $R^2 = .035$, $F\ (4,227) = 2.06$, $p = .087$. This was due primarily to the Masculine PAQ, whose beta was -.15, in the direction opposite the prediction.

Another multiple regression analysis (stepwise method) was conducted which did produce significant relationships between some of the personality scales and the Death Concerns Scale. The Feminine subscale of the PAQ explained a significant proportion of the variance for the Interpersonal subscale of the DCS in the predicted direction: $R^2 = .028$, $F\ (1,230) = 6.57$, $p < .05$, beta = .17. The EPPS explained a significant proportion of the variance for the Intrapersonal subscale in the predicted direction: $R^2 = .019$, $F\ (1,230) = 4.51$, $p < .05$, beta = -.14. The Masculine subscale of the PAQ explained a significant proportion of the variance for the RID subscale,

but in the direction opposite to the prediction. That is, those scoring high on the Masculine PAQ tended to score low on Reluctance to Interact with the Dying: $R^2 = .028$, $F(1,230) = 6.60$, $p < .05$, beta = -.17.

Another set of analyses was conducted by defining the respondents as "highly interpersonal" and "highly intrapersonal" on the personality scales. For the Modified EPPS, the range of scores was 0-10. Those who scored 4 or less (35% of the respondents) were classified as highly intrapersonal. Those who scored 7 or more (30% of the respondents) were classified highly interpersonal. For the Carlson Adjective Checklist, the range of scores was 0-15. Those who scored 7 or less (37% of the respondents) were identified as highly intrapersonal. Those who scored 10 or more (36% of the respondents) were identified as highly interpersonal. For the PAQ subscales, those respondents scoring 4.13 or above on the Masculine subscale and below 4.86 on the Feminine subscale were classed as highly intrapersonal ($N=50$). Those respondents scoring 4.86 or above on the Feminine subscale and below 4.13 on the Masculine subscale were classed as highly interpersonal ($N=50$).

Table 20 presents the results of the MANOVAs examining DCS scores for the primarily interpersonal and intrapersonal respondents by each of the personality scales and in some combinations. For the combinations, the respondent had

Table 20

DCS Scores Broken Down by Those Who Are Primarily Interpersonal or Intrapersonal on the Personality Scales

Personality Scales/ Orientation	(N)	Death Concerns Scale Interp'l	Intrap'l	RID
3 Combined[a]				
Intrap'l	(13)	5.33	4.58	3.10
Interp'l	(9)	6.18	3.81	3.67
Carlson & PAQ[b]				
Intrap'l	(30)	5.37	4.06	3.09
Interp'l	(26)	5.97	3.92	3.35
Carlson[c]				
Intrap'l	(91)	5.41	4.03	3.12
Interp'l	(86)	5.65	3.76	3.36
EPPS				
Intrap'l	(84)	5.34	4.00	3.09
Interp'l	(69)	5.57	3.72	3.22
PAQ				
Intrap'l	(48)	5.36	3.96	2.92
Interp'l	(50)	5.76	3.97	3.07

Note: The analyses were MANOVAs with the DCS as the dependent variables and the personality scales, one at a time, as the independent variables.

[a]The multivariate F (1,.5,8) = 2.73, p = .07, for the main effect of orientation on the DCS scales. This was due primarily to differences in interpersonal DCS scores, univariate F (1,20) = 4.46, $p < .05$.

[b]The multivariate F (1,.5,25) = 2.43, p = .076. This was due primarily to differences in the interpersonal DCS scores, univariate F (1,54) = 6.46, $p < .05$.

[c]The multivariate F (1,.5,85.5) = 2.54, p = .058. This was due to the combination of the three DCS scales. There were no significant univariate Fs.

to score high on the orientation in both, or all three, scales in order to be included in the grouping.

What we see here is that the interpersonally oriented respondents do have consistently higher Interpersonal DCS scores than the Intrapersonally oriented respondents, but not significantly so. And the intrapersonally oriented individuals do have higher Intrapersonal DCS scores, but not significantly so. The three measures combined, the PAQ and the Carlson combined, and the Carlson alone approach multivariate significance ($p = .07$, $p = .076$, $p = .058$, respectively) for these effects, however. For the three measures combined and for the PAQ and the Carlson together, the trends are accounted for primarily by the differences in the Interpersonal scores. For the Carlson alone, we see an example of the unusual value of the multivariate method. The univariate statistics for the three DCS scales were not significant. Only when they and the two independent variables are examined together do we get an (almost) significant multivariate effect.

There were no significant differences between the interpersonally and intrapersonally oriented respondents on Reluctance to Interact with the Dying. In fact, those with a primarily interpersonal orientation tended to report more, not less, reluctance to interact with the dying on the RID subscale.

Summary. Hypothesis 3a-1 was only partially supported. A multiple regression analysis revealed the Feminine PAQ

explaining a significant proportion of the variance on the Interpersonal DCS in the predicted direction. The EPPS explained a significant proportion of the variance on the Intrapersonal DCS in the predicted direction. The Masculine PAQ explained a significant proportion of the variance on the RID subscale in the direction opposite to the prediction. Additionally, there were three significant correlations and one nonsignificant trend between the Death Concerns Scale and the personality measures in the predicted directions.

There were also non-significant multivariate trends (for the Carlson, the Carlson and the PAQ together, and the three personality scales combined) in which the interpersonally oriented respondents had higher Interpersonal scores on the DCS than the intrapersonally oriented respondents, and the intrapersonally oriented respondents had higher Intrapersonal scores than the interpersonally oriented respondents.

Hypothesis 3b-1 was not supported. There were no significant differences between interpersonally and intrapersonally oriented respondents on Reluctance to Interact with the Dying.

Hypothesis 3a-2: Effect of Inter/Intrapersonal Orientation on Freely Listed Concerns about Death

Those people whose notion of the self in relation to others is primarily interpersonal will, of the freely

expressed concerns about death, list more interpersonal concerns than those with an intrapersonal orientation.

Chi Square analyses of the highly interpersonal and intrapersonal respondents and the freely listed concerns about death were carried out. Classification of the respondents into the two orientations was conducted as before. The results of these analyses for the four personality scales are presented in Table 21.

For these analyses, the six themes that dealt relatively unambiguously with either interpersonal or intrapersonal concerns about death were utilized. Examining Table 21 for differences between inter- and intrapersonally oriented respondents on these themes, we see that "Physical Aspects" approached significance ($p = .058$) on the EPPS in the predicted direction. "Remember Me" was significant for the Carlson ($p < .05$) and approached significance for the EPPS ($p = .10$) in the predicted direction. "Connection" was highly significant ($p < .01$) for the Carlson in the predicted direction. And "Accomplishments" was significant ($p < .05$) for the Three Combined in the predicted direction. Differences between the two orientations for "Concern for Others" were in the predicted direction but not signficantly so. "Loss of Loved Ones" and "Connection" seemed generally to be a concern of all respondents. This is not surprising when we remember that respondents generally scored high on interpersonal concerns.

Table 21

Percent of Respondents Choosing Death Concerns Themes Broken Down by Inter/Intrapersonal Orientation

	EPPS		Carlson	
Death Concerns	Inter (N=69)	Intra (N=86)	Inter (N=88)	Intra (N=89)
Physical Aspects	46%	62%	59%	60%
Accomplishments	17%	21%	16%	21%
Connection	35%	34%	46%[a]	25%[a]
Loss Loved Ones	35%	27%	31%	32%
Concern Others	44%	35%	47%	38%
Remember Me	6%	14%	3%[b]	12%[b]
	PAQ		3 Combined	
	Inter (N=50)	Intra (N=49)	Inter (N=9)	Intra (N=14)
Physical Aspects	62%	53%	78%	64%
Accomplishments	18%	29%	0[c]	36%[c]
Connection	38%	33%	44%	36%
Loss Loved Ones	22%	31%	22%	29%
Concern Others	50%	37%	56%	29%
Remember Me	10%	20%	0	14%

Note: The percent represents how many of the group listed the particular concern. The analyses were Chi Squares.

[a] $p < .01$ [b] $p < .05$ [c] $p < .05$

For the question about the most important concern about death, there were no significant differences by orientation. See Table 22 for the presentation of this data.

Summary. Hypothesis 3a-2 was only partially supported. For the freely listed concerns about death, primarily interpersonal respondents (on the Carlson) listed "Connection" significantly more often than primarily intrapersonal respondents. "Remember Me" and "Accomplishments" exhibited significant differences in the predicted direction (on the Carlson and three personality scales combined, respectively); these concerns about death were more often selected by the more intrapersonally oriented respondents.

Hypothesis 3b-2: Effect of Inter/Intrapersonal Orientation on Stated Willingness to Interact with the Dying

Those people whose notion of the self in relation to others is primarily interpersonal will express more stated willingness to interact with a dying person than those with an intrapersonal orientation.

Stated willingness to talk to a dying person about death (from the scenario--see Appendix H) was correlated with the personality measures. None of the correlations were significant. Chi Square analyses were also conducted (Table 23) examining willingness to talk to a dying patient by inter/intrapersonal orientation on the personality measures. There were no significant differences between the interpersonally and the intrapersonally oriented respondents

Table 22

Percent of Respondents Choosing Themes as "Most Important Concern about Death" Broken Down by Orientation

	EPPS		Carlson	
Death Concerns	Inter (N=62)	Intra (N=80)	Inter (N=81)	Intra (N=82)
Physical Aspects	13%	20%	17%	16%
Accomplishments	5%	5%	1%	6%
Connection	18%	9%	12%	11%
Loss Loved Ones	15%	13%	16%	13%
Concern Others	15%	10%	14%	15%
Can't Categorize	7%	4%	5%	5%
	PAQ		3 Combined	
	Inter (N=47)	Intra (N=44)	Inter (N=9)	Intra (N=13)
Physical Aspects	17%	16%	22%	31%
Accomplishments	4%	5%	0	15%
Connection	6%	9%	11%	0
Loss Loved Ones	13%	9%	22%	8%
Concern Others	13%	14%	11%	8%
Can't Categorize	6%	5%	0	0

Note: The percent represents how many of the group selected the concern as the most important. Not all columns add to 100% due to rounding. Analyses were Chi Squares.

Table 23

Number of Highly Interpersonal and Highly Intrapersonal Respondents Who Are Willing to Interact with a Dying Patient

Talk to Dying	EPPS		Carlson	
	Intrap'l	Interp'l	Intrap'l	Interp'l
Yes	63	57	70	73
No	22	13	21	14

	PAQ		3 Combined	
	Intrap'l	Interp'l	Intrap'l	Interp'l
Yes	40	41	10	9
No	9	8	3	0

Note: Analyses were Chi Squares. There were no significant differences on any of the measures.

in stated willingness to talk to a dying patient on any of the measures. Additionally, chi square analyses examined the effect of experience with the death of a close other on stated willingness to talk to a dying person about death. There were no significant differences between those who had experienced the death of an other and those who had not. Hypothesis 3b-2 was not supported.

Hypotheses 4a-1 and 4b-1: Effect of Gender, Race, and Class on Death Concerns Scale Scores

Men, whites, and the middle and upper classes in comparison with women, people of color, and members of the working class will have a higher score on the Intrapersonal concerns about death subscale, a lower score on the Interpersonal DCS, and will express more reluctance to interact with a dying person on the three scale items.

For this series of analyses, MANOVAs were conducted with gender, race and class as the independent variables and the DCS scales as the dependent variables. Table 24 reports the mean Interpersonal and Intrapersonal scores for the Death Concerns Scale in all the cells of the demographic variables. They are presented as reference points, to show variations among the cells that may exist but not be significantly different. It is clear that almost everyone scored higher on the Interpersonal subscale than on the Intrapersonal subscale. However, examination of the individual cells shows, for example, that male persons of

Table 24

DCS Scores by Demographic Variables

Race/ Occup'l Status	Interpersonal Scores Female (N)	Male (N)	Intrapersonal Scores Female (N)	Male (N)
White				
1-45	5.88 (8)	6.04 (5)	3.59 (8)	4.32 (5)
46-75	5.84 (34)	5.61 (8)	3.79 (34)	4.35 (8)
76-100	5.82 (29)	4.84 (18)	4.26 (29)	3.24 (18)
People of Color				
1-45	5.07 (28)	4.92 (19)	3.52 (28)	3.55 (19)
46-75	5.80 (24)	4.93 (12)	3.55 (24)	4.27 (12)
76-100	6.02 (24)	4.86 (14)	4.66 (24)	3.55 (14)

Note: The range of scores is 1 to 7. Higher scores mean more of the dimension. Multivariate significances for main and interaction effects are to be found in Tables 25-28. These data are presented for illustrative purposes to show mean scores in all the cells.

color scored consistently lower than any other group on the Interpersonal subscale.

Tables 25 through 28 present the main and interaction effects yielded in the multivariate analyses of variance. Each will be dealt with in turn.

Gender. The most consistent and robust effect in this set of analyses is a main effect for gender, accounted for primarily by significant differences between men and women on their Interpersonal DCS scores. The women had higher Interpersonal scores than the men. Table 25 reports the data for these results. It is interesting to note that the women also scored marginally higher on the Intrapersonal subscale and on the Reluctance to Interact with the Dying subscale.

Race. Table 26 presents the results for the main effect of race. Differences in scores on the DCS between whites and people of color approached significance (multivariate F [1,.5,103.5] = 2.37, p = .07). This was due primarily to differences on the Interpersonal scores (univariate F (1,211) = 6.01, $p < .05$). Whites tended to have higher Interpersonal scores than people of color. This was counter to the prediction. This result is to be interpreted with caution due to the lack of multivariate significance.

Occupational status. There were no significant differences on the Death Concerns Scale scores for the main effect of occupational status (Table 27). There was,

Table 25

Death Concerns Scale Scores Broken Down by Gender

DCS	Female (N=147)	Male (N=76)	F[a]
Interpersonal	5.71	5.04	10.57*
Intrapersonal	3.92	3.73	n.s.
RID	3.27	3.07	n.s.

Note: The multivariate F (1,.5,103.5) = 3.76, $p < .05$, was significant for the main effect of gender.

[a]These are univariate Fs indicating the effect of gender on the specific subscales.

*$p < .01$

Table 26

Death Concerns Scale Scores Broken Down by Race

DCS	White (N=102)	People of Color (N=121)
Interpersonal[a]	5.65	5.34
Intrapersonal	3.88	3.83
RID	3.12	3.27

Note: The multivariate F (1,.5,103.5) = 2.37, p = .07, for the main effect of race on the DCS scores.

[a]Univariate F (1,211) = 6.01, $p < .05$, for the effect of race on the Interpersonal scores.

Table 27

Death Concerns Scale Scores

Broken Down by Occupational Status

Occupational Status	(N)	Intra-personal	Inter-personal
1-45	(60)	3.61	5.21
46-75	(78)	3.85	5.66
76-100	(85)	4.04	5.51

Note: Higher numbers indicate higher status occupations. There were no significant differences for occupational status on the DCS.

however, a highly significant gender by occupational status interaction effect. This will be dealt with below in the discussion of the gender by father's occupational status interaction effect (Table 29), because it is the father's occupational status that is driving the result. There is no gender by mother's occupation interaction effect.

Analyses were also conducted examining the effect of mother's and father's occupational status separately. In a study on the self in relation to others and society and concerns about death, it was felt that mother's and father's occupational status may have differential impacts on the way an individual may organize his or her experience.

Initially, mother's occupational status scores were broken into the same three occupational status categories used above, but there were too many cells with insufficient Ns when the MANOVAs were run by gender, race and occupational status. This occurred because one third of the cases did not even have status scores (the homemakers), and the women were not as widely represented in the status scores above 50. Therefore, mother's occupational status was split into three groups also: 1-50 (37%); 51-100 (33%); and homemaker (30%). This grouping made sense for mother's occupation, because scores over 50 tended to be supervisory white collar, technical and professional or managerial, comparable to the men in the 76-100 group. The women tended not to fall into the large middle group of precision production and craft occupations.

Using these occupational status categories, there was a significant main effect for mother's occupation on the Death Concerns Scale. This was accounted for by differences in the Intrapersonal scores. Table 28 presents the data. Intrapersonal scores were much higher in the higher occupational status group. The "homemaker" group scored as the lower occupational status group did. The high occupational status group was significantly different from both the low occupational status group and the homemakers. Looking at Table 24, we see that these differences were equally true for both males and females and for whites and people of color. The effect of mother's occupation on Intrapersonal scores was consistent across all groups.

Alongside this finding for mother's occupational status, there was a gender by father's occupational status interaction effect on the DCS (Table 29). This was accounted for primarily by highly significant (F [2, 0, 90.5] = 3.51, $p < .01$) differences in the Intrapersonal scores; however, the differences in the Interpersonal scores (F [2, 185] = 3.29, $p < .05$) and the RID scores (F [2, 185] = 3.13, $p < .05$) were also significant. At the higher levels of father's occupational status, females' Intrapersonal scores were higher and males' Intrapersonal scores were lower than at the lower occupational status groups. Examination of the data (Table 29) yields an obvious break for both females and males between the middle and highest occupational status group. The differences were

Table 28

Death Concerns Scale Scores

Broken Down by Mother's Occupational Status

Occupational Status Scores	(N)	Intra-personal	Inter-personal
1-50	(83)	3.59*	5.41
51-100	(76)	4.28*	5.65
Homemaker	(64)	3.65*	5.36

Note: Higher numbers indicate higher status occupations. The multivariate F (2,0,103.5) = 2.59, $p < .05$.

*The univariate F (2,211) = 6.41, $p < .01$.
A one-way analysis of variance using the Student-Newman-Keuls procedure determined that the 51-100 group was significantly different from both the 1-50 group and the homemaker group.

Table 29

Death Concerns Scale Scores Broken Down by Gender & Father's Occupational Status

Occupational Status Scores	Female	(N)	Male	(N)
Interpersonal Scores**				
1-45	5.37	(35)	5.22	(22)
46-75	5.89	(50)	5.03	(15)
76-100	5.85	(43)	4.85	(32)
Intrapersonal Scores***				
1-45	3.53	(35)	3.93	(22)
46-75	3.72	(50)	4.00	(15)
76-100	4.40	(43)	3.38	(32)
Reluctance to Interact with Dying Scores*				
1-45	3.11	(35)	3.52	(22)
46-75	3.39	(50)	3.07	(15)
76-100	3.33	(43)	2.76	(32)

Note: The multivariate F (2,0,90.5) = 3.51, $p < .01$, for the interaction effect of gender and father's occupational status.

*The univariate F (2,185) = 3.13, $p < .05$.

**The univariate F (2,185) = 3.29, $p < .05$.

***The univariate F (2,185) = 6.66, $p < .01$.

greatest between these two groups. In other words, the females whose fathers were in the highest occupational status group had the highest Intrapersonal scores (4.40), and the males whose fathers were in the highest occupational status group had the lowest Intrapersonal scores (3.38).

For the Interpersonal subscale and the RID subscale, females' scores were higher at higher levels of occupational status. In contrast, males' scores were lower at higher levels of occupational status.

Reluctance to interact with the dying. Table 30 presents the RID scores for all groups resulting from the MANOVAs. There were no differences for these groups. There was, however, a gender by father's occupation interaction effect (F [2, 185] = 3.13, $p < .05$). See Table 29 to see this difference clearly. At higher levels of father's occupational status, females' Reluctance to Interact with the Dying was higher, and males Reluctance to Interact with the Dying was lower.

Summary. Hypothesis 4a-1 was partially supported. Females had significantly higher Interpersonal scores on the DCS. Males did not have significantly higher Intrapersonal scores. There were no significant multivariate differences between whites and people of color. However, there was one significant univariate difference on the Interpersonal DCS. In contrast to the prediction, whites had significantly higher Interpersonal scores than people of color. There were no differences on the DCS for occupational status.

Table 30

RID Scores by Demographic Variables

Race/ Occp'l Status	Female	(N)	Male	(N)
White				
1-45	3.04	(8)	4.00	(5)
46-75	3.31	(34)	2.50	(8)
76-100	3.08	(29)	2.91	(18)
People Of Color				
1-45	3.24	(28)	3.25	(19)
46-75	3.35	(24)	3.58	(12)
76-100	3.49	(24)	2.57	(14)

Note: There were no significant differences for Reluctance to Interact with the Dying.

However, looking at mother's and father's occupational status separately, those respondents whose mothers were in the higher status occupations had higher Intrapersonal DCS scores than those respondents whose mothers were in the lower status occupations, or whose mothers were homemakers. For father's occupation, there was a significant gender by occupational status interaction. At the higher occupational status levels of the fathers, females had significantly higher Intrapersonal, Interpersonal, and RID scores and males had significantly lower Intrapersonal, Interpersonal, and RID scores.

Hypothesis 4b-1 was not supported. The only significant difference among the groups in reluctance to interact with the dying was an interaction effect for gender and father's occupational status. This result supported some aspects of the prediction and was counter to most others.

Hypothesis 4a-2: Effect of Gender, Race and Class on Freely Listed Concerns about Death

Men, whites, and members of the middle and upper classes in comparison with women, people of color, and members of the working class will, of the freely expressed concerns about death, list more intrapersonal concerns.

Tables 31, 32 and 33 address the results of Chi Square analyses of concerns about death by gender, race, and occupational status. As before, only the six themes that are primarily inter- or intrapersonal are presented. There

were two non-significant trends and one significant difference for gender: Males listed "Accomplishments" more than females ($p = .11$); females listed "Connection" ($p = .06$) and "Loss of Loved Ones" ($p < .05$) more than males. There were no significant differences on "Physical Aspects," "Concern for Others," or "Remember Me." Whites listed "Accomplishments" significantly more often ($p < .05$) than people of color. There were no other differences for race.

For "most important death concern" there were no significant differences for gender or race. One nonsignificant difference that is striking, however, is "Concern for Others." Seven percent of the whites listed it as the most important concern, but 17% of the people of color listed it as most important.

There were no significant differences among occupational status groups for the analysis by mother's occupation (Table 32). For father's occupation, there were significant differences among groups for "Loss of Loved Ones" ($p < .05$) and almost significant differences for "Concern for Others" ($p = .06$). The middle occupational status group selected "Loss of Loved Ones" significantly more often than either the lowest or highest occupational status group. "Concern for Others" was selected least often by the highest occupational status group and most often by the middle occupational status group.

There were no significant differences among occupational groupings in selections for "most important

Table 31

Percent of Respondents Choosing Death Concern Themes

Broken Down by Gender and Race

Freely Listed Death Concerns	Female (N=164)	Male (N=81)	White (N=111)	People of Color (N=134)
Physical Aspects	58%	57%	62%	54%
Accomplishments	18%	27%	28%[a]	16%[a]
Connection	38%	26%	37%	31%
Loss Loved Ones	35%[b]	21%[b]	30%	31%
Concern Others	42%	44%	43%	42%
Remember Me	10%	12%	13%	9%
Most Important Death Concern	**(N=149)**	**(N=76)**	**(N=105)**	**(N=120)**
Physical Aspects	17%	15%	18%	14%
Accomplishments	5%	5%	9%	2%
Connection	10%	13%	12%	10%
Loss Loved Ones	17%	12%	17%	13%
Concern Others	11%	15%	7%	17%
Can't Categorize	5%	4%	4%	5%

Note: Analyses were Chi Squares.

[a] $p < .05$ [b] $p < .05$

Table 32

Percent of Respondents Choosing Death Concern Themes by Occupational Status

Freely Listed Death Concerns	Mother's Occupation Analysis 1-50 (N=82)	51-100 (N=74)	Homemaker (N=66)
Physical Aspects	61%	55%	59%
Accomplishments	20%	27%	17%
Connection	35%	37%	32%
Loss Loved Ones	37%	28%	27%
Concern Others	40%	45%	41%
Remember Me	15%	12%	8%

	Father's Occupation Analysis 1-45 (N=56)	46-75 (N=65)	76-100 (N=74)
Physical Aspects	59%	57%	60%
Accomplishments	20%	25%	19%
Connection	36%	40%	31%
Loss Love Ones	23%[a]	43%[a]	26%[a]
Concern Others	46%	55%	35%
Remember Me	7%	11%	15%

Note: Analyses were Chi Squares.

[a] $p < .05$

death concern" (Table 33). It was noted, however, that only 5% of the homemakers (mother's occupation analysis) selected "Connection" as most important, while 13% of the lower occupational status group and 16% of the higher occupational status group selected "Connection" as most important. Also, in the father's occupation analysis, 20% of the lowest occupational status grouping selected "Concern for Others" as most important, and the two higher occupational status groups selected "Concern for Others" as most important only 7% and 8% of the time, respectively.

Summary. Hypothesis 4a-2 was only partially supported. Females listed "Loss of Loved Ones" significantly more than males. Whites listed "Accomplishments" significantly more often than people of color. There were several non-significant trends consistent with the hypothesis.

Hypothesis 4b-2: Effect of Gender, Race, and Class on Stated Willingness to Interact with a Dying Person

Men, whites, and members of the middle and upper classes in comparison with women, people of color, and members of the working class will express less stated willingness to interact with a dying person.

Chi Square analyses were conducted on the scenario responses for stated willingness to talk to a dying patient by the demographic variables. The results are presented in Table 34. The only significant difference was for race. People of color (30%) reported signficantly ($p < .01$) less willingness to talk to the dying than did whites (13%).

Table 33

Percent of Respondents Choosing

"Most Important Death Concern"

Broken Down by Occupational Status

Most Important Death Concern	Mother's Occupation Analysis		
	1-50 (N=75)	51-100 (N=71)	Homemaker (N=60)
Physical Aspects	16%	17%	17%
Accomplishments	4%	7%	5%
Connection	13%	16%	5%
Loss Loved Ones	20%	10%	17%
Concern Others	13%	11%	8%
Can't Categorize	3%	7%	5%

	Father's Occupation Analysis		
	1-45 (N=50)	46-75 (N=61)	76-100 (N=69)
Physical Aspects	16%	13%	17%
Accomplishments	4%	7%	4%
Connection	12%	13%	12%
Loss Loved Ones	18%	20%	12%
Concern Others	20%	8%	7%
Can't Categorize	2%	2%	10%

Note: Analyses were Chi Squares.

Table 34

Stated Willingness to Talk to the Dying

Broken Down by Demographic Variables

Groups	Talk to Dying Yes	No	p
Female	133	34	n.s.
Male	60	21	
White	96	14	p<.01
People of Color	97	41	
Mother's Occupation			
1-50	63	19	
51-100	61	14	n.s.
Homemaker	54	13	
Father's Occupation			
1-45	44	13	
46-75	51	13	n.s.
76-100	62	15	

Note: Analyses were Chi Squares.

This is opposite to the prediction. Hypothesis 4b-2 was not supported.

CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION

Organization of the Discussion

The discussion is organized in the following way. First, an overview of the research and brief summary of the results will be presented. A discussion of the Death Concerns Scale construction, reliability and validity will follow. Then a discussion of the major findings concerning the hypotheses will be addressed, including discussion of methodological problems. Finally, a brief set of conclusions will be drawn.

Overview

In this study concerns about death were seen as an object of study in themselves as well as a way of distilling and making manifest one's habitual, perhaps unconscious, ways of organizing experience. It was assumed that asking someone to consider what concerned them about death would tell us not only what their thoughts on death and dying were, but also what was important to them in their life (see Feifel, 1990). Considerations of death then become a way of assessing what one's life is about. Death is for some the end. For others it is a door to another world. In either case, it structures, consciously or unconsciously how one lives one's life. To make its reality conscious is to

consider one's values, one's way of living and being. Thus it becomes a vehicle for how we organize our experience.

It was hypothesized, first, that people with systematically different relationships to the power structure of the social order would have systematically different notions of the self-in-relation-to-others. Specifically, it was hypothesized that women, people of color, and members of the working class would focus on more interpersonal issues involving attachment and connection, and that men, whites, and members of the middle and upper classes would focus on more intrapersonal issues involving autonomy and separation in constructing meaning in their world.

Second, it was hypothesized that people with systematically different notions of the self-in-relation-to-others would have systematically different concerns about death. Specifically, it was hypothesized that people who are primarily oriented toward interpersonal issues would focus on the death of the other and loss of relationships, and that people who are primarily intrapersonal would focus on the death of the self and missed accomplishments.

With regard to the first set of hypotheses, the findings of this study lent some support to these conjectures. There were differences in the predicted directions for gender, but none for race, and none for occupational status in general. There was a robust effect for gender both on the personality scales and on the Death

Concerns Scale (DCS). Women had higher interpersonal scores than men. Men had higher intrapersonal scores than women on the personality scales but not on the Death Concerns Scale. On the DCS respondents in general had higher mean interpersonal than intrapersonal scores. There were no significant effects for occupational status on the personality scales; and no general occupational status effects on the Death Concerns Scale. However, separating out mother's and father's occupation, there was a main effect for mother's occupational status on the DCS. Those respondents whose mothers were upper class had higher intrapersonal DCS scores than those respondents whose mothers were working class or were homemakers. There was an interaction effect for gender by father's occupational status. Consistent with the hypotheses, females whose fathers were upper class had higher intrapersonal scores than females whose fathers were working class; however, contrary to the hypotheses, males whose fathers were upper class had lower intrapersonal scores than males whose fathers were working class.

With regard to the second set of hypotheses, the findings of this study lent only partial support to their conjectures. There was some evidence that those who were generally more inter/intrapersonal did score in the same direction on the Death Concerns Scale, but not significantly so. The more interpersonally oriented scored higher on the Interpersonal subscale of the DCS, and the more

intrapersonally oriented scored higher on the Intrapersonal subscale of the DCS. However, in contrast to the prediction, those who were more intrapersonal were less reluctant to interact with the dying, and those who were more interpersonal were more reluctant to interact with the dying. Overall, the evidence for this set of hypotheses was not as strong as for the hypotheses dealing with gender. The reasons may be primarily methodological. This will be discussed below.

In general, I believe the research here suffers, in part, from too large a distance between the overall theory--place in the social order influencing the construction of meaning--and the specific elaboration of that theory--inter/intrapersonal orientation and concerns about death. There is enough previous research on gender to make the link, but few concrete ties to race and occupational status. What is needed is a middle-level, context-dependent theory supported by exploratory research with different class and race groups. (See the discussion, below, on the problems with the personality scales and race, for example.)

Death Concerns Scale: Development, Reliability, Validity

The initial conception of this study took place when the author noted three things about the attitudes toward death literature: 1) Evidence for the existence of gender differences was confusing and contradictory. 2) There was no theoretical basis for the examination of gender differences in this literature. 3) Most studies dealt with

the affective, not the cognitive aspects of attitudes toward death.

The creation of the Death Concerns Scale was an attempt to remedy these deficiencies in the literature. It was also an attempt to go beyond examining gender differences per se, and to see gender differences, along with race and class differences, as manifestations of an underlying explanatory variable, place in the social order.

The DCS was constructed to examine a particular dimension of concerns about death, the Interpersonal/Intrapersonal orientation--focusing on concerns about the loss of relationship versus the loss of one's self and possibilities for achievement--which was theoretically expected to be sensitive to gender, race and class differences. There was previous evidence of gender differences, and some small evidence for the possibility of race and class differences, on the Inter/Intrapersonal dimension in general, but no direct examination of this particular aspect of concerns about death.

This study has demonstrated that a theoretical basis for an expectation of gender differences in a particular situation, cognitive attitudes toward death, leads to a more complex set of results in which robust gender differences can emerge, than in an indiscriminant perusal of gender differences in areas such as death fear or death anxiety. We found that females had consistently higher interpersonal scores than males. Males did not have higher intrapersonal

scores than females, however. It is not clear whether the Intrapersonal items do not adequately tap the intended variable or whether the Death Concerns Scale has simply demonstrated a strong emphasis on everyone's part about losing those close to them.

However, differences for race and occupational status, in general, were not obtained. This calls into question either the utility of the overall theory, or its elaboration in this instance. At the least, more preparatory work needs to be done on mid-level theory development and methodological preparation for the exploration of race and occupational status effects on inter/intrapersonal orientation and concerns about death.

The factor analysis of the 40 items generated to measure Inter/Intrapersonal concerns about death revealed the three factors (Interpersonal, Intrapersonal, and Reluctance to Interact with the Dying) as expected. The reliability of the subscales on the DCS was acceptable and consistent for both the scale construction and the hypothesis testing samples.

Support for the validity of the Death Concerns Scale was mixed. The study of the targeted groups, the engineers and the hospice workers, did not support the original expectations that hospice workers would be more interpersonal and engineers would be more intrapersonal. Two explanations are possible here. First, it was argued

that the expectation was flawed. It was a mistake to assume that people who self-evidently have a very low reluctance to interacting with the dying would also be highly interpersonal. In fact, it may be dysfunctional to one's work to be highly interpersonal if one's clients are terminal patients. The ability to be separate and autonomous, more intrapersonal, would be more functional in this context. Second, it may be that engineering students in the 1980s, or students generally, are simply more interpersonal than intrapersonal. Most respondents (college students) in this study had higher interpersonal than intrapersonal scores on both the personality scales and the DCS. We do not know if people who are not young college students would be less interpersonal.

There was, however, some support for the construct validity of the Death Concerns Scale. The evidence for this support took several forms: a) the relationship between the spontaneously listed concerns about death and the DCS; b) the relationship between the pre-existing personality scales measuring the general inter/intrapersonal orientation and the DCS; and c) the ability of the DCS to act in the way the theory predicted.

The spontaneously listed concerns about death did include both interpersonal and intrapersonal items, as well as themes that were not a part of the Death Concerns Scale, such as concerns about an afterlife and the inevitability of death. The two most frequently listed themes were concerns

about an afterlife and the process of dying. What we also see in the freely listed death concerns is more evidence of the overall concern for Interpersonal issues--"connection" and "loss of loved ones" seemed generally to be of concern to all respondents. This was underestimated in the hypotheses.

There was some evidence of a relationship between the choice of freely listed concerns about death and scores on the DCS. Additionally, correlations and multivariate analyses obtained some evidence, both significant and nonsignificant trends, demonstrating a relationship between the personality measures and the DCS in the predicted directions. The more interpersonally oriented (as measured on the personality scales) scored higher on the Interpersonal DCS and the more intrapersonally oriented scored higher on the Intrapersonal DCS.

This moderate but inconclusive support for the ability of the Inter/Intrapersonal orientation to predict scores on the DCS may be due to the ways in which the pre-existing personality scales are approximations of the Interpersonal orientation. They were not designed with the orientation in mind but were culled from existing scales and their nature is that, approximate. It may also be accounted for by a certain amount of "noise" in the DCS. The three factors accounted for only 47% of the variance in the scores. Future research in this area should design an instrument that deals in a general way with the inter/intrapersonal

orientation and tries to make it sensitive to race/ethnicity and class issues.

In testing the hypotheses, the Death Concerns Scale has in some ways "acted as it was predicted to act". There were gender and occupational status differences (when mother's and father's occupations are analyzed separately) in the predicted direction for females. However, males were not more intrapersonal than females, and upper class males were less intrapersonal than working class males. It is not known whether these results are due to a college student sample. Persons in the general population may have scored differently. The predictions for race were not supported. It may be that the DCS does not adequately measure interpersonal and intrapersonal concerns about death for people of color. It may also be that there simply are not differences between whites and people of color on this scale. Further work needs to be done to assess the validity of the Death Concerns Scale, but there is enough preliminary evidence in support of its validity to warrant further efforts.

Impact of the Demographic Variables

A major thesis of this research is that gender, race and class are not explanatory variables in themselves but representative of place in the social order. The focus in this study, then, is on the relationship between differential access to power, as manifested in the demographic variables, and degree of the inter/intrapersonal

orientation, generally and for concerns about death. It is maintained that those lower in the social order will be more interpersonal and that those higher in the social order will be more intrapersonal.

In order to uphold this model, ideally one would have hoped to find differences as predicted for each of the demographic variables. The predicted differences were obtained for gender. There were no differences for race and occupational status in general. The model may be inadequate and require a less simplistic dichotomization of power and the inter/intrapersonal orientation. Also, there may be an explanation specific to the variable of race, for example, which would explain the lack of predicted results. Both may be true, but it is argued here that methodological issues may account for the lack of results for race. These should be remedied, mid-level theory should be generated and the model retested.

Gender and race. One possible explanation for the singularly robust nature of the gender result is that the author is female, white and middle-class, and knows intimately and well gender issues, or, more explicitly, how they may be expressed or enacted in a particular context. She knows less well, although has some familiarity with, class issues. She is, however, personally unfamiliar with the concrete expression of issues of race and how they would be experienced from the perspective of minorities in this culture (see McIntosh, 1988).

In other words, it is possible to design an instrument, or a study, that will fairly accurately reflect that with which one is intimately familiar and "knows" or suspects to be true. It is much harder to design items for a scale or a dimension of study without the concrete knowledge that would give it weight. This is not to say that only Blacks can know enough to study the race issues of Blacks, for example. It is to say, however, that whoever is designing the study must have a certain amount of familiarity with the concrete expression of the issues. Failing that, they must seek information from those who do.

The items for the Death Concerns Scale were not designed with an understanding of how the Interpersonal and Intrapersonal subscales might be concretely expressed from the point of view of people of color. Do interpersonal and intrapersonal mean something concretely different to people of color? Or are the items in the DCS reflecting a true lack of differences between whites and minorities in their concerns about death?

There is some evidence in the data examining the impact of gender, race, and class on the inter/intrapersonal orientation (as measured by the personality scales) indicating different scoring patterns for females of color depending on the personality scale (see Table 19). On the Feminine PAQ females of color scored solidly at the mean for the lower occupational status categories and negatively for the highest occupational status group. One could have

expected the females of color to be highly interpersonal, as they were both minority and female, but even working class minority females were not far from the mean on the Feminine PAQ. Spence and Helmreich developed and tested the PAQ on an almost exclusively white population. Perhaps the "interpersonal" or "femininity" aspects of this scale are simply more relevant for a white population and do not tap the minority view of what it means to be Interpersonal.

The PAQ "femininity" attributes (Appendix E)--emotional, able to devote self completely to others, gentle, helpful to others, kind, aware of feelings of others, understanding of others, warm in relations to others--represent stereotypes of the "ideal" female in white middle-class culture. They do not, however, encompass other aspects of what could also be seen as the Interpersonal orientation, such as: commitment to the furtherance of the community or the family; recognition of the importance of a sense of responsibility to others and to oneself as a part of the community; seeing us all as a part of a whole; focusing on connection.

A minority member might have more of a consciousness of having to pull together in order to survive, or a grittier understanding of what it takes to survive (McIntosh, 1988). If the Feminine PAQ had been more sensitive to the Interpersonal reality of minorities, we might have seen higher Interpersonal scores on it for females of color.

The items on the EPPS, in contrast, deal with a broader range of interpersonal experience (see Appendix F). They include an equal number of "nurturance" and "affiliation" items, while the Feminine PAQ items are primarily "nurturance". The EPPS interpersonal items tend also to be somewhat more actively interpersonal than the Feminine PAQ items. And, in fact, the interpersonal scores of females of color are marginally higher than on the Feminine PAQ. This broader range of interpersonal experience may allow the minority women to more easily identify with the interpersonal items on this scale.

The Carlson Adjective Checklist, like the EPPS, is less sex-typed. The two groups of adjectives, "social" and "personal", are relatively free of sex and color bias. The social adjectives are social along a range of dimensions, e.g., leader, warm, attractive, frank, cooperative, persuasive. This is also true for the personal adjectives: ambitious, idealistic, imaginative, wise, independent, creative. Unlike the PAQ, the social items here are more broadly social and not just stereotypical nurturing female behavior. And the personal items are not limited to male valued or achievement oriented work ethic attributes. Because of this they would allow those who may not adhere to the stereotypes to identify with the items as "social" or as "personal".

In fact, the females of color are much more highly interpersonal on this scale than they were on the Feminine

PAQ. Like the EPPS, Interpersonal here is more broadly defined and perhaps allowed them to identify with the items more easily than in the case of the Feminine PAQ.

In order to advance this research, attention must be paid to eliciting from minorities the concrete experience of what interpersonal and intrapersonal mean to them. How do they experience it and what are the forms, quite literally, that these expressions take with regard to specific life expressions and experiences. The theory then may find more general confirmation.

Additionally, an additive model may be too simplistic. It essentially ignores the force of one's perceived reality and gives equal weight to each of the variables indicative of place in the social order. Their weight and importance may vary with each of the groups and with the variables or situations under study.

Occupational status. The results for occupational status in the analyses of the Death Concerns Scale were of two kinds. Generally, there were no differences for occupational status. On the other hand, by separating out analyses by mother's and father's occupations, there were some compelling and provocative results. For the most part they supported the general theory offered here that higher place in the social order is associated with higher Intrapersonal scores. This was clearly the case for mother's occupational status. For all groups, whites/people of color, females/males, Intrapersonal scores were highest

when the mother worked in the higher occupational status jobs. That is, these respondents were most concerned about the loss of opportunities for achievement and attaining personal goals in their concerns about death--more so than the respondents whose mothers were in the lower status occupations. These scores were significantly different from the Intrapersonal scores of both those respondents whose mothers were homemakers and those whose mothers worked in the lower occupational status jobs.

Using father's occupational status, Intrapersonal scores were also highest for females whose fathers were in the highest occupational status group. In contrast, the Intrapersonal scores were lowest for males whose fathers were in that same group. This was true both for white males and males of color, but the differences were most extreme for white males. That is, white males whose fathers were in the lowest occupational status group had very high intrapersonal scores, and white males whose fathers were in the highest occupational status group had very low intrapersonal scores.

How do we explain the apparent departure from the prediction and theory of the males' intrapersonal scores (in contrast to the females' scores) on the father's occupational status analysis? Why are mothers' and fathers' occupational status results different?

One possible explanation is congruent with Chodorow's theory of gender identity. It is with the highest

occupational status category that the males' Intrapersonal scores (and therefore concerns about lost opportunities for achievement and work) are the lowest. Intrapersonal scores for the two lower occupational status groups are significantly higher and quite close to each other. It is also in the highest occupational status group that one finds the professional and managerial occupations that tend to be the most demanding in terms of time and emotional or psychological commitment beyond "nine to five." It may be that in this group there are many more work-absent fathers. Chodorow discussed the problem for males of identifying with a fantasy figure, one who is largely not there during the boy's waking hours. It may be that the male respondents in this group of high-achieving fathers are painfully aware of the connection for them between intrapersonal values (in the DCS they are heavily focused on work and achievement) and what they lose in terms of a close personal relationship with the father. They then may reject or devalue the intrapersonal dimension.

The contrast between father's and mother's occupational status influencing intrapersonal scores is instructive here, and may lend support to the above interpretation. For those respondents whose mothers are in the highest occupational status group, both males and females have higher intrapersonal scores than those respondents whose mothers are in the lowest occupational status group or are homemakers. These males' intrapersonal scores (white males,

4.19; males of color, 4.31) are also higher than the intrapersonal scores of those males whose fathers are in the highest occupational status group (white males, 3.32; males of color, 3.74).

One way of interpreting these results is to point out a generally accepted fact of life for professional women--they have two jobs, their paid employment and the job of homemaker/mother. Unlike the male professional, these women tend not to be absent at home even as they pursue a career. It is probably a fair assumption to make that at home the mother is conveying positive values about intrapersonal achievement and work goals. Yet because of her continued physical and emotional presence, neither the son nor the daughter need reject the Intrapersonal values.

Interestingly, and in further support of this line of reasoning, the daughters of high status occupation fathers are highly Intrapersonal. They can afford to learn from their fathers about work goals and achievement, and aspire to same, without having lost their prime source of gender identity, their mother.

Further research in this area should explore in more detail, perhaps in focused interviews, how both males and females from varying economic and racial backgrounds see their relationship with the same and opposite sex parent, specifically with regard to the perception of values involving work and the family. This could give some

qualitative backup to any replication of these results, and needed data for these conjectures.

Beyond main effects. The results concerning the demographic variables in this study include both multivariate main and interaction effects--main effects for gender and mother's occupational status, and an interaction effect for gender by father's occupational status on the DCS. Additionally, there was a significant multivariate interaction effect for gender, race, and class on the personality measures. In some ways, the interaction effects are more interesting, because they are one level more reflective of human complexity than main effects--particularly in research dealing with complex human perceptions and feelings. It is important to look at the interactions and to take into consideration all aspects of a person's background in trying to understand how it is that they make sense of their world.

We do not really know quite how each of the demographic variables may differentially affect relationship to the power structure. Is race, class, or gender more important, and does the relative importance of each of those variables depend on whether one is white or a person of color, male or female, or upper or lower class? An additive model would assume the more "powerful" (insider) attributes one has, the more one would be intrapersonal; and, conversely, the fewer "powerful" attributes, the more one would be interpersonal. This kind of model has a certain appeal in its simplicity.

Social and psychological forces seldom work that directly, however, as was demonstrated by the case of the upper class white males and their relatively low Intrapersonal scores compared with other male groups. In order to gain some understanding of the differential impact of gender, race, and class and the separate reality of each of the subgroups, comparisons should be made among all of them.

In effect, the argument should be made that it is important to complicate our study of human behavior. While "females" overall may score more interpersonally, it is important to know if working class white females score the same, or differently than, working class females of color. One of the assuptions of this study is that all behavior is situated in a context, with a history, and in trying to understand it we must try to identify as much of that context as possible. As such, to look only at whites versus people of color, or females versus males, leaves out a great deal of the context and thus the information which might help us understand what it is that we see. The attempt at identifying context should involve examining all the gender, race and class combinations.

Reluctance to Interact with the Dying

The inability of the inter/intrapersonal orientation to predict scores on the "reluctance to interact with the dying" (RID) subscale of the DCS, or to predict stated willingness to talk to the dying about death on the

scenario, probably represents a misinterpretation of the orientation's impact on one's reluctance.

It was predicted that the more interpersonally oriented individuals would be more willing to interact with the dying because they valued relationship and connection and would feel responsible to another's need. What was not considered was the potential difficulty the more interpersonally oriented might anticipate in these circumstances precisely because they might be so concerned about the other and perhaps less able to intellectually distance themselves from a potentially painful situation. If it is difficult for them to distance, and they feel they would become too involved in a painful interaction, they might be less willing to engage in that interaction in the first place.

The more intrapersonally oriented, on the other hand, had a non-significant tendency to be less reluctant to interact with the dying. Perhaps they were less reluctant precisely because they could be more distant or separate from the other to begin with and, therefore, not personally experience the painful aspects of such an interaction. They could call on the more abstract idea of need instead of the more personal reality of need and not feel as personally threatened.

There is, however, another possible explanation--the social desirability of "helping" behavior. The scores on the RID potentially ranged from 1 to 7. The mean was 3.2, however, labeled "somewhat incorrect for me" in the

questionnaire. This indicated a low reluctance to interact with the dying. The same is true for stated willingness to talk to a dying person. Seventy-six percent of the respondents stated they were willing to talk to a dying person about death. It may be that social desirability in this paper and pencil test of intent overwhelmed any possible differences between the interpersonally and intrapersonally oriented respondents.

The stated high willingness on both measures to interact with the dying about death seems counter to personal experience and to accounts in the literature about our culture's denial and avoidance of death. Perhaps the response is counter-phobic in addition to being socially desirable. We do not know what the respondents' behavior would be in a real-life situation.

While most people stated they were willing to interact with the dying, people of color were significantly less willing to talk to the dying than were whites. This was counter to the general prediction. One interpretation is that for this particular kind of prosocial behavior there may be more of a sanction for admitting unwillingness to talk to the dying about death for whites than for people of color. Perhaps it is culturally more acceptable to admit reluctance for people of color than for whites.

The Problem of College Students

Perhaps the single largest mediating factor in attenuating the results based on the theory discussed above,

is the fact that the respondents were college students. In a study that is concerned with examining place in the social order, as measured by gender, race, and class, and the effect of that place on ways of looking at the world, a sample of all college students has great potential to attenuate those effects.

The fact of being college students, traditionally associated with the middle and upper classes, already places the respondents in a special category, a group that is, in this culture, more and more common, but still among the elite. Minority and working class college students have in some way placed themselves apart from their non-college bound peers. At least some part of their values and ways of looking at the world and their place in it must be somewhat different by virtue of being in college.

An important consideration and suggestion for future research, therefore, is not to use a college population, exclusively. One should go to the community and select a range of minorities and working class respondents so that those groups are not represented entirely by their elites or young who are possibly using college as a way out of their background.

This raises another concern for future research--that of age differences. While we noted no consistent age differences on the variables in the sample used to test the hypotheses, the sample was primarily young. Fifteen percent (37) were over 25, but only three percent (7) were over 35.

Future research should look at a more representative age sampling and examine differences among various age groups. For example, previous research (Feldman, Biringen, & Nash, 1981; Fry, 1985; Neugarten, 1977) has shown some evidence that there are role and/or attitudinal changes with older men and women. Women tend to become more active outside the home and concerned with achieving for themselves, while men tend to become more concerned with home and family.

These findings are not inconsistent with the theory expressed here. Men's relationship to power and their place in the social order might change as they retired and became elderly. If the women had been primarily homemakers, their relationship to the social order also would or could change as their children left the home and they were freer to pursue other interests. The cohorts involved in these studies would have matured at a time when it was not as common as it is now for there to be dual career families.

Conclusions

The general theory proposed here--that place in the social order, as manifested in gender, race and class, influences one's perception of the self-in-relation-to-others, and that that orientation influences one's concerns about death--was supported only by the results for gender and the separate mother's occupation analysis results.

Females had significantly higher interpersonal scores than males, both generally and with regard to concerns about death. The upper class respondents had significantly higher

intrapersonal scores in their concerns about death than the working class respondents, using mother's occupational status analysis. With the father's occupational status analysis, there were provocative gender differences in DCS scores. Females with upper class fathers had higher intrapersonal scores than females with working class fathers and than males with upper class fathers. Males with upper class fathers had lower intrapersonal scores than males with working class fathers and than females with upper class fathers. It was suggested that further research could explore how males and females from varying racial and economic backgrounds perceive parental (same and opposite sex) influence on their values, specifically with regard to work and the family.

The results for general occupational status did not support the model.

The results for race/ethnicity did not support the proposed theoretical model. Possible methodological reasons for this were explored. Refinement of the measures was suggested with particular attention being paid to eliciting what the inter/intrapersonal orientation may mean to minorities, and incorporating the results of this understanding into future measures.

In general, it is recommended that a mid-level theory be developed which is closer to the specific issues studied. This theory should be informed by exploratory resarch on the

meaning of the inter/intrapersonal orientation and concerns about death for different race and class groups.

The Death Concerns Scale appears to be reliable. Further work needs to be done to more firmly establish its validity.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Informed Consent/Cover Letter

This questionnaire is part of a research project on people's attitudes and opinions about death and dying. We are trying to understand better the connection between how people may see themselves and their lives and the concerns they may have about death and dying. For some people, answering questions like those in this questionnaire can be an interesting and thought-provoking experience. It gives them the opportunity to think about things they may not ordinarily think about every day. For other people, answering some of the questions can be stressful, particularly if it reminds them of an experience they found painful or upsetting. In trying to understand our human experience, we believe that it is important both to ask the questions and to respect the feelings of those who do not wish to answer them.

Participation in answering the questions in this questionnaire is entirely voluntary and anonymous. If at any point you do not wish to answer a particular question or if you do not want to finish the questionnaire, you are completely free to do so without penalty of any kind. We also very much appreciate the extent to which each of you is willing to share his/her thoughts and experience with us.

We will be asking several types of questions: general background questions, questions about how you see yourself, concerns about death, experience with death, and reactions to a scenario. Completing the questionnaire should take approximately 30 to 45 minutes. Please try to answer the questions as honestly as possible. <u>There are no "right" or "wrong" answers.</u> In each question we always want to know what <u>you</u> think.

If you would like a summary of the results of the research when it is completed, please request an envelope, put your name and address on it, and place it in the large envelope marked "Requests for Results." A summary of the results will be sent to you at the completion of the study.

Thank you for your help. If you have any questions about the study I may be reached at the address below.

Jody Brown
Social/Personality Psychology
Graduate School & University Center
City University of New York
33 West 42 Street
New York, New York 10036

APPENDIX A, continued

I have read the above and agree to participate in this study. I understand I may cease participating at any point without penalty of any kind.

_____

Signature Date

APPENDIX B

Death Concerns Scale: 40 Original Items Subjected to Factor Analysis

1. not my own death but the death of someone close to me
2. *losing my chance to stand out from the crowd
3. not being needed anymore
4. *not wanting to talk to a dying person about his/her death
5. *not realizing my work potential
6. my own death more than the death of someone close to me
7. feeling alone
8. *ending all plans and activities
9. *missing those close to me when they die
10. *living on after death by becoming famous
11. *not wanting to be around dying persons
12. *not having said what I wanted to say to my loved ones
13. *ending all creative activities
14. believing I've been part of a community and affected people I've known
15. being replaced at work
16. losing connection with others
17. *not being able to care for my family and friends
18. the loss and destruction of my self
19. *being missed by those close to me
20. not having control over my life at the end
21. *not wanting to visit a dying friend
22. *not being missed in the world at large
23. being able to be with my loved ones when they are dying
24. taking care of my business affairs before dying
25. *not knowing what to do with myself if I lose someone close to me
26. *dying before I have achieved my work goals
27. *losing someone close to me
28. *not being able to do things anymore
29. *causing sorrow to relatives and friends
30. *being needed by my family
31. being able to be with my loved ones when I am dying
32. *not having left my mark on the world
33. providing financially for my family
34. living on in the memories of my family and friends
35. being left alone at the end
36. *ending of ties with loved ones
37. *having unresolved problems with family or friends
38. losing my independence at the end
39. *being remembered after death through my individual accomplishments
40. realizing we are all basically alone

*retained in the final scale

APPENDIX B, continued

Death Concerns Scale: Interpersonal and Intrapersonal Subscales

Interpersonal Concerns (concerns about relationships and connections):

-losing someone close to me
-missing those close to me when they die
-not having said what I wanted to say to my loved ones
-not being able to care for my family and friends
-being missed by those close to me
-not knowing what to do with myself if I lose someone close to me
-causing sorrow to relatives and friends
-being needed by my family
-ending of ties with loved ones
-having unresolved problems with family or friends

Intrapersonal Concerns (concerns about personal goals and achievements)

-not realizing my work potential
-ending all plans and activities
-living on after death by becoming famous
-ending all creative activities
-not being missed in the world at large
-dying befor I have achieved my work goals
-losing my chance to stand out from the crowd
-not being able to do things anymore
-not having left my mark on the world
-being remembered after death through my individual accomplishments

APPENDIX C

Death Concerns (freely listed)

1)Afterlife: What happens after death, spiritual, religious.
Including: reincarnation, heaven & hell, who will I see, whre will I go, what is it like, long sleep?
Scoring: Neither
2)Timing & Physical Circumstances of Own Death.
Including: timing of death, cause, pain, what will happen, what will become of body, physical circumstances of death, the funeral, burial
Scoring: Intrapersonal
3)Inevitability & uncontrollability of death (powerlessness)
Including: unfairness, death of innocent and young, untimeliness, meaning of life, acceptance, why die, can't come back, gone forever
Scoring: Neither
4)My accomplishments, goals, experiences and contributions
Including: do what I want, experience all, accomplishments, personal goals and contributions
Scoring: Intrapersonal
5)Being in Connection (focus on connection or lack thereof)
Including: never seeing family & friends, separation from loved ones,not watching children grow, people left behind, will I be alone, generally or specifically at time of death, meet with family & friends in afterlife?
Scoring: Interpersonal
6)Loss of loved ones.
Including: how cope, loneliness, not being needed, what do if lose. . ., need for lost one--more focus on loss of specific person(s) than on connection itself
Scoring: Interpersonal
7)Concern for well being of those left behind
Including: How will they be affected, who will care for them, their happiness, how live without me, grief & pain caused them
Scoring: Interpersonal
8)Reactions and feelings of those left behind
Including: how feel, how react to my death (emphasis on their reactons to "me," not what will happen to them--i.e., looking to them for feedback on how they feel about you)
Scoring: Neither
9)Will I be remembered/forgotten/missed?
Including: who will come to my funeral
Scoring: Intrapersonal

APPENDIX D

Carlson Adjective Checklist

Social	Personal
attractive	ambitious
compassionate	confident
considerate	creative
cooperative	efficient
dependable	energetic
frank	fair-minded
friendly	idealistic
generous	imaginative
leader	independent
likeable	optimistic
persuasive	practical
sincere	rational
sympathetic	reasonable
tactful	versatile
warm	wise

APPENDIX E

Personal Attributes Questionnaire

"Femininity": Female-valued Attributes

1. very emotional
2. able to devote self completely to others
3. very gentle
4. very helpful to others
5. very kind
6. very aware of feelings of others
7. very understanding of others
8. very warm in relations to others

"Masculinity": Male-valued Attributes

1. very independent
2. very active
3. very competitive
4. can make decisions easily
5. never gives up easily
6. very self-confident
7. feels very superior
8. stands up well under pressure

APPENDIX F

The Modified Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS)

Achievement:

I would like to accomplish something of great significance.
I would like to be a recognized authority in some job, profession, or field of specialization.
I like to be able to say that I have done a difficult job well.
I like to accomplish tasks that others recognize as requiring skill and effort.
I like to do my best in whatever I undertake.

Autonomy:

I like to be independent of others in deciding what I want to do.
I like to feel free to do what I want to do.
I like to do things that other people regard as unconventional.
I like to do things in my own way and without regard to what others may think.
I like to say what I think about things.

Affiliation:

I like to form new friendships.
I like to share things with my friends.
I like to do things with my friends rather than by myself.
I like to do things for my friends.
I like to participate in groups in which the members have warm and friendly feelings toward one another.

Nurturance:

I like to help my friends when they are in trouble.
I like to forgive my friends who may sometimes hurt me.
I like to sympathize with my friends when they are hurt or sick.
I like my friends to confide in me and to tell me their troubles.
I like to treat other people with kindness and sympathy.

APPENDIX G

Table G1

Personality Scale Scores Broken Down by Race/Ethnicity

Personality Scale	White (N=98)	Hispanic (N=35)	Black (N=38)	East Asian (N=36)
EPPS	-.07	.05	.04	.24
Carlson	-.03	.05	.01	.02
Masculine PAQ[a]	.01	.24	-.13	-.25
Feminine PAQ	.10	-.02	.06	-.09

Note: The scores are in Z (standard) score form to allow comparability among the measures. There were no multivariate significant differences for race/ethnicity on the personality scales.

[a]The univariate F (3, 183) = 3.28, $p < .05$. This must be interpreted with caution because of the lack of multivariate significance.

APPENDIX G, continued

Table G2

Death Concerns Scale Scores Broken Down by Race/Ethnicity

DCS	White (N=102)	Hispanic (N=34)	Black (N=42)	East Asian (N=36)
Interpersonal	5.65	5.26	5.46	5.34
Intrapersonal	3.88	3.89	3.65	3.96
RID	3.12	3.01	3.32	3.42

Note: There were no multivariate or univariate significances for race/ethnicity on the Death Concerns Scale.

APPENDIX H

Scenario on Willingness to Interact with a Dying Person

Please read the following story and then answer the questions after it.

> You are a volunteer in a local hospital. One day, just after you arrive, you notice a patient whom you know has terminal cancer begin to talk to a staff member about his/her impending death. All of a sudden, there is a medical emergency down the hall and the staff member apologizes to the patient for leaving and hurries away. The cancer patient looks distressed at being left alone and clearly wants to talk to someone.

1. If you were the volunteer, what would you do? Would you go and talk to the patient about dying? ____ Yes ____ No

Why? or why not?

2. Would you feel conflict about the decision?

____ Yes ____ No

If yes, what is the conflict about?

REFERENCES

Anastasi, A. (1982). Psychological testing. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Aries, P. (1981). The hour of our death. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Bakan, D. (1966). The duality of human existence: An essay on psychology and religion. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Bard, M. (1966). The price of survival for cancer victims. Trans-action.

Barry, J., Bacon, M., & Child, I. A. (1957). Cross cultural survey of some sex differences in socialization. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 55, 327-332.

Becker, E. (1973). The denial of death. New York: The Free Press.

Benoliel, J. Q. (1972). Nursing care for the terminal patient: A psychosocial approach. In B. Schoenberg, A. C. Carr, D. Peretz & A. Kutscher (Eds.), Psychosocial aspects of terminal care (pp. 145-161). New York: Columbia University Press.

Berger, P. L. & Luckmann, T. (1966). The social construction of reality. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.

Bloch, R. (1978). Untangling the roots of modern sex roles: A survey of four centuries of change. Signs, 4, 237-252.

Block, J. (1983). Differential premises arising from differential socialization of the sexes: Some conjectures. Child Development, 54, 1335-1354.

Bursztajn, H., Feinbloom, R., Hamm, R. & Brodsky, A. (1981). Medical choices, medical chances: How patients, families and physicians can cope with uncertainty. New York: Delta/Seymour Lawrence.

Carlson, E. R. & Carlson, R. (1960). Male and female subjects in personality research. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 6, 482-483.

Carlson, R. (1971). Sex differences in ego functioning: Exploratory studies of agency and communion. Journal

of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 37, 267-277.

Carlson, R. (1972). Understanding women: Implications for personality theory and research. Journal of Social Issues, 28, 17-32.

Carlson, R. & Levy, N. (1968). A brief method for assessing social-personal orientation. Psychological reports, 23, 911-914.

Carlson, R. & Levy, N. (1970). Self, values and affects: Derivations from Tompkins polarity theory. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 16, 338-345.

Chodorow, N. (1974). Family structure and feminine personality. In M. Z. Rosaldo & L. Lamphere (Eds.), Woman, culture, and society (pp.43-66). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Chodorow, N. (1978). The reproduction of mothering: Psychoanalysis and the sociology of gender. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Collett, L. J. & Lester, D. (1969). The fear of death and the fear of dying. The Journal of Psychology, 72, 179-181.

Comrey, A. L. (1978). Common methodological problems in factor analytic studies. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46, 648-659.

Conte, H. R., Weiner, M. B., & Plutchik, R. (1982). Measuring death anxiety: Conceptual, psychometric, and factor-analytic aspects. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43, 775-785.

Crawford, M. & Marecek, J. (1989). Psychology reconstructs the female. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 13, 147-165.

Cronbach, L. J. & Meehl, P. E. (1967). Construct validity in psychological tests. In D. N. Jackson & S. Messick (Eds.), Problems in human assessment (pp. 57-77). Huntington, N. Y.: Krieger.

de Beauvoir, S. (1977). Old age (P. O'Brian, Trans.). New York: Penguin Books. (Original work published 1970)

Dickstein, L. S. (1977-78). Attitudes toward death, anxiety and social desirability. Omega: Journal of Death and Dying, 8, 369-378.

Dickstein, L. S. (1972). Death concern: Measurement and correlates. Psychological Reports, 30, 563-571.

Durlak, J. A. & Kass, R. A. (1981-82). Clarifying the measurement of death attitudes: A factor analytic evaluation of fifteen self-report death scales. Omega: Journal of Death and Dying, 12, 129-141.

Edwards, A. L. (1959). Edwards personal preference schedule: Manual. New York: Psychological Corporation.

Ehrenreich, B., & English, D. (1979). For her own good: 150 years of experts' advice to women. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.

Epstein, C. F. (1985). Ideal roles and real roles or the fallacy of the misplaced dichotomy. Research in Social Stratification and Mobility, 4, 29-51.

Epstein, C. F. (1988). Deceptive Distinctions: Sex, gender and the social order. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Feifel, H. (1990). Psychology and death: Meaningful rediscovery. American Psychologist, 45, 537-543.

Feldman, S., Biringen, Z. & Nash, S. (1981). Fluctuations of sex-related self-attributions as a function of stage of family life cycle. Developmental Psychology, 17, 24-35.

Florian, V. & Har-Even, D. (1983-84). Fear of personal death: The effects of sex and religious belief. Omega: Journal of Death and Dying, 14, 83-91.

Florian, V. & Kravetz, S. (1983). Fear of personal death: Attribution, structure and relation to religious belief. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44, 600-607.

Franke, K. J. & Durlak, J. A. (1990). Impact of life factors on attitudes toward death. Omega, 21, 41-49.

Freud, S. (1959). Thoughts for the times on war and death. Collected papers (Vol. 4, pp. 288-317). New York: Basic Books. (Original work published 1915)

Fry, C. (1985). Culture, behavior and aging in the comparative perspective. In J. E. Birren & K. W. Schaie (Eds.), Handbook of the psychology of aging (2nd ed.) (pp. 216-244). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co.

Gilligan, C. (1977). In a different voice: Women's conceptions of self and morality. Harvard Educational Review, 47, 481-517.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gilligan, C. (1990). Teaching Shakespeare's sister: Notes from the underground of female adolescence. In C. Gilligan, N. P. Lyons, & T. J. Hanmer (Eds.), Making Connections: The relational worlds of adolescent girls at Emma Willard School (pp. 6-29). Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Glazer, B. & Strauss, A. (1965). Awareness of dying: A study of social interaction. Chicago: Aldine.

Grady, K. E. (1981). Sex bias in research design. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 5, 628-636.

Gutmann, D. (1965). Women and the conception of ego strength. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 11, 229-240.

Gutmann, D. (1977). The cross-cultural perspective: Notes toward a comparative psychology of aging. In J. E. Birren & K. W. Schaie (Eds), Handbook of the psychology of aging (pp. 216-244). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co.

Haan, N. (1978). Two moralities in action contexts: Relationships to thought, ego regulation, and development. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36, 286-305.

Hare-Mustin, R. T. & Marecek, J. (1988). The meaning of difference: Gender theory, postmodernism, and psychology. American Psychologist, 43, 455-464.

Hollingshead, A. B. (1965). Two factor index of social position. Unpublished manuscript. New Haven, CT: Yale Station.

Iammarino, N. (1975). Relationship between death anxiety and demographic variables. Psychological Reports, 37, 262.

Illich, I. (1976). Medical nemesis: The expropriation of health. New York: Bantam.

Kastenbaum, R. (1987-88). Theory, research, and application: Some critical issues for thanatology. Omega, 18, 397-410.

Kastenbaum, R, & Costa, P. (1977). Psychological perspectives on death. Annual Review of Psychology, 28, 225-249.

Kearl, M. (1986-87). Death as a measure of life: A research note on the Kastenbaum-Spilka strategy of obituary analyses. Omega, 17, 65-78.

Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: The cognitive-developmental approach to socialization. In D. Goslin (Ed.), Handbook of socialization theory and research (pp. 347-480). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Krauss, I. (1976). Stratification, class, and conflict. New York: The Free Press.

Krieger, S. R., Epting, F. R., & Leitner, L. M. (1974). Personal constructs, threat, and attitudes toward death. Omega: Journal of Death and Dying. 5, 299-310.

Kübler-Ross, E. (1969). On death and dying. New York: McMillan.

Kübler-Ross, E., & Worden, J. W. (1977-78). Attitudes and experiences of death workshop attendees. Omega: Journal of Death and Dying, 8, 91-106.

Lester, D. (1967). Experimental and correlational studies of the fear of death. Psychological Bulletin, 67, 27-36.

Lester, D. (1972). Studies in death attitudes: Part two. Psychological Reports, 30, 440.

Lewis, J. M. (1982). Dying with friends: Implications for the psychotherapist. American Journal of Psychiatry, 139, 261-266.

Lifton, P. D. (1985). Individual differences in moral development: The relation of sex, gender, and personality to morality. Journal of Personality, 53, 306-334.

Lifton. R. J. (1979). The Broken Connection. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Lowry, R. (1965). Male-female differences in attitudes towards death. Dissertation Abstracts, 27, 1607B-1608B. (University Microfilms No. 65-14,429).

Lykes, M. B. (1984). Autonomous individualism versus social

individuality: Towards an alternative understanding of the self. Dissertation Abstracts International, 45 (4), 1322B. (University Microfilms No. DA8416004)

Lykes, M. B. (1985). Gender and individualistic vs. collectivist bases for notions about the self. Journal of Personality, 53, 356-383.

Lyons, N. P. (1983). Two perspectives: On self, relationship, and morality. Harvard Educational Review, 53, 125-145.

Maccoby, E. E. (1990). Gender and relationships: A developmental account. American Psychologist, 45, 513-520.

Mahler, M., Pine, F., & Bergman, A. (1975). The psychological birth of the human infant: Symbiosis and individuation. New York: Basic Books.

Marks, A. (1986-87). Race and sex differences and fear of dying: A test of two hypotheses--high risk or social loss? Omega, 17, 229-236.

Marks, A. (1988-89). Structural parameters of sex, race, age, and education and their influence on attitudes toward suicide. Omega, 19, 327-336.

Matras, J. (1975). Social inequality, stratification, and mobility. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

McDonald, G. (1976). Sex, religion and risk-taking behavior as correlates of death anxiety. Omega: Journal of Death and Dying, 7, 35-44.

McIntosh, P. (1988). White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies (Working Paper No. 189). Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College, Center for Research on Women.

Mead, M. (1935). Sex and temperament in three primitive societies. New York: William Morrow & Company.

Miles, M. S. (1980). The effects of a course on death and grief on nurses' attitudes toward dying patients and death. Death Education, 4, 245-260.

Miller, J. B. (1976). Toward a new psychology of women. Boston: Beacon Press.

Nam, C. B. & Powers, M. G. (1983). The socioeconomic approach to status measurement. Houston: Cap & Gown.

Nam, C. B. & Terrie, E. W. (1988). 1980-based Nam-Powers occupational status scores. Working Paper Series 88-48. Center for the Study of Population, Florida State University.

Neimeyer, R., Dingemans, P., & Epting, F. (1977). Convergent validity, situational stability and meaningfulness of the threat index. Omega: Journal of Death and Dying, 8, 251-265.

Nelson, L. D. (1979-80). Structural conduciveness, personality characteristics and death anxiety. Omega: Journal of Death and Dying, 10, 123-133.

Nelson, L. D., & Nelson, C. C. (1975). A factor analytic inquiry into the multi-dimensionality of death anxiety. Omega: Journal of Death and Dying, 6, 171-178.

Norusis, M. J. (1985). SPSSX: Advanced statistics guide. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Nunnally, J. C. (1967). Psychometric Theory. New York: McGraw-Hill.

O'Neil, J. M. (1981). Patterns of gender role conflict and strain: Sexism and fear of femininity in men's lives. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 60, 203-210.

Ortner, S. B., & Whitehead, H. (1981). Introduction: Accounting for sexual meanings. In S. B. Ortner & H. Whitehead (Eds.), Sexual meanings: The cultural construction of gender and sexuality (pp. 1-27). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Parlee, M. B. (1981). Appropriate control groups in feminist research. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 5, 637-644.

Pedhazur, E. J. (1982). Multiple regression in behavioral research: Explanation and prediction, 2nd Edition. New York: CBS College Publishing (Holt, Rinehart and Winston).

Pollak, J. M. (1979-80). Correlates of death anxiety: A review of empirical studies. Omega: Journal of Death and Dying, 10, 97-121.

Pollak, S., & Gilligan, C. (1982). Images of violence in thematic apperception test stories. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42, 159-167.

Powers, M. G. (Ed.) (1982). Measures of socioeconomic status: Current issues. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Powers, M. G., & Holmberg, J. J. (1982). Occupational status scores: Changes introduced by the inclusion of women. In M. G. Powers (Ed.), Measures of socioeconomic status: Current issues (pp. 55-81). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Prose, F. (1990, January 7). Confident at 11, confused at 16. The New York Times Magazine, pp. 22-25, 37-38, 40, 45-46.

Quint, J. (1965). Institutionalized practices of information control. Psychiatry, 28, 119-132.

Ray, J. J., & Najman, J. (1974). Death anxiety and death acceptance: A preliminary approach. Omega: Journal of Death and Dying, 5, 311-315.

Rhudick, P. J., & Dibner, A. S. (1961). Age, personality and health correlates of death concern in normal aged individuals. Journal of Gerontology, 16, 44-49.

Richardson, V. & Sands, R. (1986-87). Death attitudes among mid-life women. Omega, 17, 327-341.

Rigdon, M., Epting, F., Neimeyer, R., & Krieger, S. (1979). The threat index: A research report. Death Education, 3, 245-270.

Roe, A. (1956). The psychology of occupations. New York: Wiley.

Romer, N., & Cherry, D. (1980). Ethnic and social class differences in children's sex-role concepts. Sex Roles, 6, 245-263.

Rosenblatt, A., Greenberg, J., Solomon, S., Pyszczynski, T., & Lyon, D. (1989). Evidence for terror management theory: I. The effects of mortality salience on reactions to those who violate or uphold cultural values. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57, 681-690.

Rummel, R. J. (1970). Applied factor analysis. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Sampson, E. E. (1978). Scientific paradigms and social values: Wanted - a scientific revolution. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36, 1332-1343.

Schachter, S., & Singer, J. (1962). Cognitive, social and physiological determinants of emotional state. Psychological Review, 69, 379-399.

Schneidman, E. (1973). Deaths of man. New York: Quadrangle.

Schultz, D. P. (1969). The human subject in psychological research. Psychological Bulletin, 72, 214-228.

Scott, N. A. (1955). Reliability of content analysis: The case of nominal scale coding. Public Opinion Quarterly, 19, 321-325.

Selvey, C. (1973). Concerns about death in relation to sex, dependency, guilt about hostility, and feelings of powerlessness. Omega: Journal of Death and Dying, 4, 209-219.

Sherif, C. (1979). Bias in psychology. In J. Sherman & E. T. Banks (Eds.), The prism of sex: Essays in the sociology of knowledge (pp. 93-133). Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Sherif, M. (1966). The psychology of social norms. New York: Harper & Row. (Original work published 1936)

Shotter, J. (1983). "Duality of structure" and "intentionality" in an ecological psychology. Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 13, 19-43.

Silverberg, R. A. (1985). Men confronting death: Management versus self determination. Clinical Social Work Journal, 13, 157-169.

Smart, R. G. (1966). Subject selection bias in psychological research. The Canadian Psychologist, 7, 115-121.

Smith, D. E. (1979). A sociology for women. In J. A. Sherman & E. T. Beck (Eds.), The prism of sex: Essays in the sociology of Knowledge (pp. 135-187). Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1978). Masculinity and Femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates, and antecedents. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R. L., & Stapp, J. (1975). Ratings of self and peers on sex role attributes and their relation to self-esteem and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32, 29-39.

Stack, C. B. (1986). The culture of gender: Women and men of color. Signs, 11, 321-324.

Starr, P. (1982). The social transformation of American medicine. New York: Basic Books.

Stern, D. N. (1985). The interpersonal world of the infant: A view from psychoanalysis and developmental psychology. New York: Basic Books.

Sudman, S., & Bradburn, N. M. (1982). Asking questions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Templer, D. (1970). The construction and validation of a death anxiety scale. Journal of General Psychology, 82, 165-177.

Thomas, L. (1983). The youngest science: Notes of a medicine-watcher. New York: The viking Press.

Tolstoy, L. (1960). The death of Ivan Ilych and other stories. New York: The New American Library. (Original work published 1886)

Turner, J. (1984). Societal stratification: A theoretical analysis. New York: Columbia University Press.

Walker, L. J. (1984). Sex differences in the development of moral reasoning: A critical review. Child Development, 55, 677-691.

Wallston, B. S. (1981). What are the questions in psychology of women? A feminist approach to research. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 5, 597-617.

Wangerin, W. (1978). The book of the dun cow. New York: Pocket Books.

Weller, A., Florian, V. & Tenenbaum, R. (1988-89). The concept of death-"masculine" and "feminine" attributes. Omega, 19, 253-263.

Wortman, D., & Dunkel-Schetter, C. (1979). Interpersonal relationships and cancer: A theoretical analysis. Journal of Social Issues, 35, 120-155.

Yalom, R. (1980). Existential psychotherapy. New York: Basic Books.