1987

Females' evaluative responses to androgynous and traditionally masculine male stimulus persons

Sharon Louise Younkin

Recommended Citation

FEMALES' EVALUATIVE RESPONSES

TO ANDROGYNOUS AND TRADITIONALLY MASCULINE

MALE STIMULUS PERSONS

_____

A Thesis Presented to

the Faculty of

California State University, San Bernardino

_____

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

in

Psychology

_____

by

Sharon Louise Younkin

June, 1987

FEMALES' EVALUATIVE RESPONSES

TO ANDROGYNOUS AND TRADITIONALLY MASCULINE

MALE STIMULUS PERSONS

———————

A Thesis Presented to

the Faculty of

California State University, San Bernardino

———————

by

Sharon Louise Younkin

June, 1987

Approved by:

David J. Lutz, Ph.D., Chair, Psychology $\underset{\text{Date}}{June\ 17, 1987}$

Robert E. Cramer, Ph.D.

Michael G. Weiss, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

Literature in the areas of androgyny and sex-role stereotypes evidences clear changes in male roles. Subjects evaluated an androgynous and a traditionally sex-role stereotyped male on 13 variables arranged on a Likert scale, after having read a predetermined number of hypothetical question and response sets. As predicted, the subjects evaluated the androgynous stimulus person much more positively than they did the masculine stimulus person. Specifically, the androgynous stimulus person was judged to be more likeable, intelligent, moral, mentally healthy, and similar to the subjects than the masculine stimulus person. Furthermore, his comments were judged to be more appropriate and more honest than the masculine stimulus person's. Importantly, it appeared that while the subjects had received sufficient information with which to formulate judgements about the stimulus persons by their first evaluation, the receipt of additional information resulted in ratings for the androgynous stimulus person being even more socially desirable, and ratings for the masculine stimulus person being even more socially undesirable. Discussion focused on possible reasons for conflicting findings in the literature and on the implications that the changes in traditional sex roles have for counseling male clients.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

Research in the area of male and female sex roles has been of tremendous interest to psychologists for the past few decades. One of the most popular concepts to have emerged from this vast body of work is that of androgyny. A generally accepted, albeit broad, definition of androgyny is the blending of positively valued "masculine" and "feminine" traits within an individual of either gender (Cook, 1985).

While androgyny per se is a relatively new concept in the scientific literature, it is far from a new idea. As Heilbrun notes in Toward a Recognition of Androgyny (1973), Coleridge stated over 100 years ago that, "the truth is, a great mind must be androgynous." References to androgyny can be found even farther back in history. As Datan (1984-5) writes about the ancient Greek tragedy, "The Bacchae of Euripides", this story conveys the message that androgyny brings one advantages throughout the life cycle. Additional comments about and examples of androgyny can be found in a variety of literary works throughout history. Thus, while androgyny may be a novel topic in the scientific literature, it has been acknowledged and written about for centuries.

Psychological Androgyny

Bem Sex-Role Inventory   Since Sandra Bem (1974)
"rediscovered" androgyny and formulated an empirical
measure of it, numerous studies have been published, and
androgyny remains a widely researched and often
controversial field. When Bem (1974) defined androgyny as
a psychological construct and published her method of
measuring and scoring it with the Bem Sex-Role Inventory
(BSRI), she stated that her intention in formulating this
measure was to question the traditionally held belief that
the prototypes of mental health were men and women whose
behaviors and/or personality characteristics were those
considered "appropriate" for their gender, i.e., sex-role
stereotyped (Bem, 1974).

Bem noted that, in response to society's changing
views on sex roles and the breaking away from sex-role
stereotypes, she wanted to move the focus of this
research onto the consequences experienced by those
individuals whose behavior was more flexible; in other
words, those who, instead of conforming to traditional
gender-appropriate behaviors, exhibited actions and/or
responses determined by the situation, not dictated by
their gender and what would accordingly be considered sex-
role appropriate behavior. She wanted to see the
androgynous individual as a model of "a more human

standard of psychological health" (Bem, 1974, p. 162).

From this well-intended beginning, androgyny has become surrounded by criticism and controversy over everything from the conceptual meaning of it, to which is the best assessment device, to what is the best method of scoring (Bem, 1977, 1979; Heilbrun & Pitman, 1979; Locksley & Colton, 1979; Lubinski, Tellegen, & Butcher, 1983; Pedhazur & Tetenbaum, 1979; Spence & Helmreich, 1979; Taylor & Hall, 1982). Lenney (1979), noted that the various scales, and even the methods of scoring each scale, implied somewhat different conceptions of androgyny. While certain of these criticisms have proven to be quite valuable in refining some of the problems, others have only served to confuse and confound the issue. There is, however, no doubt that researchers have refined the knowledge of androgyny and its correlates, and have used this knowledge to eliminate many of the initial problems encountered in the field. Because such controversy has played a major part in the development of the study of androgyny, it is pertinent to the discussion at hand.

The BSRI is purported to measure personality characteristics that fall into categories of attributes considered to be either desirable for males, desirable for females, or neutral (Bem, 1979). Bem notes (1974) that

final item selection was composed of traits judged to be more socially desirable for one sex than the other because of the fact that "both historically and cross-culturally, masculinity and femininity seem to have represented two complementary domains of positive traits and behaviors" (p. 156). Neutral items were chosen for inclusion that were judged to be no more desirable for one sex than the other by both males and females. Kimlicka, Wakefield, & Friedman (1980) compared factors from the BSRI for male and female college students, and found that, for both men and women, the masculine and feminine items measured the same constructs, and the masculine and feminine components showed empirical agreement with theoretically constructed orthogonal masculine and feminine factors.

Bem originally advocated the use of a "balance" method of scoring, resulting in only three classifications (masculine, feminine, and androgynous). After much criticism of this method (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974, 1975) she revised this in favor of a four-fold classification system which was obtained using a median-split method of assessment and resulted in groups labeled masculine, feminine, androgynous and undifferentiated. This method assumes that masculinity and femininity are both related in a linear fashion, and makes no further assumptions regarding how masculinity and femininity

4

combine to produce behavior (Lenney, 1979).

Bem improved her original scale by eliminating certain items, such as the terms masculine and feminine, which had originally accounted for much of the variance between males and females (Pedhazur & Tetenbaum, 1979), thus creating the "short form" of the BSRI (Bem, 1978, 1979). While Bem's original scale may have had a masculine bias, the short form may contain a feminine bias (McPherson & Spetrino, 1983). Another major criticism of the BSRI is that it is composed of socially desirable traits, and the majority of subjects, wanting to view themselves in a favorable light, tend to respond that these traits are "often true" of them, bringing into question the validity of the data derived from this measure (Pedhazur & Tetenbaum, 1979).

Personal Attributes Questionnaire   Rivaling the BSRI as a measure of androgyny is the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) developed by Spence, Helmreich & Stapp (1974, 1975). This measure resembles the BSRI both in theory and in form (Kelly & Worrell, 1977), although both scales were developed independently (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). The PAQ was developed with items culled from the Sex-Role Stereotype Questionnaire (Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman, & Broverman, 1968). The items comprising the PAQ were selected from a pool of items which had been

judged by males and females to distinguish between the typical man and the typical woman (Spence & Helmreich (1979). Furthermore, they state that "the PAQ is a specialized measure of socially desirable instrumental and expressive characteristics, objectively defined trait dimensions that distinguish between the sexes to some degree and thus may be labeled masculine and feminine" (p. 1032). The "femininity" scale has been denoted as a measure of one's level of expressive or communion-oriented traits, whereas the "masculine" scale has been denoted as a measure of one's level of instrumental or agency-oriented traits (Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1975). These trait dimensions are response predispositions that combine with situational variables and other person variables to determine behavior (Helmreich, Spence, & Holahan, 1979).

As noted above, Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp (1975) were the first researchers to differentiate subjects who were balanced on masculinity and femininity. While Bem classified all such individuals as androgynous, Spence et al. noted that there were definite character differences between those high in both masculinity and femininity and those low in both traits. Thus, they split this group into two separate categories, the former being termed androgynous, and the latter undifferentiated. Spence

6

and Helmreich (1979) recommended that their "absolute method" for scoring androgyny, utilizing median splits, be used due to its conceptual simplicity--NOT for its ability to accurately predict behavior. They noted that when the data indicate non-linear relationships between masculinity and femininity, the median-split method should not be used, but rather a more refined means of categorization, one that specifies more than two levels of masculinity and femininity; for example, multiple regression analysis.

Both the PAQ and the BSRI are mainly comprised of socially desirable instrumental (masculine) and expressive (feminine) personality traits, and these abstract trait dimensions have minimal relationships with sex-role attitudes and behaviors that do not tap into these traits (Spence & Helmreich, 1980). The PAQ, and to a large extent, the BSRI, can properly be regarded as trait measures of socially desirable instrumental or expressive characteristics. Importantly, while these measures are related to behaviors requiring instrumental or expressive capacities, they do not necessarily predict other gender related phenomena. These measures do, however, appear appropriate for studying culturally defined aspects of masculinity and femininity (Baldwin, Critelli, Stevens, & Russell, 1986).

Theoretical Assumptions In addition to the problems

associated with the individual measures of androgyny,

there are also major underlying theoretical difficulties

that must be considered. Myers and Gonda (1982) note that

the methods of assessing androgyny are based entirely on

untested assumptions. They state that masculinity and

femininity have been blindly accepted to be bidimensional

and orthogonal, not unidimensional, bipolar constructs;

and that they are best defined as concepts based on

social differences rather than biological ones.

Furthermore, they argue that there has been an over-

reliance on trait theory and unquestioning acceptance of

masculinity and femininity as basic dimensions of

personality.

Along these same lines, Taylor and Hall (1982) note

that androgyny research lacks any clarity in its central

concepts, and that researchers are unclear regarding key

methodological issues which, combined, have lead to

misinterpretations of the data. Similarly, Lubinski,

Tellegen and Butcher (1983) advocated against androgyny as

an empirical construct predictive of mental health.

Instead, they suggested that it presently must be

considered predictively and conceptually redundant to

masculinity and femininity. Although she disagreed with

the Lubinski et al. assessment, even Spence (1983) remarks

that researchers have become so caught up in the theory
and the concept of androgyny, they have ignored the fact
that it is based on unanalyzed assumptions, and that other
interpretations of the data are possible. She states
that researchers have forgotten that the terms masculine,
feminine, androgynous, and undifferentiated were designed
as labels to differentiate various score combinations.
Apart from measuring gender differences on the masculinity
and femininity scales, assigning additional meaning to
these terms would be unfounded.

A similar criticism has been noted, i.e., that making
the criterion for the classification of androgyny a high
score on both the masculinity and femininity scales and
then using only socially desirable traits to comprise
those scales, may lead to a bias in favor of finding a
positive relation between androgyny and health (Baldwin,
Critelli, Stevens, & Russell, 1986).

Empirical Studies of Androgyny

For the past decade researchers have attempted to
clarify the relationship between sex-role orientation and
a number of different traits and behaviors. Four areas
are pertinent to the present study: (a) behavioral
flexibility, (b) attraction and liking, (c) personal
adjustment, and (d) mental health.

Behavioral flexibility. Behavioral flexibility, or

more specifically, the ability to adapt one's behavior

to the situation at hand without regard to sex-role

stereotyped appropriateness, was one of the first

behavioral correlates of androgyny to be examined. In one

of the first of such studies, Bem and Lenney (1976) found

that androgynous subjects of both sexes were able to

display independence (a masculine trait) when pressed to

conform and playfulness (a feminine trait) when given an

opportunity to interact with a kitten. These results

were interpreted as empirical evidence of the fact that

androgynous individuals display a greater degree of

behavioral flexibility (i.e. situationally effective

behaviors) in a variety of different situations.

Helmreich, Spence, and Holahan (1979) replicated Bem

and Lenney's (1976) study examining degree of comfort and

preference for performing role-incongruent tasks. Their

results indicated that, in accordance with the previous

research, androgynous subjects reported the highest levels

of comfort for the performance of role-incongruent

behaviors. Along these same lines, Orlofsky and Windle

(1978) reported that androgynous subjects displayed

greater behavioral adaptability than both male and female

sex-typed subjects and undifferentiated subjects.

Behavioral flexibility is inextricably linked with

both psychological and cognitive flexibility. Studies of these constructs indicate that it may be the masculine component of androgyny that provides one an advantage. As a case in point, Anderson (1986) examined androgyny and psychological flexibility, i.e., independence from traditional social norms and individuality, and found that it was the subjects' masculinity scores, not androgyny scores, that provided an advantage across these dimensions. Similarly, Carter (1985), in examining the relationship between cognitive flexibility and sex-role orientation, found that androgynous and masculine individuals show the greatest cognitive flexibility. Echoing the results found by Anderson (1986) it was determined that the subjects' masculinity accounted for the largest proportion of this effect.

Attraction and liking. Numerous studies attest to the fact that one's sex-role orientation and, most particularly, whether one is androgynous or sex-typed impacts heavily on one's level of attractiveness and likeability. In an early study performed by McKee and Sherriffs (1959), it was reported that females indicated the ideal male to be someone with both masculine and feminine characteristics. Surprisingly, considering the fact that this study pre-dated media interest in androgyny, males reported their belief that such a man

11

would constitute an ideal in the eyes of women.

In Pursell and Banikiotes' (1978) study of sex-role orientation and interpersonal attraction, it was revealed that female subjects found the androgynous stimulus person (stimulus persons were comprised of a protocol formed using traits from the BSRI) to be more attractive than the sex-role stereotyped stimulus person, whereas males found the sex-role stereotyped stimulus persons to be more attractive than the androgynous stimulus persons. These findings were, however, modified by a significant interaction wherein attraction interacted with the subject's sex-role orientation. Specifically, it was found that androgynous subjects (both males and females) were most attracted to the androgynous stimulus persons whereas sex-typed subjects were most attracted to the sex-typed stimulus persons.

Along the same lines, Kulik and Harackiewicz (1979) investigated the relationship of sex-role orientation and opposite sex interpersonal attraction utilizing stimulus person profiles consisting of traits from the BSRI. This investigation revealed that psychological androgyny is a beneficial factor in attraction, and most especially in platonic attraction.

In a study looking at the effect sex-role orientation has on romantic attraction and physical

attractiveness, Bridges (1981) noted that females found the androgynous stimulus person most attractive, while males did not show a preference. On the dimension of physical attractiveness, however, it was discovered that both males and females rated the sex-typed stimulus persons as more attractive.

A study by Kimlicka, Wakefield and Goad (1982) examining the sex roles of ideal persons of the opposite sex, yielded several interesting findings. Males rated their ideal woman as having a feminine sex-role orientation. Females, on the other hand, had differing preferences based on their own sex-role orientation. Specifically, androgynous and feminine women preferred androgynous and masculine men, masculine women preferred masculine men and undifferentiated women preferred masculine and undifferentiated men. These findings led to the conclusions that males are allowed more freedom by females to adopt out-of-role behaviors, whereas males do not allow females these same freedoms. Furthermore, the effect of this for males is to give them an increased range of acceptable behaviors and sex-role orientations. Orlofsky (1982) also looked at sex-role orientation and interpersonal attraction and discovered that 66% of the female subjects described an androgynous male ideal whereas 32% of males described an androgynous female

ideal.

Jackson (1983) looked at androgyny and perceived attractiveness, finding that subjects found the androgynous stimulus person to be more likeable and well adjusted than either the sex-typed male or female stimulus person. Along similar lines, a contemporary study by McPherson and Spetrino (1983) found that, while female subjects (both androgynous and sex-typed) rated both an ideal man and an ideal woman similarly; males (both sex-typed and androgynous) rated the ideal man as being significantly different from the ideal woman.

In summary, it seems clear that these investigations indicate that the androgynous individual has a clear advantage over sex-typed and undifferentiated individuals. Androgynous individuals, as shown by the data presented above, are found to be more attractive and likeable, and, perhaps most importantly, they are perceived as being an "ideal" for both men and women.

Personal adjustment. Bem's original statements about psychological androgyny (Bem, 1974) included the hope that this concept would become a new measure of personal adjustment. This idea helped to guide research toward examining how one's sex-role orientation might relate to one's level of personal adjustment. One of the first such studies was performed by Deutsch and Gilbert (1976;

Gilbert, Waldroop & Deutsch, 1981), in which they examined the relationship between sex role and personal adjustment, discovering that females' descriptions of both their "ideal other" and "ideal self" were androgynous. However, the subjects indicated that a masculine sex-role orientation was indicative of the greatest level of adjustment, leading the researchers to the conclusion that masculinity may be the sex-role orientation considered most healthy in our society.

Other researchers have found similar results. Specifically, regarding males, self-esteem is found to be correlated with masculinity (Flaherty & Dusek, 1980; Lee & Scheurer, 1983). As regards females, the results are more complex in that both masculinity and femininity appear to be related to self esteem (Flaherty & Dusek, 1980) and to superior adjustment (Silvern & Ryan, 1979). However, Flaherty and Dusek (1980) did conclude that better psychological adjustment is associated with androgyny.

Mental health. Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson and Rosenkrantz (1970) performed a landmark study in which they investigated clinicians' ideals of mental health for men, women, and adults. The results indicated what Broverman et al. termed a double standard of mental health, wherein males are described in the same terms used to describe mentally healthy adults, while women are not

described in such terms. However, in replications (Swenson & Ragucci, 1984; Phillips & Gilroy, 1985) this negative evaluation of women was not found, possibly indicating a change in clinicians' formerly stereotyped views of mental health standards.

A contemporary examination of peoples' perceptions of mental health in relation to traditional and liberated sex-role stereotypes (Shapiro & Shapiro, 1985) indicated that the psychologically healthy male was found to correspond with current conceptualizations of androgyny, i.e., the mentally healthy individual was described as having approximately equal amounts of active and yielding traits.

Lending support to the hypothesis that androgyny corresponds with mental health, Major, Carnevale & Deaux (1981) found that androgynous individuals were judged as having numerous adjustment advantages over sex-typed and undifferentiated individuals. Specifically, the androgynous stimulus person was rated as being more popular, interesting, attractive, adjusted, competent, intelligent, and successful than the male and female sex-typed stimulus persons and the undifferentiated stimulus person.

Sex-Role Stereotypes

Looking at sex-role stereotypes, Block (1973) notes that the careful scrutiny by today's society of traditionally held beliefs regarding masculinity and femininity is not only encouraging, but is fostering society's re-evaluation of the personal and cultural costs of maintaining conventional definitions of these concepts. Conventional sex-roles need to be re-defined, and the way in which we teach our children about sex-roles must be up-dated. Most importantly, "if our social aim can become the integration of agency and communion, the behavioral and experiential options of males and females will be broadened and enriched and we can all become more truly whole, more truly human" (Block, p. 526).

It seems clear that traditional sex-role stereotypes continue to impact our lives (Huston-Stein & Higgins-Trenk, 1978; Neufeld, Langmeyer, & Seeman, 1974; Ruble, 1983). It appears, however, that society's heightened awareness does not necessarily translate to real-life behaviors, and in fact, sex-role stereotyped behavior is often reported as being most appropriate and most approved of, as evidenced by the literature in this field. Furthermore, it has been evidenced that this negative view of non-traditional behaviors applies more to males than it does to females (Fagot, 1977; Feinmen, 1984; Galper &

Luck, 1980). It has been hypothesized that this is due in part to society's view of the male role as one of higher prestige and power than the female role, thus any deviation from this elevated male position is a step downward, and therefore unacceptable (Feinman, 1984).

Empirical Studies of Sex-Role Stereotypes

While contemporary research of sex-role stereotypes reveals conflicting findings, and often contradicts research on androgyny, this literature is pertinent to the topic at hand; therefore, a brief overview follows.

Sex-Role Stereotyped Traits   It has been noted that typical sex-role stereotyped traits for males include such attributes as: aggressiveness, activity, competitiveness, dominance, and independence (Remland, Jacobson, & Jones, 1983). A landmark study of sex-role stereotypes was conducted in 1968 by Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman and Broverman. The results of this study revealed that, not only is the presence of sex-role stereotypes well documented, but greater social value is placed on masculine traits as compared to feminine traits. Their study examined the extent to which sex-role stereotypes influenced self-concepts, with results indicating that sex-role stereotypes are still rigidly defined and held by both men and women, as is the idea that masculine traits are more valuable.

A sad commentary on the stability of this concept in the face of the plethora of information about androgyny can be found by comparing the above study to more contemporary examinations of sex-role stereotypes. Werner and La Russa (1985) investigated persistence and change in sex-role stereotypes. They found that males were viewed as being more forceful, independent, stubborn and reckless than females; whereas females were viewed as being more mannerly, giving, emotional and submissive than men. Lee and Scheurer (1983) provide further support for the idea that masculine characteristics are more highly valued than feminine characteristics. As a result of the value placed on masculine traits, Feinman (1984) notes that men's sex-role deivation represents a downward social move, and subsequently, a loss of approval.

Best, Williams, and Briggs (1980) investigated this phenomenon further and found that, compared to the female sex-role stereotype, the male stereotype was significantly stronger and more active. Their analysis revealed that these differences were attributable to the connotations of activity (masculine) and passivity (feminine) that are commonly associated with sex-role stereotypes and as such, differences previously seen as indicative of social desirability of the male role are in fact actually due to the greater activity associated with this role.

Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson and Rosenkrantz (1972) noted that masculine characteristics are more highly valued than feminine characteristics, and furthermore that both male and female subjects' concepts of the ideal man and the ideal woman reflect sex-role stereotypes. As mentioned above (Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz, & Vogel, 1970) they noted the existence of a double standard of mental health wherein males were perceived as achieving mental health by adult standards while females did not. Thus, they conclude that the literature provides clear evidence of the existence of sex-role stereotypes in contemporary society.

Canter and Meyerowitz (1984) looked at sex-role stereotypes using behavioral self-reports. Their findings indicated that there were gender differences in subjects' self-reports of ability, enjoyment, performance, opportunity and competence in behaviors; all of which could be categorized according to sex-role stereotypes. In addition, it was discovered that there were gender differences in the perceived appropriateness of behaviors, and that males showed a greater propensity toward sex-typing than did females. These data led to the conclusion that stereotypes accurately reflected true sex differences in behaviors. Similar findings were noted in an investigation of sex-related attitudes (Babladelis,

Deaux, Helmreich, & Spence, 1983). This study indicated

that traditional sex-role differences continue to be found

in both males' and females' perceptions of their

instrumental and expressive qualities.

Attraction and liking. An investigation of sex-role

orientation and attraction (Seyfried & Hendrick, 1973)

indicated that while females were more attracted to sex-

role congruent males than they were to incongruent males,

males made no such distinction. These findings led the

researchers to conclude that women are able to adopt more

of the traditionally masculine sex-role characteristics

without incurring a decrement in their perceived

attractiveness, whereas men are not as free to adopt

feminine sex-role characteristics, unless they are willing

to risk a decline in their perceived attractiveness.

In contrast, an examination of the sex-role

orientation of the "typical", "desirable", and "ideal" man

and woman (Gilbert, Deutsch & Strahan, 1978) found that,

for female subjects, the ideal man and the ideal woman

were androgynous, whereas for males the ideal man and the

ideal woman were sex-role stereotyped. Thus, they

concluded that traditional stereotypes are still in

effect. This finding is supported by a more recent study

(Ruble, 1983) which examined subjects' beliefs regarding

the desirability and typicality of personal

characteristics in men and women, and the results attest
to the continued strength of stereotypes for both males
and females. In contrast to this; however, it was
discovered that a desirable female did not differ
significantly from a desirable male, findings which
prompted the authors to conclude that sex-based attitudes
no longer rigidly adhere to previous rigid stereotypes.
These findings were true of both male and female
subjects.

Changing stereotypes. Harris and Lucas (1976)
suggest that traditional sex-role stereotypes are
changing, although they note that females may be re-
appraising their views more so than men. Additionally,
they note that because of the fact that men's and women's
roles are interactive ones, any lasting changes in one
will of necessity impact on the other; i.e., the
redefinition of the female role has necessitated revision
of the male role. Echoing this idea, an investigation of
gender and sex-role attitudes (Smith, Resick, &
Kilpatrick, 1980), determined that females held more
liberal attitudes toward their sex roles, whereas males
held more liberal sexual attitudes and behaviors.
Similarly, a longitudinal investigation of changes in sex-
role orientations (McBroom, 1984), found that respondents
decreased in traditionalism over a five year time span.

It was also noted that women changed their viewpoints regarding sex-role stereotypes much more so than men, and at twice the rate as compared to men.

Helmreich, Spence, and Gibson (1982) report findings supporting a trend away from sex-role stereotypes and toward a more egalitarian (i.e. androgynous) way of thinking. This trend may be driven by the increased public awareness of this topic. However, it has been noted that, while social stereotypes may influence one's social judgement of an individual, simply gaining personal, subjective information may reduce the impact of stereotypes to a minimum (Locksley, Brogida, Brekke, & Hepurn, 1980).

Some studies reveal a reverse trend in sex-role stereotypes, i.e., a more positive evaluation of the feminine sex role. For example, Korabik (1982) examined subjects' ratings of stereotyped stimulus persons and found that feminine females were rated more positively than masculine males. These results were explained by noting that, while females may acknowledge the societal value of masculine traits, they do not necessarily like individuals characterized by these traits. Similar findings were revealed from a study in which subjects described their ideal selves and ideal male and female persons on scales derived from the BSRI (Silvern & Ryan,

1983). It was found that both male and female subjects characterized the ideal person as being significantly more feminine than masculine.

Men's Roles

Moreland (1980) states that men often feel as if they must deny their needs for intimacy, support and emotional expression in order to see themselves as masculine men. However, this stringent, stereotyped view of the male sex role necessiates that men deprive themselves of many valuable, enriching experiences. O'Leary and Donoghue (1978) state that "if there is a tragedy associated with the adult male role as traditionally defined, it is perhaps men's belief that deviation from that role will result in negative consequences. The promise of androgyny is a promise of freedom from the artificial constraints imposed on all of us by sex roles" (p. 25).

As a result of the attention and reformulation of women's roles, the male sex role is becoming an important and legitimate topic of investigation (Pleck, 1976). As he defines the traditional male sex role, the development of emotional and interpersonal feelings such as tenderness and vulnerability are discouraged. On the other hand, anger and impulsive behaviors, most especially when shared and expressed with other males, are often experienced as particularly validating of masculinity. In the modern

male role, however, interpersonal skills are not only encouraged, but expected, especially insofar as these promote smooth collaboration with others toward achievement. Lastly, and in direct contrast to the traditional male role, intimacy and emotional expression are also encouraged.

Galper and Luck (1980) note that, while females may now adopt non-traditional (i.e. masculine) behaviors and traits, males are not experiencing a comparable, socially accepted broadening of traditional male roles. Thus, they conclude, that behaviors and traits that differ from these cultural stereotypes constitute a greater violation of social norms.

The manner in which men are socialized may well produce and maintain both sexist attitudes and behaviors (O'Neil, 1981). Furthermore, it is often difficult for men to comprehend the idea that they, as well as women, are oppressed and thus adversly affected by sexism and rigid gender role socialization. As a result of this, men's new and changing roles may well involve sex-role strain and conflict.

In an examination of the new male role, it is stated that, while males are cognizant of the cost involved in adhering to the traditional male sex-role stereotype, they believe that the benefits justify the costs (Boles &

Tatro, 1980). This is not to say that men do not possess nontraditional attitudes, but that these are not reflected in their behavior. The reason for this phenemenon is stated to be the fact that the only alternative to traditional roles that men consider is a completely opposing one--i.e., feminine sex-typed. In other words, they will be either leaders or followers, active or passive. As such, these researchers believe that males will put forth greater resistence to a move toward androgynous roles than will females, and that the pressure to accommodate to these changing roles will create both role conflict and role strain. Pleck (1981) also notes that, while the traditional "macho" implications of the male role may have lessened in recent times, there is still a stong belief that it is essential for men to acquire a masculine sex-role identity.

In contrast to this line of thought, O'Leary and Donoghue (1978) state that males have the potential of much wider acceptability of traditional and non-traditional behaviors than was previously assumed. Additionally, a study on American male attitudes revealed that a new and quite liberal set of attitudes and beliefs is gaining importance for males (Biggs & Fiebert, 1984).

In summary, it seems clear that men's roles are changing dramatically, with men's attitudes and behaviors

requiring modifications as a result of the change in their roles. It appears that these changes, coupled with the changes in women's roles in the past few decades, are leading society into a more androgynous way of life.

Statement of Purpose

Research in the area of androgyny and sex-role stereotypes documents a tremendously wide array of findings. While opinions may vary regarding the utility of the androgyny construct, it seems clear that it impacts on today's society, and as such is worthy of scientific investigation. An examination of this literature indicated that androgynous individuals are often found to be more attractive and likeable, have a more flexible range of behaviors, have better personal adjustment and better mental health. Research in the area of sex-role stereotypes; however, often maintains that sex-role stereotyped individuals, most especially sex-role stereotyped males, are evaluated more favorably in terms of attraction, adjustment, and mental health.

While these two bodies of research may appear to pronounce opposing findings, this may be due to the great methodological differences found herein. It appears that many of these studies rely on brief lists of adjectives for rating purposes. As such, the subjects receive very little information upon which to base their decisions.

Furthermore, traditionally masculine terms encompassing

activity and achievement orientations are positively

valued in our society, which may explain those findings

which indicated that the traditional male stereotype was

viewed in a positive light.

Thus, the present study utilized as a method of

investigation a more well-defined, empirically and

theoretically based, in-depth means of describing both the

masculine and the androgynous stimulus persons.

Specifically, hypothetical scenarios were formulated and

pre-tested to verify that the traditional and non-

traditional responses were perceived differently. These

responses were theoretically based as the key terms used

to differentiate the traditional from the non-traditional

responses were drawn from the masculine and feminine

scales of the BSRI. In contrast to the majority of the

work done in this field, the subjects were presented with

a large amount of information with which to judge the

stimulus persons. It was believed that, by so doing, the

subjects would be given enough salient data with which to

make informed choices in their evaluations, thus making

their evaluations more accurate and reliable. Through the

use of this methodology, it was believed that the

androgynous stimulus person would be consistently

preferred over the masculine stimulus person.

Hypotheses Based on the findings that androgynous individuals are generally preferred over sex-typed individuals (Jackson, 1983; Major, Carnevale, & Deaux, 1981; Shapiro & Shapiro, 1985), it was hypothesized that the overall evaluations of the androgynous stimulus person (SP) would be more positive than those of the masculine SP. Specifically, it was believed that the androgynous SP's comments would be perceived as being more appropriate and honest as compared to the masculine SP's comments. Furthermore, it was hypothesized that the androgynous SP's personality would be evaluated as more likeable, more intelligent, more moral, and more mentally healthy than the masculine SP's personality. Additionally, it was believed that the androgynous and masculine SP's would not be rated significantly differently in regards to their sexual orientation. The androgynous and masculine SP's comments and personalities were also expected to be significantly different on the dimensions of masculinity and femininity.

It was further hypothesized that these results would change in magnitude as a function of the amount of information given, with the androgynous SP's evaluations rising in a socially desirable direction and the masculine SP's evaluations dropping in a socially undesirable direction.

METHOD

Subjects

Ninety-eight female undergraduate volunteers
recruited from Psychology courses at California State
University, San Bernardino, participated in the study for
extra credit. The subjects ranged in age from 17 to 60
(M = 23.56). All subjects were naive with respect to the
experimental task. Five female and two male research
assistants served as experimenters.

Experimental Design

The experimental design was a 3 (conditions: initial
evaluation at 2, initial evaluation at 4, initial
evaluation at 8) x 2 (stimulus person: masculine,
androgynous) mixed factorial design. The independent
variable, at what point the subjects made their
evaluations, was determined by the experimental
condition. Specifically, subjects in Condition 1 received
evaluation questionnaires after reading two hypothetical
situations followed by the corresponding masculine and
androgynous responses, then again after two additional
sets and again after four additional sets. Subjects in
Condition 2 made their evaluations after reading four

hypothetical situations and their corresponding masculine and androgynous responses, then again after reading four additional sets. Subjects in Condition 3 made their evaluations after reading all eight hypothetical situations and the corresponding masculine and androgynous responses. Thus, both masculine and androgynous responses were read by each subject, making the stimulus person a within variable.

Materials

Situations. Ten hypothetical situations and corresponding masculine and androgynous responses were formulated, (See Appendix A) from which eight were randomly drawn for administration to each subject. The selection of the eight situations utilized for each packet and the order of presentation was determined using a random numbers table. The hypothetical situations were drawn in part from a group of ten scenarios that had been pre-tested and utilized in similar studies (Bartell, 1986; Renk, 1986). These empirically-based scenarios dealt with the following topics: romantic attraction, emotional expression, activity preferences, automobile problems, television preferences, child care, job situations, performing household chores, and infidelity. These situations were pre-tested in order to determine whether subjects could discriminate between the stimulus persons'

(SPs') responses (i.e., that the masculine SP was significantly different from the androgynous SP). Final selection of the ten situations utilized was made from information gleaned from these prior empirical studies.

The masculine and the androgynous responses were formulated according to the specifics of each particular situation, using the adjectives comprising the masculine and feminine portions of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) (Bem, 1974), i.e., these responses were theoretically derived. In formulating each masculine response, two masculine terms were utilized; in formulating each androgynous response, one masculine and one feminine term from the BSRI was used. For example, question and response set #7 read as follows:

Question

You have been offered a new job that involves a promotion and a pay raise. The job would require that you and your family move across the country, and they need an answer as soon as possible. What would you do in this situation?

Speaker #1's Response

Well, being a competitive person, I could not let an opportunity like that pass me by. I know mobility is a criterion for climbing the

corporate ladder and I know my family would be
excited and back me 100%. Yah, the decision
would be easy to make. I'd let them know we
could have our bags packed by the end of the
week!

Speaker #2's Response

That sounds great. But...if I had a family
there would be a lot of things to consider...I
would definitely be sensitive to their
needs...In the end it would have to be a family
decision and if we all agreed it was a good
move, I'd take the job. I'm really ambitious and
would enjoy the challenge that goes along with a
new job and move across the country.

In the above example, the key terms used by Speaker
#1 (the masculine stimulus person) were "competitive" and
"makes decisions easily". The key terms used by Speaker
#2 (the androgynous stimulus person) were "sensitive"
(feminine), and "ambitious" (masculine).

Speaker Evaluation Forms The Speaker Evaluation
Forms comprised the experimental measure for "Experiment
A". The subjects evaluated each of the Speakers and their
comments using a list of adjectives and descriptive terms
arranged in a bi-polar fashion on a seven-point scale (See
Appendix B). The subjects' evaluations regarding the

Speakers' comments were assessed by their responses to the statement: "After listening to Speaker #1 (#2)'s comments, I found them to be:" after which were found the following phrases on a Likert scale: very unclear - very clear, masculine - not masculine, very inappropriate - very appropriate, very honest - very dishonest, not feminine - feminine. The subjects' evaluations regarding the Speakers' personalities were assessed by their responses to the statement: "After listening to Speaker #1 (#2), I found Speaker #1 (#2) to be:" after which were found the following phrases on a Likert scale: very likeable - not very likeable, masculine - not masculine, not very intelligent - very intelligent, not very similar to me - very similar to me, very moral - very immoral, not feminine - feminine, very mentally healthy - not very mentally healthy, homosexual - heterosexual.

As mentioned above, the subjects in Condition 1 received these evaluation forms after the second, fourth, and eighth scenarios. The subjects in Condition 2 received evaluation forms after the fourth and eighth scenarios, and subjects in Condition 3 received evaluation forms after the eighth scenario only.

Personal Attributes Questionnaire The Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) (Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1974, 1975) comprised the experimental measure for

34

"Experiment B" (See Appendix C). This instrument is designed to assess masculinity, femininity, and androgyny, using 24 sets of personal characteristics arranged in a bi-polar fashion on a 5-point scale. Spence & Helmreich (1978) report that the PAQ achieves significant levels of internal consistency, with Cronbach alpha values of .85, .82, and .78 for the PAQ M, PAQ F, and PAQ M-F scales respectively. Test-retest reliabilities were noted to be .58 for males and .62 for females on the PAQ M scale; and .54 for males and .67 for females on the PAQ F scale (Yoder, Rice, Adams, Priest, & Prince, 1982).

Post-Experiment Questionnaires. The post-experiment questionnaires consisted of a short demographic information form (see Appendix D) and an 11-item Subject Reaction Questionnaire adopted from Schwartz & Gottlieb (1980) and Pantin & Carver (1982) (See Appendix E). This measure consisted of the following statements: I enjoyed participating in this experiment; I found the experiment instructive about the social sciences; I found the experiment instructive about myself; I am willing to participate in another experiment in the future; I feel more trusting in authorities; I feel positive about my evaluation of experimental research. Each of these statements was followed by a 7-point scale anchored with

the phrases not at all and very much. This measure was utilized in order to gain an understanding of the subjects' feelings about and reactions to having participated in an experiment involving deception.

Consent and Instruction Forms Each subject received separate consent of participation forms for each experiment with a brief description of the experiment, and the subject's right to confidentiality and to withdraw participation at any time (See Appendices F & G). The subjects also received brief written instructions for each experimental task (See Appendices H & I).

Procedure

The study was presented as two independent experiments. "Experiment A" was presented as a study of interpersonal communication, utilizing the transcripts of two male students' responses to a set of hypothetical questions. (It was stressed that these were written transcripts of actual responses from male students who had been chosen at random for this task.) "Experiment B" was presented as a study of the personality characteristics of college students. To increase the salience of the deception, two experimenters recruited subjects, each for "their" experiment, and the two experimenters administered their respective experiments independently. The order of presentation of the two experiments was counterbalanced

across conditions.

The experimental subjects were tested in groups ranging in size from 2 to 30 ($\underline{M}$ = 10). All groups were held under similar environmental conditions, in classrooms at California State University, San Bernardino, with each subject sitting at an individual desk. Due to the fact that the experiment was conducted in group form, 5 min grace was given after the designated time for the experiment to begin, to allow for late arrivals. At 5 min after the designated hr, an "Experiment In Progress" sign was placed outside the classroom and the experiment began.

The experimenters introduced themselves and re-stated the purpose of "their" experiment. Each subject was then given a packet containing a pencil and a set of experimental forms. The subjects were instructed to remove the materials from their packets, the first of which was a standard consent form. The subjects were requested to read this form and sign it if they agreed to participate. The subjects were then instructed to turn to the next page in their packet and read the experimental instructions along with the experimenter. Once all of the subjects understood that their task was to read all of the material in their packet and complete any forms in the order in which they appeared, they were instructed to begin. Whether the subjects received the materials for

"Experiment A" or "Experiment B" first was determined by counterbalancing order across groups.

Once all of the subjects had completed all of the materials in their packet, the materials were collected and the experimenter for the second experiment distributed a new set of materials. The same initial sequence occurred as in the first experiment, with the subjects being requested to read and sign a standard consent form if they agreed to participate in the experiment. Once all of the subjects had done so, they were again instructed to read the experimental instructions along with the experimenter. Once they understood that their task again was to read all of the materials in their packet and fill out any forms in the order in which they were found, the subjects were instructed to begin. When the subjects had completed this task, the appropriate experimenter collected the packets.

At this point, the experimenter who had administered "Experiment A" debriefed the subjects as to the true nature of the study, and explained the deception (see Appendix J). The experimenter invited and answered any questions the subjects had regarding any aspect of the experiment and offered to send the subjects the results of the experiment. The subjects were then asked to complete the Subject Reaction Questionnaire and the Demographic

Information Form. Once the subjects had completed this final phase of the experiment, they were thanked for their participation and cooperation, given their extra credit slips, and dismissed.

RESULTS

Manipulation Check

To determine whether the subjects perceived sex-role differences between the stimulus persons (SPs), the SPs' comments and personalities were evaluated on the dimensions of masculinity and femininity. The subjects' evaluations of the comments and personalities were desired in order to detect any distinctions the subjects may have made between what one says, i.e., comments, and one's character, i.e., personality. A 3 (conditions: initial evaluation at 2, initial evaluation at 4, initial evaluation at 8) x 2 (order: androgynous followed by masculine; masculine followed by androgynous) X 2 (stimulus person: masculine, androgynous) design was used to analyze these effects as well as any possible order effects. As expected, the ratings of the masculine and the androgynous stimulus persons were significantly different. The masculine SP's comments were evaluated as being more traditionally masculine ($\underline{M}$ = 5.69) than were the androgynous SP's comments ($\underline{M}$ = 4.51; $\underline{F}$(1,92) = 24.08, $\underline{p}$ < .001). Similarly, the androgynous SP's comments ($\underline{M}$ = 3.29) were evaluated as being more traditionally feminine than the masculine SP's comments ($\underline{M}$ = 1.98;

40

$F(1,92) = 35.59$, $p < .001$).

Similar differences were also found on the subjects' evaluations of the masculinity and femininity of the stimulus persons' personalities. The masculine stimulus person ($M = 5.75$) was rated higher on masculinity than the androgynous stimulus person ($M = 4.75$; $F(1,92) = 18.93$, $p < .001$). Similarly, it was found that the androgynous SP was rated as being more feminine ($M = 3.33$) than the masculine SP ($M = 1.96$; $F(1,92) = 41.98$, $p < .001$. It is important to note that, while the androgynous SP was rated less masculine (and more feminine) than the masculine SP, he was still viewed as being on the masculine side of neutral, not on the feminine side of neutral. Thus, it appears that the androgynous SP was properly viewed according to contemporary theories of androgyny, i.e., high scores on BOTH masculinity and femininity.

It should also be noted that sex role and not sexual orientation was manipulated as both SP's were seen as heterosexual ($M = 5.81$, $M = 5.58$ for the masculine and androgynous SP's, respectively). Thus, the relatively high femininity score for the androgynous SP did not result in the misconception that he had a homosexual orientation. These effects (for masculinity, femininity, and sexual orientation) were discovered in all subsequent analyses. Finally, no significant order effects were

revealed; therefore, all of the data presented has been collapsed across this variable.

Analysis of Subjects' Initial Evaluations

To determine whether the stimulus persons were perceived differently and whether this varied as a function of amount of information, a multivariate analysis of variance was performed using a 3 (conditions: initial evaluation at 2, initial evaluation at 4, initial evaluation at 8) x 2 (stimulus person: masculine, androgynous) mixed design across 8 evaluations. A significant multivariate main effect for SP was revealed, $F(8,88) = 29.24$, $p < .001$. Subsequent univariate analyses (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1983; see Table 1) indicated the androgynous SP's comments were perceived by the subjects as being more appropriate and honest than those of the masculine SP. Additionally, the androgynous SP's personality was rated as more likeable, intelligent, similar to the subject, moral, and mentally healthy than the stereotypically masculine SP.

These effects were qualified by a significant multivariate interaction effect, $F(16,176) = 2.17$, $p < .01$. Subsequent univariate analyses (see Table 2) revealed that all other univariate analyses for the evaluation variables were significant. Thus, the androgynous SP's comments were perceived to be more

42

Table 1

Main Effects Analysis of Subjects' Initial Evaluations of
the Androgynous and Masculine Stimulus Persons

| Variable | Stimulus Person | | F |
	Masculine	Androgynous	
Comments:			
Appropriate	3.41	5.93	113.58*
Honest	4.76	6.11	35.37*
Personality:			
Likeable	2.95	6.14	202.40*
Intelligent	3.52	5.60	90.07*
Similar	2.21	5.28	136.27*
Moral	3.74	5.74	81.78*
Mental Health	4.16	5.79	51.87*

Note. N = 98; df = 2,95.

* p < .001.

43

Table 2

Subjects' Initial Evaluation of the Androgynous and

Masculine Stimulus Persons by Subject's Condition

Variable	Stimulus Person						F
	Masculine			Androgynous			
Condition:	1	2	3	1	2	3	

Comments:

Clarity	5.25 ab	5.88 b	4.16 a	5.22 ab	4.97 ab	5.72 b	8.66***

Appro-

priate	4.06 b	3.56 ab	2.59 a	5.53 c	5.91 c	6.34 c	7.71***
Honesty	5.19 abc	4.85 ab	4.22 a	5.84 bcd	6.09 cd	6.41 d	3.74*

Personality:

Like-

ability	3.75 b	2.94 a	2.16 a	6.00 c	5.97 c	6.47 c	7.02**

Intelli-

gence	4.06 b	3.35 ab	3.16 a	5.16 c	5.47 cd	6.19 d	6.39**
Similar	2.84 b	2.29 ab	1.50 a	5.03 c	5.00 c	5.81 c	5.82**
Moral	4.06 a	3.97 a	3.16 a	5.59 b	5.56 b	6.06 b	4.04*

Table 2 (cont'd)

Mental

Health 4.53   4.32   3.62   5.47   5.68   6.22   4.76*
          a   a   a   b   b   b

Sexual

Orienta-

tion   5.44   5.88   6.09   5.75   5.29   5.72   3.35*
         ab   ab   b   ab   a   ab

Note. N = 98; df = 2,95.

Condition 1 = first evaluation at 2, Condition 2 = first

evaluation at 4, Condition 3 = first evaluation at 8.

For each dependent variable, different subscripts for two

conditions indicate that those two conditions were

reliably different at the .05 level using Tukey's HSD

multiple comparison procedure.

* p < .05. ** p < .01. ***p < .001.

appropriate and honest than the masculine SP's.

Additionally, this analysis indicated that the androgynous SP's comments were clearer than the masculine SP's. Furthermore, the androgynous SP's personality was found by the subjects to be more likeable, intelligent, similar to the subjects, moral and mentally healthy than the traditionally masculine SP. To determine the nature of the interactions, Tukey's HSD pairwise multiple comparison procedure, for this and all other multiple comparisons, was utilized (Jaccard, Becker, & Wood, 1984). These follow-up tests revealed that, over the course of the evaluations, the masculine SP's ratings dropped in a socially undesirable direction, while the androgynous SP's ratings rose in a socially desirable direction. While this analysis did reveal some significant differences between mean ratings for the masculine SP as well as some significant differences between mean ratings for the androgynous SP, these seem to be spurious results as no meaningful pattern could be discerned. This is especially true for the sexual orientation variable. It should be recalled that no significant differences were found between the masculine SP and the androgynous SP for this variable in any other analysis. As indicated in Table 2, a significant difference was found between Condition 3's evaluation of the masculine SP and Condition 2's

46

evaluation of the androgynous SP. It seems clear that this is a spurious effect and bears no real meaning.

Analysis of Subjects' Final Evaluations

To determine whether the stimulus persons were perceived differently and whether this evaluation varied as a function of having made previous evaluations, a multivariate analysis of variance was performed using a 3 (conditions: initial evaluation at 2, initial evaluation at 4, initial evaluation at 8) X 2 (stimulus person: masculine, androgynous) design across 8 evaluations. A significant multivariate main effect for SP was revealed, $F(8,88) = 42.64$, $p < .001$. As with the analysis over the initial evaluations, subsequent univariate analyses (see Table 3) indicated that the androgynous SP's comments were perceived as more appropriate and more honest than the masculine SP's comments. In addition, the androgynous SP's comments were seen as having more clarity than the traditionally masculine SP's comments. Furthermore, the androgynous SP was perceived as more likeable, intelligent, similar to the subject, moral, and mentally healthy than the masculine SP. In contrast to the previous analysis, the multivariate interaction effect was not significant, $F(16,176) = 1.15$, $p = .31$.

Analysis of Evaluations Across Trials for Condition 1

To determine whether the stimulus persons were

Table 3

Main Effects Analysis of the Subjects' Final Evaluations

of the Androgynous and the Masculine Stimulus Persons

| Variable | Stimulus Person | | F |
	Masculine	Androgynous	
Comments:			
Clarity	5.18	5.65	4.59*
Appropriate	2.90	5.97	165.29**
Honest	4.81	6.19	39.82**
Personality:			
Likeable	2.50	6.40	321.33**
Intelligent	3.34	5.88	142.34**
Similar	1.81	5.71	297.78**
Moral	3.58	5.85	131.27**
Mental Health	3.91	5.86	86.50**

Note. N = 98; df = 1,95.

* p < .05; ** p < .001.

perceived differently and how this evaluation varied

across trials, a multivariate analysis of variance with

repeated measures was performed for subjects in condition

1 using a 2 (stimulus persons: masculine, androgynous) X

3 (trials: evaluation at 2, evaluation at 4, and

evaluation at 8) within design across the 8 evaluation

variables. A significant multivariate main effect for SP

was revealed, $F(8,24) = 21.76$, $p < .001$. Subsequent

univariate analyses (see Table 4) indicated that the

androgynous SP's comments were perceived as more

appropriate and more honest. Furthermore, the androgynous

SP's personality was perceived as more likeable,

intelligent, similar to the subject, moral, and mentally

healthy as compared to the masculine SP's personality.

While the multivariate ANOVA for the interaction

effect did not attain statistical significance,

$F(16,110) = 1.36$, $p = .176$, the utilization of a priori

hypotheses permits an investigation of the univariate

analyses. In order to control for the inflation of the

Type I error rate, set alpha (.05) was divided by the

number of univariate comparisons performed (8) resulting

in a more stringent adjusted alpha level of .006.

Utilizing this criterion, significant differences were

found for likeability and similarity. Here again a trend

may be noticed in that the masculine SP's ratings tend to

Table 4

Main Effects Analysis of Evaluations across Trials for
Condition One

Variable	Stimulus Person		F
	Masculine	Androgynous	
Comments:			
Appropriate	3.31	5.66	92.71**
Honest	5.19	6.00	8.77*
Personality:			
Likeable	3.25	6.15	128.45**
Intelligent	3.82	5.46	55.18**
Similar	2.40	5.41	81.49**
Moral	3.89	5.54	52.00**
Mental Health	4.34	5.52	25.56**

Note. N = 32; df = 1,31.

* p < .01.; ** p < .001.

Table 5

Subjects' Evaluations of the Androgynous and Masculine
Stimulus Persons by Trials

Variable		Stimulus Person					F
	Masculine			Androgynous			
Trials:	1	2	3	1	2	3	
Personality:							
Likeable	3.75 b	3.19 ab	2.81 a	6.0 c	6.0 c	6.44 c	7.49*
Similar	2.84 a	2.38 a	2.0 a	5.03 b	5.44 b	5.75 b	6.93*

Note. N = 32; df = 2,30.

Condition 1 = evaluation after 2, Condition 2 = evaluation
after 4, Condition 3 = evaluation after 8.

For each dependent variable, different subscripts for two
conditions indicate that those two conditions were
reliably different at the .05 level using Tukey's HSD
multiple comparison procedure.

* p < .006.

51

decrease in a socially undesirable direction, whereas the androgynous SP's ratings tend to increase in a socially desirable direction.

Personal Attributes Questionnaire

Rather than use sample specific median splits which decrease the generalizability of the findings, the subjects' scores on the Personal Attributes Questionnaire were analyzed according to the norms established by Spence and Helmreich (1978) for college populations. Utilizing Spence and Helmreich's mean cutpoints of 21, 23, and 15 for M, F, and M-F respectively, the present sample (M = 14.54, F = 16.53, and M-F = 16.29) was skewed as the great majority of subjects were classified as androgynous. Due to this finding, an analysis of the subjects' evaluations of the SP's by the subjects' sex-role orientation was not performed.

Subjects' Evaluations of the Experiment

The data revealed that the subjects had very positive views of the experiment (see Table 6). The subjects enjoyed participating in the experiment ($\underline{M}$ = 4.28), and they found that it was somewhat instructive about themselves ($\underline{M}$ = 3.41) and about the social sciences ($\underline{M}$ = 3.30). The subjects reported that they were quite willing to participate in future experiments ($\underline{M}$ = 5.13) and they were positive about their evaluation of the

experiment (M = 4.45). Similar to the results found in previous research (Cramer, McMaster, Bartell, & Dragna, 1986; Bartell, 1986), the subjects reported that their level of trust in authorities was not adversely affected by their participation (M = 2.95).

Along these same lines, all of the subjects indicated that they thought the research should be permitted to continue, and that it was justified. The subjects also found the explanations about the experiment satisfactory, they did not regret having participated in an experiment involving deception, and they were not resentful about having been deceived.

Table 6

Percent of Subjects' Responses on Subject's Reaction

Questionnaire

	Response						
Question	Not at all 0	1	Somewhat 2	3	Quite 4	5	Very much 6
1. enjoyed participating	0.0	0.8	8.6	15.6	35.2	16.4	23.4
2. instructive about social sciences	2.3	10.2	17.2	23.4	25.8	14.8	6.3
3. instructive about self	3.1	2.4	20.5	30.7	17.3	19.7	6.3
4. willing to participate again	0.0	0.8	2.3	4.7	16.4	27.3	48.4
5. more trusting to authorities	9.4	12.5	13.3	28.9	16.4	13.3	6.3
6. positive about evaluation of the research	0.0	2.3	7.0	10.9	29.7	23.4	26.6

Table 6 (cont'd)

	Response	
Question	Yes	No
7. Should the research be permitted to continue?	100.0	0.0
8. Is the research justified?	100.0	0.0
9. Did the explanations satisfy you?	96.9	3.1
10. Do you regret participating?	0.8	99.2
11. Are you resentful about having been deceived?	2.3	97.7

Note. N = 98.

DISCUSSION

As predicted, the androgynous SP was rated more
positively than the masculine SP. Specifically, the
androgynous SP's comments were judged to be more
appropriate and honest than the masculine SP's; and most
importantly, the androgynous SP was consistently found to
be more likeable, intelligent, moral, and mentally healthy
than the masculine SP. These findings are consistent with
much of the literature in this field, most especially
Jackson (1983), Major, Carnevale, and Deaux (1981), and
Shapiro and Shapiro (1985).

Additionally, the androgynous SP was perceived as
being more similar to the subjects than was the masculine
SP. In an investigation of attraction and sex-role
attitudes, Seyfried and Hendrick (1973), and Pursell and
Banikiotes (1978) considered the similarity hypothesis,
i.e., that individuals with similar attitudes and needs
will find each other attractive. Both of these
investigations provided support for this hypothesis. With
this knowledge, it can be inferred that the subjects'
perceived similarity to the androgynous SP is indicative
of their attraction to him. This result would concur with
the findings of several other researchers (Bridges, 1981;

Kulik & Harackiewicz, 1979; McKee & Sherriffs, 1959;

Pursell & Banikiotes, 1978).

The hypothesis that the androgynous SP and the

masculine SP would be perceived differently on the

variables of masculinity and femininity received support.

This finding echoes the results found in similar studies

(Bartell, 1986; Jackson, 1983; Renk, 1986). An analysis

of these variables also indicated that the androgynous SP

was indeed perceived to be androgynous as defined by

current conceptualizations of androgyny, i.e., he was

rated highly in both masculinity and femininity (Bem,

1979; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1975). Additionally,

the hypothesis that while the masculine and the

androgynous SP would differ in regard to masculinity and

femininity, they would not be perceived differently in

terms of sexual orientation, was proven to be true, with

one spurious exception. These results are consistent

with those found in similar studies (Bartell, 1986; Renk,

1986).

It was expected that, in contrast to most studies in

the literature in which stimulus persons are evaluated on

the basis of a list of adjectives (Bridges, 1981;

Korabick, 1982; Kulik & Harackiewicz, 1979; Major,

Carnevale, & Deaux, 1981; Pursell & Banikiotes, 1978),

providing the subjects with a substantial amount of

detailed information would have an impact on their
evaluations. It was believed that this impact would be
evidenced by differences in ratings across trials and
between conditions. The prediction that these
evaluations would change in magnitude as a function of
amount of information given, however, only received
qualified support. This variable had a significant impact
when the subjects' initial evaluations were compared. It
was evidenced that there was a trend toward evaluating the
androgynous SP more positively, and the masculine SP more
negatively when more information was received, i.e., when
the subjects' initial evaluations came after eight
hypothetical question and response sets, their evaluations
were stronger than those whose initial evaluations came
after four hypothetical question and response sets, whose
evaluations were stronger in turn as compared to those
subjects whose initial evaluations came after two
hypothetical question and response sets.

Amount of information was also analyzed as a within
variable for the subjects in Condition 1, an analysis
which did not prove significant. However, in terms of the
original hypothesis, amount of information as a between
variable actually appears more relevant, as the
possibility of within group variables contaminating the
data was not a factor.

An examination of the ratings received from the subjects' initial evaluations as compared to their final evaluations revealed subtle differences in scores. Comparing the mean scores for the masculine SP and the androgynous SP for the subjects' initial evaluations to the mean scores for the masculine SP and the androgynous SP for the subjects' final evaluations, it appeared that there was a tendency for the subjects to judge the masculine SP more negatively and the androgynous SP more positively in their final evaluations. Thus, it appears that while the subjects had received sufficient information with which to formulate judgements about the SP's by their first evaluations, gaining further information did make these judgements somewhat stronger.

While the PAQ was utilized as a measure of the subjects' sex-role orientations, due to a skewed sample this variable was not entered into the data analysis. While there is some support for the hypothesis that the sex-role orientation of subjects may be an important factor in the formation of evaluations (Pursell & Banikiotes, 1978; Seyfried & Hendrick, 1973), there is actually more support for the hypothesis that sex-role orientation of the subject is, in fact, not a significant factor (Bridges, 1981; Kulik & Harackiewicz, 1979; Malchon & Penner, 1981; Remland, Jacobson, & Jones, 1983). Thus,

the fact that the sample was not evaluated on this variable has support in the literature.

As regards the subjects' evaluation of the experiment, the results proved to be quite favorable. Not only did the subjects enjoy their participation in the experiment, they also found it to be an edifying experience. These positive feelings very likely influenced the fact that most of the subjects were willing to participate in experiments in the future. These results concur with those found in similar studies (Cramer, McMaster, Bartell, & Dragna, 1986; Bartell, 1986).

The conflicting results seen in the androgyny literature and the sex-role literature, especially as compared to the clear-cut findings of this study, may seem difficult to reconcile. Firstly, this may be due in part to the fact that this study examined the responses of females only. It has been noted (Harris & Lucas, 1976; Korabick, 1982; McBroom, 1984; Scher, 1984), that females may be more liberal in their attitudes and beliefs regarding sex-role orientation than males.

Scher (1984) offers another explanation for this conflict in her examination of sex-role contradictions. She states that, while changes in traditional sex-roles have resulted in changed attitudes regarding the ideal

male and the ideal female, such that the ideal for both sexes is now perceived as being androgynous, with this change in public beliefs may come a private ambivalence. Scher suggests that the contradictions evidenced in the sex-role research may suggest "a personal attachment to traditional sex-role models, but an intellectual change in ascribing androgynous characteristics to the abstract male and female" (p. 652). However, a recent study (Bartell, 1986) found evidence that subjects will not only ascribe androgynous characteristics to a stimulus person, but attitudinal and behavioral measures indicated that they preferred him over a masculine sex-typed individual.

O'Neil (1981) offers further insight into possible reasons for the inconsistency found in the androgyny and sex-role stereotype literature. In his examination of this issue, O'Neil proposes that the 1970's constituted a time of sex-role change and of conflict between the sexes due to their changing roles. When one considers that much of the work in this area was performed in the 1970's, it makes sense that a period of transition, with its concomitant confusion and conflict, would produce studies with varying results.

Along similar lines, an examination of the changes in sex-role orientations found that studies that looked at sex-role orientation, and as such performed measurements

of subjects' perceptions of behaviors considered appropriate for the sexes, have been impacted by the gradual changes in sex roles and the decrease in traditionalism (McBroom, 1984). Add to this the fact that the 1970's marked the introduction of androgyny as a psychological construct, and the variance in this body of work makes even more sense. Any new concept is going to take time to effect changes in people's thoughts and beliefs. As stated by Harris and Lucas (1976), "ambivalence, conflict, and resistence always accompany transition" (p. 394).

The new male role is described as one in which interpersonal relationships are characterized by emotional sensitivity, cooperation, and playfulness; yet this role, and those who espouse it, are not considered unmasculine by themselves or by others (Moreland, 1980; Pleck, 1981). This appears to be the very definition of androgyny, and harkens back to Bem's early work (Bem & Lenney, 1976). Further evidence of men's changing roles is provided by a variety of contemporary studies (Biggs & Fiebert, 1984; McBroom, 1984; O'Neil, 1981; Pleck, 1981).

These ideas have an obvious impact on members of today's society, and as such, they are of concern to those in the helping professions. O'Neil (1981) states that, when counseling men, an assessment of both sex-role

conflict and sex-role strain must be performed. Further, counselors need to help males examine the effect these issues are having in their lives, and the degree to which such conflicts limit their emotional, interpersonal, and physical lives. Similarly, in "Resocialization: A strategy for moving beyond stereotypes" it is stated that counselors need to modify dysfunctional sex-role identities, attitudes, and behaviors (Clarey, 1985).

A framework for sex-role counseling has been proposed by Cook (1985). Due to the changes in sex-roles evidenced in the past two decades, counselors are more often presented with clients who are trying to deal with the impact and the meaning of these changes. The aim of sex-role counseling is to help clients to achieve maximum levels of adaptability, and to promote personal satisfaction and psychological growth.

As regards future research, taking into account the discrepancies evidenced in this area of study, it seems apparent that this variance needs to be addressed and explained in fact and not just in theory. It would seem that, due to the fact that society has, in large part, weathered the transitional period as regards this field, it is time for investigators to clarify the state of this research. Future studies would likely be more fruitful, as evidenced in the results presented herein, to focus on

research in which subjects are provided a sufficient amount of information with which to evaluate the stimulus persons, and not just a list of adjectives, as seen in much of the research to date.

Additionally, since it has been evidenced that males may be less liberal in their views on the changes in traditional sex roles, research employing men as subjects needs to be increased. Lastly, the possible discrepancies between attitudes and behaviors needs to be examined further. It may be that, while society has evolved to the point that non-traditional, or androgynous, roles are accepted and valued cognitively, these beliefs may well not be played out in real life.

In sum, it has been shown that the changes in sex-roles in the past two decades have impacted on our culture. Our views of what type of individual is attractive and psychologically healthy have changed from traditional, stereotyped descriptions to androgynous ones. Additionally, our views on the ideal for both males and females have become androgynous. This study provides support for the fact that our attitudes and beliefs regarding sex-role orientations and, more specifically, male roles, have changed; and that a preference for androgyny exists.

APPENDIX A

Hypothetical Question and Response Sets

Question 1:   You are attracted to someone in one of your

classes. What would you do in this

situation?

Speaker #1's Response: Well...Let's see...If I were

attracted to someone I would just be assertive and go up

to her on the break and start talking about the

professor...or the homework. I'm not afraid to talk to

girls...I'd ask her for her phone number so we could go

out some time. I like to take my dates out to dinner and

a movie. Of course, in this kind of situation you run the

risk of her saying no, but I wouldn't let that stand in my

way...I'd ask her out.

Speaker #2's Response: Well...You know in situations like

this I can be shy because you can never be sure if she is

going to like you too. There is definitely a risk

involved...But I'm sure I would take the risk and find an

excuse to talk to her so I could get to know her a little

better and find out the kind of things she likes to do. I

know everyone is not interested in the same things, but

Appendix A (cont'd)

I'm sure we could find something we could both enjoy doing.

Question 2: You are watching a sad movie at home with your girlfriend and you feel as if you are about to cry. What would you do in this situation?

Speaker #1's Response: This is a tough one...I never watch sad movies. Let's see...I'm basically an individualist and don't like movies about relationships...I enjoy action films...If I had to watch a sad movie...I know I would really be bored. Boy...I can't even imagine myself wanting to cry...As I mentioned before, I have a strong personality and I'm just not the type to cry. What good would that do anyway? It's only a movie.

Speaker #2's Response: Ya know...I have to admit if I could choose between watching a sad movie or something on ESPN...Ya know, the sports channel, I would probably choose ESPN. I'm really athletic and love sports. However, that doesn't mean I can't be compassionate. If I was watching a sad movie and I felt like crying I would go ahead and cry. In fact, if the movie was real sad my

Appendix A (cont'd)

girlfriend would probably be crying too.

Question 3:   You have just heard that your girlfriend is cheating on you. What would you do in this situation?

Speaker #1's Response: Oh...I'd have to take an aggressive stance...I'd confront her with it because no one is going to make a fool out of me. I'd demand to know who she was seeing and I'd deal with that later...Of course, I'd have to end the relationship...And anyway, I'm independent and don't have to stand for that kind of stuff. Besides, there are plenty of other girls out there.

Speaker #2's Response: Well...let's see...I'd try to be analytical and not jump to any conclusions. So...the first thing I would do is talk it over with her and listen to what she had to say about the situation. If it were true...I have to admit that I'd be upset and mad but I wouldn't cuss her out. I would just try to talk to her and work things out and if things didn't work out I would just deal with it.

Question 4:   A friend has just ended a long-term relationship and you think he may be upset

about it. What would you do in this
situation?

Speaker #1's Response: Well...I tend to have a strong
personality and can be dominant. So...I'd call him up and
tell him to get ready...cause I'm coming over to take him
to a football game or...what would even be better is a
night out on the town...He'd have a great time...Beats
sitting around moping about it. At least...I'd be keeping
him busy and keeping his mind off of it...I could even
look around to set him up with someone new.

Speaker #2's Response: Well...I'm sympathetic to this
kind of thing. So I'd probably ask him over to my place
and talk about it...I'd talk to him about how he feels and
how I felt when it happened to me. Basically...I would
let him know these kinds of things happen and you have to
be willing to take risks. When he felt better and wanted
to go out I could arrange a double date.

Question 5: You have been waiting patiently in line when
a woman cuts in front of you. What would you
do in this situation?

Speaker #1's Response: Well let's see...I can see myself
being forceful in a situation like this. I would simply

direct the woman to the end of the line. My time is just as valuable as hers...If I have to wait, why shouldn't she? If she refused to go to the end of the line, I might have to be even more assertive. I wouldn't think twice about telling the person in charge and having them escort her to the back of the line.

Speaker #2's Response: I really don't think some people are aware of how they are imposing on others when they do things like that...So I'd definitely be assertive and ask the woman to go to the end of the line. Though...ya know...if she really had a good reason and if I wasn't in a really big hurry myself, I might yield and let her cut ahead of me if the other people in line didn't mind.

Question 6: Your mother is ill and your father is out of town. You have just been called home to help out in this situation. What would you do?

Speaker #1's Response: Well...I'd certainly go home if my family asked me to and act as the leader by taking over the responsibilities of running the house. The first thing I would do is call my sisters to come over and do the cooking and cleaning...I would take care of the yard...or make sure the car is running O.K....or fix

Appendix A (cont'd)

anything that was broken...In situations like this you just need to take charge, and I have leadership abilities so I'm sure I could handle it.

Speaker #2's Response: Well...Being loyal to my family is important to me. So there would be no question. I'd go home and help mom in any way she needed me to. I would do everything around the house...like cooking and keeping the house picked up...I would also take care of the yard and all of that kind of stuff. It would really be no problem taking care of the house inside and out because I have been independent for quite some time and I do all that stuff at my house.

Question 7: You have been offered a new job that involves a promotion and a pay raise. The job would require that you and your family move across the country, and they need an answer as soon as possible. What would you do in this situation?

Speaker #1's Response: Well...being a competitive person, I could not let an opportunity like that pass me by. I know mobility is a criterion for climbing the corporate ladder and I know my family would be excited and back me

Appendix A (cont'd)

100%. Yah, the decision would be easy to make. I'd let
them know we could have our bags packed by the end of the
week!

Speaker #2's Response: That sounds great. But...if I had
a family there would be a lot of things to consider...I
would definitely be sensitive to their needs...In the end
it would have to be a family decision and if we all agreed
it was a good move, I'd take the job. I'm really
ambitious and would enjoy the challenge that goes along
with a new job and move across the country.

Question 8: Your sister is going out of town for the
            weekend and she needs to leave her 3-year-old
            son with you. What would you do in this
            situation?

Speaker #1's Response: Three years old? Why couldn't you
make the child about 12? I'm ambitious and my weekends
are really busy. I always have something going on...And
if I happen to be home I usually spend that time staying
in shape...Ya know, doing athletic things...things I
couldn't do with a 3-year old...But if my sister really
wanted me to watch her 3-year-old...I'd probably call my
girlfriend to come over to help keep him entertained.

Speaker #2's Response: No problem...I love children and I'm sure we could find plenty for us to do together. Ya know, I really can't wait till I have kids of my own so I can take them camping, and teach them how to play ball and play games with them like hide-n-go-seek...In situations like this you have to be self-sufficient, and that I am. I know we would have a great time.

Question 9: Your car breaks down and the gas station mechanic says that it will cost $500.00 to fix it. What would you do in this situation?

Speaker #1's Response: If anyone told me it would cost $500.00 to fix my car I would have to take a stand and tell him to forget it. I'm self-reliant, and besides I'm good with cars and have a whole garage full of tools so it would be no problem...I'd just fix it myself. I'd even go to the junkyard for the parts and save more money.

Speaker #2's Response: Well...don't get me wrong...I'm pretty self-sufficient and I do know my way around under the hood but if it cost $500.00 to fix it then it has to be something major...Sometimes I can be gullible...I guess the really smart thing to do is to ask the mechanic what exactly is wrong and then check around, to get several

Appendix A (cont'd)

estimates. I could also get another mechanic's opinion.

Question 10: It is past time for your 90-day review which involves discussion of your work performance and a raise. Your supervisor has not yet set up a time and date for the evaluation. What would you do in this situation?

Speaker #1's Response: In a situation like that...it's management's responsibility to stay on top of those things. So...I'd defend my beliefs...I'd just ask my supervisor when he was planning to do my evaluation. After all...I know management likes sharp, aggressive people and by speaking up he would see that I have those qualities.

Speaker #2's Response: That's rough because you can never really be sure how they are going to react to your questioning them about your evaluation. However, I am sure that I would be assertive and talk to my supervisor about the situation. Anyway, the evaluation may have slipped his mind, in which case I would be understanding.

Evaluation of Speaker #1 (#2)

Please evaluate Speaker #1 (#2) by placing a check in the blank space that best describes how you feel.

1. After listening to Speaker #1 (#2)'s comments, I found them to be:

very unclear	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	very clear
masculine	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	not masculine
very appro- priate	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	very appro- priate
very honest	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	very dishonest
not feminine	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	feminine

2. After listening to Speaker #1 (#2), I found Speaker #1
    (#2) to be:

| very
likeable | __ | __ | __ | __ | __ | __ | __ | not very
likeable |

| masculine | __ | __ | __ | __ | __ | __ | __ | not
masculine |

| not very
intelli-
gent | __ | __ | __ | __ | __ | __ | __ | very
intelli-
gent |

| not very
similar
to me | __ | __ | __ | __ | __ | __ | __ | very
similar
to me |

| very
moral | __ | __ | __ | __ | __ | __ | __ | very
immoral |

| not
feminine | __ | __ | __ | __ | __ | __ | __ | feminine |

| very
mentally
healthy | __ | __ | __ | __ | __ | __ | __ | not very
mentally
healthy |

| homo-
sexual | __ | __ | __ | __ | __ | __ | __ | hetero-
sexual |

APPENDIX C

Personal Attributes Questionnaire

The items below inquire about what kind of a person you think you are. Each item consists of a PAIR of characteristics, with the letters A-E in between. For example:

  Not at all Artistic   A...B...C...D...E   Very Artistic

Each pair describes contradictory characteristics-- that is, you cannot be both at the same time, such as very artistic and not at all artistic.

The letters form a scale between two extremes. You are to choose a letter which describes where YOU fall on the scale. For example, if you think you have no artistic ability, you would choose A. If you think you are pretty good, you might choose D. If you are only medium, you might choose C, and so forth.

1. Not at all
   aggressive   A...B...C...D...E   Very
                                              aggressive

2. Not at all
   independent   A...B...C...D...E   Very
                                              independent

3. Not at all
   emotional   A...B...C...D...E   Very
                                              emotional

4. Very
   submissive   A...B...C...D...E   Very
                                              dominant

5. Not at all
    excitable in
    a major
    crisis   A...B...C...D...E

    Very
    excitable in
    a major
    crisis

6. Very
    passive   A...B...C...D...E

    Very
    active

7. Not at all
    able to
    devote self
    completely
    to others   A...B...C...D...E

    Able to
    devote
    self
    completely
    to others

8. Very
    rough   A...B...C...D...E

    Very
    gentle

9. Not at all
    helpful to
    others   A...B...C...D...E

    Very
    helpful to
    others

10. Not at all
    competitive   A...B...C...D...E

    Very
    competitive

11. Very home
    oriented   A...B...C...D...E

    Very
    worldly

12. Not at all
    kind   A...B...C...D...E

    Very
    kind

13. Indifferent
    to others'
    approval   A...B...C...D...E

    Highly needful
    of others'
    approval

14. Feelings not
    easily hurt   A...B...C...D...E

    Feelings
    easily hurt

15. Not at all
    aware of
    feelings of
    others   A...B...C...D...E

    Very
    aware of
    feelings of
    others

16. Can make
    decisions
    easily   A...B...C...D...E

    Has difficulty
    making
    decisions

Appendix C (cont'd)

17. Gives up
    very easily   A...B...C...D...E   Never gives up
    easily

18. Never
    cries   A...B...C...D...E   Cries very
    easily

19. Not at all
    self-
    confident   A...B...C...D...E   Very
    self-
    confident

20. Feels very
    inferior   A...B...C...D...E   Feels very
    superior

21. Not at all
    understanding
    of others   A...B...C...D...E   Very
    understanding
    of others

22. Very cold in
    relations
    with others   A...B...C...D...E   Very warm in
    relations
    with others

23. Very little
    need for
    security   A...B...C...D...E   Very strong
    need for
    security

24. Goes to
    pieces under
    pressure   A...B...C...D...E   Stands up well
    under
    pressure

APPENDIX D

Demographic Questionnaire

1. How old are you?   _____

2. Education

    A. Level (please check one)

        freshman   _____

        sophomore   _____

        junior   _____

        senior   _____

        graduate   _____

    B. Major (please check one)

        Administration/Business   _____

        Education   _____

        Humanities   _____

        Natural Sciences   _____

        Social & Behavioral Sciences   _____

    C. Highest degree you plan to obtain (please check one)

        B.A./B.S.   _____

        M.A./M.S.   _____

        Ph.D./M.D.   _____

        Other   _____

Appendix D (cont'd)

4. Have you participated in any experiments similar to this? _____

    If yes, approxmiately when did you participate?

    _____

Subject's Reaction Questionnaire

Please place a check in the blank space corresponding to your answer to each statement presented on the left.

	Not at all	Somewhat	Quite	Very much
	0 1	2 3	4 5	6

1. I enjoyed participating in this experiment

   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

2. I found the experiment instructive about the social sciences

   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

3. I found the experiment instructive about myself

   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

4. I am willing to participate in another experiment in the future

   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

5. I feel more trusting in authorities

   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

6. I feel positive about my evaluation of experimental research

   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

Appendix E (cont'd)

7. Should this research be permitted to continue?

   _____ yes   _____ no

8. Is this research justified?

   _____ yes   _____ no

9. Did the explanations about the purpose of the
   experiment satisfy you?

   _____ yes   _____ no

10. Do you regret having participated in this experiment?

   _____ yes   _____ no

11. Are you resentful about having been deceived?

   _____ yes   _____ no

APPENDIX F

Consent Form (Experiment A)

I understand that I am going to participate in a social psychology experiment. The experiment involves interpersonal communication and I understand that I can quit the experiment at any time. I also understand that my performance will be kept strictly confidential. I agree to participate.

NAME_____
               (print)

SIGNATURE_____

DATE_____

APPENDIX G

Consent Form (Experiment B)

I understand that I am going to participate in a social psychology experiment. This study is looking at the personality characteristics of college students. I understand that I can quit the experiment at any time. I also understand that my performance will be kept strictly confidential. I agree to participate.

NAME _____
                    (print)

SIGNATURE _____

DATE _____

APPENDIX H

Instructions (Experiment A)

Inside the folder you will find some information that
we would like you to read, and a set of evaluation scales
to be filled out. We want you to go through the packet in
the order the pages are stapled--DO NOT skip any pages.
The material you will be reading is a transcript of two
male college students responding to a series of questions.
On each page in the packet you will find the question and
the answers given by "Speaker #1" and "Speaker #2". You
should carefully read each question and then the responses
of Speaker #1 and Speaker #2 in that order. The packet
also contains evaluation forms that should be completed
carefully in the order they appear.

APPENDIX I

Instructions (Experiment B)

Please read the instructions on the questionnaire carefully. Please answer each item. There are no right or wrong answers. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential. We are interested in group data, not individual responses.

APPENDIX J

Debriefing Statement

This experiment was designed to investigate a major research area in social psychology. We are interested in finding out how people respond to men who report behaving in a stereotypic masculine or in an androgynous manner. We have found that no two people react to sex-typed behaviors in the same way.

In order to investigate this area a small deception was necessary. The transcripts you read were actually predetermined to be either stereotypically masculine or androgynous, and were not transcripts of actual responses of college students. Additionally, both of the packets you received were part of one study. We are sorry that we could not tell you about the true purpose of the study, but if you had known about it you may have responded differently. This experiment conforms to the ethical principles established by the American Psychological Association.

It is our sincere hope that you understand the necessity of deceiving you, and that you can help us in completing this experiment by not speaking to anyone on

campus about your experiences here today. As you can see, the validity or importance of your participation in the experiment can be compromised if other subjects become aware of the experiment's true purpose.

By the way, if you are interested in obtaining the results of the experiment, please print your name and address on the envelope attached to your packet and we will send the results to you at a later date.

Thank you so much for your participation.

REFERENCES

Anderson, K. (1986). Androgyny, flexibility, and
    individualism. Journal of Personality Assessment,
    50, 265-278.

Babladelis, G., Deaux, K., Helmreich, R., & Spence, J.
    (1983). Sex-related attitudes and personal
    characteristics in the United States. International
    Journal of Psychology, 18, 111-123.

Baldwin, A., Critelli, J., Stevens, L., & Russell, S.
    (1986). Androgyny and sex role measurement: A
    personal construct approach. Journal of Personality
    and Social Psychology, 51, 1081-1088.

Bartell, P. (1986). The reinforcing functions of
    androgyny: Partial reinforcement. Unpublished
    master's thesis, California State University, San
    Bernardino.

Bem, S. (1974). The measurement of psychological
    androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical
    Psychology, 42, 155-162.

Bem, S. (1977). On the utility of alternative procedures
    for assessing psychological androgyny. Journal of
    Personality and Social Psychology, 45, 196-205.

Bem, S. (1978). The Short Bem Sex-Role Inventory.
    California: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Bem, S. (1979). Theory and measurement of androgyny--
    Reply to the Pedhazur-Tetenbaum and Locksley-Colten
    critiques. Journal of Personality and Social
    Psychology, 37, 1047-1054.

Bem, S., & Lenney, E. (1976). Sex typing and the
    avoidance of cross-sex behavior. Journal of
    Personality and Social Psychology, 33, 48-54.

Best, D., Williams, J., & Briggs, S. (1980). A further
    analysis of the affective meanings associated with
    male and female sex-trait stereotypes. Sex Roles, 6,
    735-747.

Biggs, P., & Fiebert, M. (1984). A factor analytic study
of American male attitudes. Journal of Psychology,
116, 113-116.

Block, J. (1973). Conceptions of sex role: Some cross-
cultural and longitudinal perspectives. American
Psychologist, 28, 512-527.

Boles, J., & Tatro, C. (1980). The new male role.
American Journal of Psychoanalysis, 40, 227-237.

Bridges, J. (1981). Sex-typed may be beautiful, but
androgynous is good. Psychological Reports, 48, 267-
272.

Broverman, I., Broverman, D., Clarkson, F., Rosenkrantz,
P., & Vogel, S. (1970). Sex-role stereotypes and
clinical judgements of mental health. Journal of
Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 34, 1-7.

Broverman, I., Vogel, S., Broverman, D., Clarkson, F., &
Rosenkrantz, P. (1972). Sex-role stereotypes: A
current appraisal. Journal of Social Issues, 28, 59-
78.

Bryan, L., Coleman, M., & Ganong, L. (1981). Geometric
mean as a continuous measure of androgyny.
Psychological Reports, 48, 691-694.

Canter, R., Meyerowitz, B. (1984). Sex-role stereotypes:
Self-reports of behaviors. Sex Roles, 10, 293-306.

Carter, D. (1985). Relationships between cognitive
flexibility and sex-role orientation in young adults.
Psychological Reports, 57, 763-766.

Clarey, J. (1985). Resocialization: A strategy for
moving beyond stereotypes. Journal of Counseling and
Development, 64, 195-197.

Cook, E. (1985). A framework for sex-role counseling.
Journal of Counseling and Development, 64, 253-258.

Cramer, R., McMaster, M., Bartell, P., & Dragna, M.
(1986). Subject competence and minimization of the
bystander effect. Manuscript submitted for
publication.

Datan, N. (1984-85). Androgyny and the life cycle: The Bacchai of Euripides. Imagination, Cognition, and Personality, 4, 405-413.

Deustch, C., & Gilbert, L. (1976). Sex role stereotypes: Effect on perceptions of self and on others and on personal adjustment. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 23, 373-379.

Fagot, B. (1977). Consequences of moderate cross-gender behavior in preschool children. Child Development, 48, 902-907.

Feinman, S. (1984). A status theory of the evaluation of sex-role and age-role behavior. Sex Roles, 10, 445-456.

Flaherty, J., & Dusek, J. (1980). An investigation of the relationship between psychological androgyny and components of self-concept. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36, 984-992.

Galper, R., & Luck, D. (1980). Gender, evaluation, and causal attribution: The double standard is alive and well. Sex Roles, 6, 273-283.

Gilbert, L., Deutsch, C., & Strahan, R. (1978). Feminine and masculine dimensions of the typical, desirable and ideal woman and man. Sex Roles, 4, 767-778.

Gilbert, L., Waldroop, J., & Deutsch, C. (1981). Masculine and feminine stereotypes and adjustment: A reanalysis. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 5, 790-794.

Harris, L., & Lucas, M. (1976). Sex-role stereotyping. Social Work, 21, 390-395.

Heilbrun, A., & Pitman, D. (1979). Testing some basic assumptions about psychological androgyny. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 135, 175-188.

Heilbrun, C. (1973). Toward a recognition of androgyny. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Helmreich, R., Spence, J., & Gibson, R. (1982). Sex-role attitudes: 1972-1980. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 8, 656-663.

91

Helmreich, R., Spence, J., & Holahan, C. (1979). Psychological androgyny and sex role flexibility: A test of two hypotheses. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1631-1644.

Huston-Stein, A. & Higgins-Trenk, A. (1978). The development of females: Career and feminine role aspirations. In P. B. Baltes (Ed.) Life-span development and behavior (Vol. 1). New York: Academic Press.

Jaccard, J., Becker, M., & Wood, G. (1984). Pairwise multiple comparison procedures: A review. Psychological Bulletin, 96, 589-596.

Jackson, L. (1983). The perception of androgyny and physical attractiveness: Two is better than one. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 9, 405-413.

Kelly, J., & Worell, J. (1977). New formulations of sex roles and androgyny: A critical review. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45, 1101-1115.

Kimlicka, T., Wakefield, J., & Friedman, A. (1980). Comparison of factors from the Bem Sex Role Inventory for male and female college students. Psychological Reports, 46, 1011-1017.

Kimlicka, T., Wakefield, J., & Goad, N. (1982). Sex-roles of ideal opposite-sexed persons for college males and females. Journal of Personality Assessment, 46, 519-521.

Korabik, K. (1982). Sex-role orientation and impressions: A comparison of differing genders and sex roles. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 8, 25-30.

Kulik, J., & Harackiewicz, J. (1979). Opposite-sex interpersonal attraction as a function of the sex-roles of the perceiver and the perceived. Sex Roles, 5, 443-452.

Lee, A., & Scheurer, V. (1983). Psychological androgyny and aspects of self-image in women and men. Sex Roles, 9, 289-306.

Lenney, E. (1979). Concluding comments on androgyny: Some intimations of its mature development. Sex Roles, 5, 829-840.

Locksley, A., Borgida, E., Brekke, N., & Hepburn, C.
    (1980). Sex stereotypes and social judgement.
    Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39,
    821-831.

Locksley, A., & Colton, M. (1979). Psychological
    androgyny: A case of mistaken identity? Journal of
    Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1017-1031.

Lubinski, D., Tellegen, A., & Butcher, J. (1983).
    Masculinity, femininity and androgyny viewed and
    assessed as distinct concepts. Journal of
    Personality and Social Psychology, 44, 428-439.

Major, B., Carnevale, P., & Deaux, K. (1981). A different
    perspective on androgyny: Evaluations of masculine
    and feminine personality characteristics. Journal of
    Personality and Social Psychology, 41, 988-1001.

Malchon, M., & Penner, L. (1981). The effects of sex and
    sex-role identity on the attribution of
    maladjustment. Sex Roles, 7, 363-375.

McBroom, W. (1984). Changes in sex-role orientations: A
    five-year longitudinal comparison. Sex Roles, 11,
    583-592.

McKee, J., & Sherriffs, A. (1959). Men's and women's
    beliefs, ideals, and self-concepts. American Journal
    of Sociology, 64, 356-363.

McPherson, K., & Spetrino, S. (1983). Androgyny and sex-
    typing: Differences in beliefs regarding gender
    polarity in ratings of ideal men and women. Sex
    Roles, 9, 441-451.

Moreland, J. (1980). Age and change in the adult male sex
    role. Sex Roles, 6, 807-818.

Myers, A., & Gonda, G. (1982). Utility of the
    masculinity-femininity construct: Comparison of
    traditional and androgyny approaches. Journal of
    Personality and Social Psychology, 43, 514-522.

Neufeld, E., Langmeyer, D., & Seeman, W. (1974). Some
    sex-role stereotypes and personal preferences, 1950
    and 1970. Journal of Personality Assessment, 38,
    247-254.

O'Leary, V., & Donoghue, J. (1978). Latitudes of
     masculinity: Reactions to sex-role deviance in men.
     Journal of Social Issues, 34, 17-27.

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

Orlofsky, J. (1982). Psychological androgyny, sex-typing,
     and sex-role ideology as predictors of male-female
     interpersonal attraction. Sex Roles, 8, 1057-1073.

Orlofsky, J., & Windle, M. (1978). Sex-role orientation,
     behavioral adaptability, and personal adjustment.
     Sex Roles, 4, 801-811.

Pantin, H., & Carver, C. (1982). Induced competence and
     the bystander effect. Journal of Applied Social
     Psychology, 12, 100-111.

Pedhazur, E., & Tetenbaum, T. (1979). Bem Sex Role
     Inventory: A theoretical and methodological
     critique. Journal of Personality and Social
     Psychology, 37, 996-1016.

Phillips, R., & Gilroy, F. (1985). Sex-role stereotypes
     and clinical judgements of mental health: The
     Brovermans' findings reexamined. Sex Roles, 12,
     179-193.

Pleck, J. (1976). The male sex role: Definitions,
     problems and sources of change. Journal of Social
     Issues, 32, 155-164.

Pleck, J. (1981). Prisoners of manliness. Psychology
     Today, 15, 68-83.

Pursell, S., & Banikiotes, P. (1978). Androgyny and
     interpersonal attraction. Personality and Social
     Psychology Bulletin, 4, 235-239.

Remland, M., Jacobson, C., & Jones, T. (1983). Effects of
     psychological gender and sex-incongruent behavior on
     evaluations of leadership. Perceptual and Motor
     Skills, 57, 783-798.

Renk, P. (1986). Self-report and behavioral reactions to
     male sex-role incongruency. Unpublished master's
     thesis, California State University, San Bernardino.

Rosenkrantz, P., Vogel, S., Bee, H., Broverman, I., & Broverman, D. (1968). Sex-role stereotypes and self-concepts in college students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 32, 287-295.

Ruble, T. (1983). Sex stereotypes: Issues of change in the 1970's. Sex Roles, 9, 397-402.

Scher, D. (1984). Sex-role contradictions: Self-perceptions and ideal perceptions. Sex Roles, 7/8, 651-656.

Schwartz, S., & Gottlieb, S. (1980). Bystander anonymity and reactions to emergencies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39, 418-430.

Seyfried, B., & Hendrick, C. (1973). When do opposites attract? When they are opposite in sex and sex-role attitudes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 25, 15-20.

Shapiro, J., & Shapiro, D. (1985). A control model of psychological health: Relation to "traditional" and "liberated" sex-role stereotypes (Investigation and extension of a construct). Sex Roles, 12, 433-447.

Silvern, L., & Ryan, V. (1979). Self-rated adjustment and sex-typing on the Bem Sex-Role Inventory: Is masculinity the primary predictor of adjustment? Sex Roles, 5, 739-763.

Silvern, L., & Ryan, V. (1983). A reexamination of masculine and feminine sex-role ideals and conflicts among ideals for the man, woman, and person. Sex Roles, 9, 1223-1248.

Smith, A., Resick, P., & Kilpatrick, D. (1980). Relationships among gender, sex-role attitudes, sexual attitudes, thoughts, and behaviors. Psychological Reports, 46, 359-367.

Spence, J. (1983). Comment on Lubinski, Tellegen, and Butcher's "Masculinity, femininity, and androgyny viewed and assessed as distinct concepts". Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44, 440-446.

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

Spence, J., & Helmreich, R. (1979). The many faces of androgyny: A reply to Locksley and Colten. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1032-1046.

Spence, J., & Helmreich, R. (1980). Masculine instrumentality and feminine expresiveness: Their relationships with sex role attitudes and behaviors. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 5, 147-163.

Spence, J., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1974). The Personal Attributes Questionnaire: A measure of sex-role stereotypes and masculinity-femininity. JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 32, 29-39.

Spence, J., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1975). Likeability, sex-role congruence of interest, and competence: It all depends on how you ask. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 5, 93-109.

Swenson, E., & Ragucci, R. (1984). Effects of sex-role stereotypes and androgynous alternatives on mental health judgements of psychologists. Psychological Reports, 54, 475-481.

Tabachnick, B., & Fidell, L. (1983). Using multivariate statistics. New York: Harper & Row.

Taylor, M., & Hall, J. (1982). Psychological androgyny: Theories, methods and conclusions. Psychological Bulletin, 92, 347-366.

Werner, P., & La Russa, G. (1985). Persistence and change in sex-role stereotypes. Sex Roles, 12, 1089-1100.

Yoder, J., Rice, R., Adams, J., Priest, R., & Prince, H. (1982). Reliability of the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS) and the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ). Sex Roles, 8, 651-657.