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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the present study was to investigate the effect of male gender role-related characteristics on romantic and friendship liking in women. Women (n = 96) participated in groups and were each given a booklet containing descriptions of eight male stimulus persons (SPs) written from the perspective of bogus female raters from a bogus previous study. Two trait type (valence and gender role) and two success (income and occupational status) variables were manipulated such that no two booklets were exactly alike. For the success variables, high (over $80,000) or low (under $15,000) annual income and high (professional) or low (laborer) occupational status were indicated for each SP. Positive or negative EPAQ traits were indicated as the valence manipulation and masculine or feminine EPAQ traits were indicated as the gender role manipulation for the trait type variables. Although each participant was exposed to all four levels of the success variables, they were only exposed to two the four levels of the trait type variable and were thus divided into six comparison groups. It was predicted that SPs with positive traits would score higher than SPs with negative traits on both friendship and romantic liking scales, while SPs with masculine traits would score higher on the romantic liking scale than SPs with feminine traits and SPs with feminine traits would score higher than SPs with masculine traits on the friendship liking scale. Similarly, for masculine SPs romantic liking scores were expected to be higher than their friendship liking scores while for feminine SPs friendship liking scores
were expected to be higher than their romantic liking scores. Finally, a preference for SPs with high income and occupational status over those with low income and occupational status was expected for the romantic liking scale, but no difference was expected for the friendship liking scale. As expected, SPs with positive traits were rated significantly higher on both romantic and friendship liking scales than SPs with negative traits, feminine SPs were rated significantly higher than masculine SPs on the friendship liking scale, and feminine SPs were rated significantly higher on the friendship liking scale than the romantic liking scale. However, feminine-trait SPs were preferred on the romantic liking scale, which was a reversal of the predicted gender role effect on romantic liking. In a reversal of the predicted type of liking effect, masculine SPs scored significantly higher on friendship liking than on romantic liking. As expected, income and occupational status had no effect on friendship liking. On the romantic liking scale, partial support was found for the income hypothesis. High income SPs were rated significantly higher on romantic liking than low income SPs only in the M+/F+ comparison group, in which only positive-trait SPs were presented to Ss. No difference in romantic liking scores was found between high and low occupational status SPs. However, occupational status was involved in each of six unexpected interactions found. The preference of all SPs as friends rather than romantic partners may reflect a general caution in women against becoming involved too quickly in romantic dating relationships while the partial support for the income hypothesis suggests that income may not become a criterion for women in romantic relationships until personality criteria have been met. Social desirability bias may have affected participants' romantic liking ratings of feminine SPs.
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INTRODUCTION

When and if men ever get in touch with their feelings on a mass level, they will be venting anger and hurt both at their own socialization and at women who go for heroes while saying they want vulnerability (Farrell, 1986, p. 351).

The changing roles of men and women has been a topic of increasing interest in theoretical literature and empirical studies since the resurgence of the women's movement three decades ago. As feminism gained power and recognition, many women began to question and change their roles and a smaller number of men began to realize that their own gender role had its share of problems. Although men have generally been slower to change their gender roles than women (Farrell, 1986), the symbiotic nature of gender roles and the changing role of females could eventually produce the change of male roles (Farrell, 1976).

This interaction of gender roles is especially evident in heterosexual romantic relationships, in which romantic partners reinforce their own and each other's gender role. For example, even today, the majority of heterosexual romantic relationships begin with the male partner taking the initiative and the female partner either accepting or rejecting his advances (Farrell, 1986). Continuing that pattern of behavior may reinforce traditional male and female roles. Furthermore, the type of women men approach and the type of men women accept can play a large part in reinforcing each other's gender role (Farrell, 1986). This thesis examined the male gender role in terms of female preferences for males with varying gender role traits and levels of success.
Although the men's movement never paralleled the power, momentum, or national attention of the women's movement, it did begin to bring about an awareness of male gender role, its problems, and its limitations. In his examination of the male gender role, Brannon (1976) outlined its dimensions. Some of parameters of the male gender role can be seen when one examines the effect of deviation from that role. What makes it more likely that a male's "manhood" will be questioned? Femininity, for one. This is the first of four dimensions of Brannon's definition of the male gender role:

1. No Sissy Stuff: The stigma of all stereotyped feminine characteristics and qualities, including openness and vulnerability.
2. The Big Wheel: Success, status, and the need to be looked up to.
4. Give 'Em Hell: The aura of aggression, violence, and daring.

Much of what has been written about the male gender role relates to this first injunction against traits, behaviors, career interests, or life styles that can be interpreted as feminine. Fasteau (1974) wrote about a case in which a businessman who cried at work was prevented from future promotions and was even asked to resign. If a man cries at home because of a stressful day at work, or if he is the more "needy" partner in the marriage, his wife may feel annoyed at having to "mother" him instead of feeling sympathetic (Farrell, 1986). Brannon also points out that if a man expresses caring or affection for any males other than his relatives or fails to prove his attraction to or interest in women, his manhood as well as his sexual orientation may be questioned, unless he is very careful about who he expresses these feelings to and how he expresses them.
Much of the male gender role literature has pointed out that the stigma of being labeled homosexual is feared by many homosexual and heterosexual men in American society (Brannon, 1976; Doyle, 1983; Lewis, 1978; Pleck, 1981). If a man exhibits submissive behavior when confronted by others or appears to be physically weak or have soft or feminine facial features, his manhood may be questioned, unless, in the latter case, he is “successful,” according to Brannon.

Success is Brannon’s second dimension of the male gender role. He calls this one of the “most basic routes to manhood in our society.” (p.19) Part of being successful can involve being a “good provider,” but that is not the only aspect of success. After describing the history of the changing male role as a good provider, Doyle (1983) concluded that even though the male role of good provider will eventually end due to the increase in working couples, leisure activities, changes in the nature of work, and other factors, there is still pressure on men to be successful. Doyle (1983) believes that achievement was more important to men in the 1980s than in the previous two decades. But this need for achievement is not limited to employment. Although success is usually defined, according to Brannon (1976), “in terms of occupational prestige and achievement, wealth, fame, power, and visible positions of leadership,” (p. 19) it can be seen in many activities that involve competition, performance, or competence (Doyle, 1983; Farrell, 1986; Pleck, 1981), and even some biological functions, such as sexual intercourse, that should not involve competence or performance (Brannon, 1976).

Brannon’s third dimension of the male gender role partly involves physical size and strength, but it more importantly involves courage, mental and physical “toughness”, self-reliance, and confidence, especially in the face of
hardship. Even a small adult male can be a "real man" if he "stands tall" in the face of hardship. Most males behave this way, according to Doyle (1983), in response to the fear of appearing unmanly to others.

Brannon’s fourth dimension of the male gender role is a more extreme, negative side of masculinity that involves great risk taking, aggression, and violence which can be not only very damaging to men, but also to women and to male-female relationships. Although rape, the worst extreme of the male link between sex and aggression, is not acted out by the majority of men, the average man may feel pressure to exhibit aggression in relationships in less sinister ways. Brannon recalls in his personal experience with the male gender role:

When I was around 15 we had as neighbors a pair of newlyweds called Dick and Birdie. One evening after a loud quarrel Dick left in a huff, and when he returned home hours later, he found both the front and back doors locked. He pounded and pounded, to no avail. By now in a blind rage he raced over to our house, seized my boy scout ax, and proceeded to chop his own front door to splinters. The newlyweds apparently settled their differences that night... Several years later, my father attended a poker game with "the boys." He had promised to be home by one, but finally stumbled back in the wee hours of the morning — to discover that my mother had locked him out! After knocking and banging around for awhile my father left in disgust, probably feeling a little guilty about breaking his promise, and spent the night somewhere else. The misunderstanding was settled the next day, and was presumably forgotten. But in the midst of an argument some years later, I heard my mother say to my father: "Well, I'll say this: if you were a real man, you'd have chopped down my front door that night I locked you out, the way Dick next door did to Birdie! "No one less than Attila the Hun could have lived up could have lived up to that role all the time; we were all losers. But we believed in the values and norms that made us losers, we reinforced them, and we imposed them on others. My father actually felt ashamed, after that conversation, that he hadn't chopped or knocked the door down (p. 35).
This thesis examined Brannon's four components of the male gender role in terms of masculine versus feminine personality traits (the positive and negative personality aspects of Brannon's masculine "Sturdy Oak" and "Give 'em Hell" components, as well as those of Brannon's "Sissy Stuff", the feminine characteristics that "real men" must avoid) and in terms of success (Brannon's "Big Wheel" component). These components were examined in the context of women's ratings of stimulus males as potential friends and romantic dating partners.

**Gender Role Stereotypes**

Gender role stereotypes have been examined in numerous studies for over three decades (Feinman, 1974; Malchon & Penner, 1981; Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, & Boverman, 1968). Several studies (Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz, and Vogel, 1970; Feinman, 1974; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1975) have found that masculine behavior is generally approved more than feminine behavior. Gilbert, Deutsch, and Strahan (1978) examined participant ratings of the typical, ideal, and desirable man and woman in terms of gender role characteristics. Although the ideal and desirable man and woman was rated as more androgynous than the typical man, they also found that even the ideal or desirable man is characterized as being more masculine than feminine and the ideal woman as being more feminine than masculine. However, conflicting evidence can be seen in a study by Silvern and Ryan (1983) which found that the ideal person for both male and female subjects was more feminine than masculine.

Since it seems unlikely that the popular values that reinforce gender roles could change that much in five years, it seems more reasonable to
suggest that other factors may be responsible for this difference. One such factor could be social desirability. It is possible that gender role ideals may be less affected by true gender role attitudes and behavior than by social desirability based on modern liberal expectations. Jean and Reynolds (1984) suggest that today's known socially desirable items in gender role questionnaires are items that represent liberal rather than conservative attitudes. They proposed that a possible measure of the awareness of feminist ideology is the ability to fake liberal attitudes. Jean and Reynolds found that subjects were capable of faking liberal or conservative gender role attitudes as measured in survey-type questionnaires, and concluded that such scales can fall prey to the effects of social desirability.

Perhaps a less liberal social desirability-biased measure of gender role attitudes can be found in research participants' responses to gender role incongruity in children and other adults. In his investigation of adult responses to children's gender role behavior, Feinman (1974; 1981) found that cross-gender role behavior was more acceptable in girls than in boys. In the earlier study, Feinman found that masculine behavior is generally more approved than feminine behavior, that gender role congruent behavior is generally more approved than gender role incongruent behavior, and that cross gender role behavior was more disapproved in boys than in girls. In the later study, Feinman confirmed all of the above findings and theorized that masculine behavior may be viewed as having a higher status than feminine behavior to explain these findings. Thus, given the higher status of masculinity, a boy who acts like a girl is not only violating a gender role, he is also perceived to be stepping down in status. Girls who play like boys are also violating their gender
role, but they are perceived as moving up in status, so they are not as
disapproved for cross-gender role behavior as are boys.

Evidence from studies examining gender role based career, pathology,
and self disclosure expectations suggest that the same status principle may be
operating with adults. Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp (1975) found that a male
majoring in something traditionally feminine such as interior decoration or home
economics tends to receive disapproval from subjects. Tilby and Kalin (1980)
found that men and women judged otherwise normal stimulus persons (SPs)
with gender role incongruent occupations and interests as less well adjusted
that gender role congruent SPs in friendship and family relationships as well as
in their work and career, especially for male SPs. However, conflicting
evidence from O'Leary and Donaghue (1978) suggests that not all feminine
careers are viewed less favorably for men than all masculine careers. A man
who had the feminine career interest of teaching kindergarten was found to be
preferred as a co-worker over a man with the masculine career interest of
working in the business field. This effect was found first in college students, and
was replicated using high-school students. O'Leary and Donaghue's findings,
though, seem to represent an exception to the more general tendency to favor
masculine occupations for men.

Some evidence also suggests that men are tolerated less than females
for exhibiting forms of pathology that are typically thought of as displaying
weakness or femininity. Hammen and Peters (1977) found that depressed male
SPs were more rejected as friends, dates, and relationship partners and seen
as more maladjusted than depressed female SPs. They concluded that this
greater rejection of male SPs was mostly due to their deviation from the male
role by displaying depression. This finding suggested that depression may have been seen by subjects as a feminine pathology. In a later study, Hammen and Peters (1978) confirmed that subjects did attribute feminine traits to depressed SPs. The attribution of femininity to depression may be harmful to both sexes. It may be harmful to females because it implies that at some level depression and perhaps other pathology is expected of women. But, it may be harmful to males because it could penalize them for expressing emotions that can be construed as depression. Furthermore, this may apply more generally to males who exhibit other forms of pathology or dysfunction. In fact, Malchon and Penner (1981) found that males can be disapproved of just for being in therapy. Male SPs in therapy were viewed by men and women to be more maladjusted than female SPs.

It is extremely difficult for anyone to benefit from therapy without talking to the therapist, but once he is in a therapy setting, there is some evidence that suggests that views of the male SP's adjustment can only get worse the more he talks. Derlega and Chaikin (1975) found that self-disclosing male SPs in a therapy setting were seen as more maladjusted than males who did not self-disclose. The opposite was found for female SPs. Another study by Kleinke and Kahn (1980) supports the proposition that simply self-disclosing in a therapy setting is gender role incongruent for men, but not for women. They found that self-disclosing women were more disliked than non-self-disclosing women only if they were talking about gender role incongruent feelings. Otherwise, the non-self-disclosing women were more disliked. The results for male SPs were simpler. High self-disclosing male SPs were more disliked than
those who self-disclosed less. This being the case, it is not surprising that men
generally engage in less intimate self-disclosure than women (Morgan, 1976).

Costs of the Male Gender Role

The greater punishment for male role incongruity is one of ten
propositions of Pleck’s (1981) Sex Role Strain paradigm. Pleck’s paradigm
points out the inherent psychological strain involved in gender roles. Although
gender role expectations exist throughout society, they are contradictory,
inconsistent, psychologically dysfunctional, and an almost impossible standard
to meet. There is gender role strain in the conflicting demands of career and
family, and in the changing of gender roles over time. But gender role violation
is severely punished, especially for men, which leads to extreme gender role
conformity. In terms of the male gender role, Pleck’s Sex Role Strain paradigm
and Feinman’s (1974) status theory point out society’s unrealistically high
expectations for men.

Conforming to the male gender role can cause stress as well as strain. For
gender-typed men, even the awareness of the stress of conforming to this
role may not be enough to change their behavior. A study by Currant, Dickson,
Anderson, and Faulkender (1979) divided assertiveness into two types:
oppositional assertion, which involves confrontation and standing up for
oneself; and expressive assertion, which involves the expression of affection
and appreciation. Androgynous and gender-typed subjects of both genders
indicated that they would feel more anxiety doing oppositional assertion than
expressive assertion, but the gender-typed men were the only group in the
study to indicate that they would be more likely to engage in oppositional
assertion than expressive assertion. This finding suggests that men may often
force themselves to engage in more confrontive and stressful behaviors than the situation calls for, simply because these behaviors are more masculine.

Gender role strain can also be seen in male insecurity and lack of expressiveness. Recall that Gilbert et al. (1978) found the characteristics of the ideal man to be more masculine than feminine. They also found that men see themselves as falling short of what they believe the ideal male to be like. Failure to live up to this ideal can lead to self-doubt in many men. Tavris (1977) found in a survey of Psychology Today readers that many men felt that they lacked particular positive masculine traits such as independence, self-confidence, and competitiveness. They also felt they lacked certain feminine traits such as warmth, gentleness, and the ability to love. But, perhaps the latter deficiency in expressiveness exists because of ingrained past socialization and continued socialization from society pressuring men to avoid exhibiting feminine traits, despite the more recent desirability of these traits. This position is supported by empirical evidence that men feel that they must deny needs for support, emotional expression, and intimacy to maintain a masculine self-image (Moreland, 1980).

Although recent changes in the male gender role encourage men to express these needs more than in the past, this permission to be expressive has its limits. Because today's men "see heterosexual relationships as the only legitimate source of the emotional support they need" (Pleck, 1981, p.141), they tend to reach out only to women, not to other men. In discussing the literature on male same-gender friendships, Lewis (1978) stated that, although there was evidence that men have more same-gender friendships than women, these friendships tended to be more superficial than those of women. He explained
that pressure to compete, aversion to vulnerability and homophobia are some of
the demands of the male gender role that prevent or minimize the opportunity
for open self-disclosure, closeness, and emotional intimacy among men.

The effects on emotional health of the stressful instrumental demands as
well as the strict limitations on expressiveness of the male gender role have
been discussed. There is also evidence that adhering to these qualities of the
male gender role could have harmful effects on physical health. Farrell (1986)
cites health statistics from several sources in comparing men’s health to
women’s health:

In the area of physical health, women fare far better than men. On
the average, women live 7.8 years longer than men; men suffer
over 98 percent of the major diseases. Some of this may be
biological. But since the gap has increased in the United States
by almost 700 percent since 1920 (from 1 year to 7.8 years), and
since many causes of death have high sex-role-related
characteristics, from war (the all-male draft) to the 600 percent
higher incidence of work-related accidents among men (including
over 2,000,000 disabling injuries and 14,000 deaths per year) we
can see that a good portion of this difference is due to sex-role
assignment. (p.12)

Physical injury and death as a result of risk-taking are the most obvious
contributing factors to men’s shorter average life span. But another contributing
factor may be the effect of the emotional stress of the male role on physical
health. Several studies have found a link between high masculinity and
coronal-prone Type A characteristics (Auten, Hull, & Hull, 1985; Grimm &
Yarnold, 1985; Stevens, Pfost, & Ackerman, 1984). Furthermore, more recent
findings by Helgeson (1990; 1991) have established an even more concrete
masculinity link to heart attacks. In her former study, Type A behavior, health
practices and social support were measured in male and female patients who
had recently suffered a heart attack. Helgeson also measured their masculinity
and femininity using Spence, Helmreich, & Holohan's (1979) Extended Personal Attributes Questionnaire (EPAQ). Although she found no link between masculinity and Type A characteristics, she did find negative masculinity, as measured by the EPAQ, to have a stronger relationship to heart attack severity than Type A characteristics, weak social support, or poor health practices. In the latter study, she found a similar relationship between masculinity and heart attack recovery. After hospitalization for a heart attack, men who were highly masculine were more likely to be rehospitalized than men who were expressing their emotions to their wives. Thus, emotional expressiveness is not only emotionally healthy, but also can be physically healthy for men.

Male Gender Role Factors in Attraction and Relationships

If emotional expressiveness can be important to men in something as seemingly unrelated as heart attack recovery, how important is it to men in dyadic relationships? Do the effects of gender role traits in men on their relationships with women vary with the level of relationships examined? Or are the same traits preferred by women in their attraction to male friends, dates, sexual partners, relationship partners, and husbands? The effect of feminine and masculine gender role traits or behaviors on relationships can be examined in terms of women's romantic attraction to men. Seyfried and Hendrick (1973) found that women were more attracted to role congruent, or masculine gender-typed men than to role incongruent or feminine men. Additionally, Kimlicka, Wakefield, and Goad (1982) found that males with masculine traits attracted females with various gender role traits. However, women were not at all attracted to feminine males. They concluded that only when combined with high masculinity was femininity not a disadvantage in
attracting females. This conclusion suggests that if androgyny is preferred in males over masculine gender-typing, it is not because femininity is preferred over masculinity (see Cramer, Kupp, & Kuhn, in press). Perhaps women are not so interested in sensitivity, gentleness, and other feminine traits in a man that they would be attracted to a man who was not also highly masculine. The findings of Kimlicka, Wakefield, and Goad lead to the question: If forced to choose between the two, would women be more attracted to a man with only highly masculine traits than a man with only highly feminine traits?

Once a serious relationship has been established, though, feminine traits in men may play a larger part in relationship satisfaction than in the initial attraction. The quality of a dyadic relationship can be measured by the extent to which correlations exist among the partners' perceived similarity as well as their mutual understanding, validation, and recognition for insight ability in the relationship. Homosexual and heterosexual couples participating in Schullo and Alperson's (1984) study were given the EPAQ and asked to evaluate themselves, their partner, and how they thought their partner would evaluate them. The feminine positive scale accounted for more congruence among these perspectives than any other EPAQ scale, suggesting that the existence of these traits in one's partner is important in relationship satisfaction. Schullo and Alperson also replicated the finding of a previous study (Alperson & Friedman, 1983) that women in heterosexual relationships tended to be the more subordinate partner. In support of the latter finding, Gerber (1988) acknowledged that men tend to assume the role of leader and women the role of follower in marriage. While it is probably no surprise to most people that men tend to be the leaders in intimate relationships, findings from an earlier study by
Tavris (1977) on this issue may be very surprising. Findings from her survey suggested that many heterosexual women actually prefer to be the subordinate partner. Despite drawing from a possibly biased sample of Psychology Today readers, she found that only 27 percent of the women polled could view their being more intelligent than their male partner as "totally acceptable," and 36 percent indicated that this would be unacceptable. The men polled were actually more accepting of a woman's superior intelligence. The males were also more accepting than the females of a woman's superior earning power or fame over her male partner. According to Tavris, "many female respondents still want to look up to their men" (p. 82), which suggests that respect may be an important factor in women's romantic attraction to men. A man's greater intelligence could be one reason to respect him. Another reason could be his financial success. Not surprisingly, Tavris also found that women valued success in a partner more than did men. However, Tavris' findings are 15 years old now, and her survey-based methodology does not make for strong empirical evidence. Are respect and success still important to women today in the men they select?

Stronger empirical evidence from more recent studies (Buss, 1988; Buss & Barnes, 1986; Howard, Blumstein, & Schwartz, 1987; Townsend, 1987; Townsend & Levy, 1990) indicate that even today, success-related characteristics such as ambition, earning potential, and earning capacity are judged by heterosexual women to be more desirable in a relationship partner than by heterosexual men. But, do men who display their success tend to be undesirable to women? Buss (1988) asked subjects to make observations of close friends to examine the frequency and judged effectiveness of various
mate attraction tactics. His hypothesis that men tended to acquire and display material resources was confirmed, which suggests that it may not simply be the display of success-related resources, but only the obvious or arrogant display of such resources that women find undesirable. Furthermore, friends judged the acquisition and display of material resources to be an effective tactic for men in attracting a woman. This may seem exploitive, but who is exploiting whom? Male success is exploited and objectified by women just as women’s bodies are exploited and objectified by men, according to Farrell (1986). One can also take a more moderate view that success may be as important to women as physical attractiveness is to men in selecting a romantic partner.

Why is success an important criterion to women when considering a potential male romantic partner? Perhaps they need financial success in their boyfriends or husbands because they feel deprived of it in their own lives (Farrell, 1986), but if women’s generally lower socioeconomic status (SES) in society explains their tendency to have financial success as a major criterion in selecting a marital partner, then when women’s SES increases, their “available pool of marital partners” should also increase, because they are not choosing from only a financially elite subset of the male population. This was not what Townsend (1987) found when he conducted a study of students studying medicine, a field with high earning potential. In fact, Townsend found that as a woman’s earning potential increased, so did her expectations for a possible marital partner’s earning potential. Thus, rather than becoming less selective, women with increased SES became more selective on their success or earning potential criterion for marital desirability in available men. Furthermore, this was not found to be true for men. Their marital pool increased as their SES did. If
success is a form of status, perhaps high SES women in Townsend's study were responding to a need for male status rather than to a need for financial support. Both Townsend's and Tavris' findings suggest that women want to respect their male relationship partners.

Findings in a later study by Townsend and Levy (1990) which examined levels of success and relationships in greater detail also suggest a respect criterion in women's male relationship partner preferences. They showed research participants photographs of opposite-sexed SPs and asked them to read a description of the SP. The photographs had been prerated for low, medium and high physical attractiveness; the descriptions stated that each SP was training to be a doctor, high school teacher, or waiter and projected an annual salary of $80,000; $22,000; or $15,000, corresponding to the aforementioned career. They found that a partner's success level, which Townsend called "status," was a more important consideration for women than for men in their willingness to engage in all measured levels of relationships, including meeting for coffee and conversation, going out on a date, having sex, having a serious relationship that could lead to marriage, having a serious sexual relationship that could lead to marriage, and marriage to this person. Furthermore, they concluded from trend analyses of the differences in responses to these different levels of involvement that "the effects of a potential partner's status on women's willingness to enter relationships appear to increase as the sexual involvement and marriage potential of relationships increase" and that, "although potential partners' physical attractiveness also affects women's willingness to enter relationships that involve coitus and/or marital potential, high status can equalize the acceptability of less physically
attractive to a level only inferior to that of the most physically attractive, high status man” (p.160). These findings suggest that male partner’s success level becomes more important as the prospective relationship becomes more involved.

However, findings by Sprecher (1989) suggest that Townsend and Levy’s findings on physical attractiveness and status represent participant attributions about the importance of these factors rather than their actual importance in romantic attraction. She used a factorial design to examine the effect of opposite-gender SP’s physical attractiveness, earning potential, and expressiveness on the attraction ratings research participants gave them. She found that each of these characteristics had a significant effect on attraction that was similar for both male and female raters, with physical attractiveness by far being the most important characteristic and earning potential having only a slightly more powerful effect than expressiveness. However, raters attributed their attraction more to internal characteristics such as personality (which is interesting because it was held constant) and expressiveness than to physical attractiveness or earning potential, with men valuing physical attractiveness more than women, and women valuing personality, expressiveness, and earning potential more than men.

**Summary**

Masculine traits and behaviors are generally more liked than feminine traits and behaviors (Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz, and Vogel, 1970; Feinman, 1974; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1975). Although some recent studies have found feminine traits and behaviors to be more valued in men (Silvern & Ryan, 1983), much of this apparent change may be a
result of social desirability that is due to increasing awareness of feminist ideology, since survey-type gender role research tends to be vulnerable to such effects (Jean & Reynolds, 1984).

Feinman (1974; 1981) proposed that the reason that cross-gender role behavior was more acceptable in girls than in boys was that masculinity is perceived as a higher status gender role than femininity. Findings from adult studies examining gender role based career (Spence et al., 1975; Tilby & Kalin, 1980; O'Leary and Donoghue, 1978), pathology (Hammen & Peters, 1977; Hammen & Peters, 1978; Malchon & Penner, 1981), and self disclosure expectations (Derlega & Chaikin, 1975; Kleinke & Kahn, 1980; Morgan, 1976) suggest that the same status principle may explain why men are also more punished than women for violating the expectations of their gender role. According to Pleck (1981), gender role expectations exist throughout society and are contradictory, inconsistent, psychologically dysfunctional, and an almost impossible standard to meet. In order to adapt to these unrealistically high expectations, many men force themselves to engage in more confrontive and stressful behaviors than a situation calls for, simply because these behaviors are more masculine (Currant, Dickson, Anderson, & Faulkender, 1979); many feel that they must deny their needs for support, emotional expression, and intimacy to maintain a masculine self-image (Moreland, 1980), many see themselves as falling short of what they believe the ideal male to be like (Gilbert et al., 1978); and the failure to live up to this ideal can lead to self-doubt in many men (Tavris, 1977).

The only intimate emotions men express are usually towards women, not to other men (Pleck, 1981). Men's same-gender friendships tend to be more
superficial than those of women because pressure to compete, aversion to vulnerability and homophobia minimize the opportunity for open self-disclosure, closeness, and emotional intimacy among men (Lewis, 1978).

In addition to the psychological costs, the male gender role may have costs for physical health, in terms of Type A characteristics (Auten, Hull, & Hull, 1985; Grimm & Yarnold, 1985; Stevens, Pfost, Ackerman, 1984) and heart attack severity and recovery (Helgeson, 1990; 1991).

Women tend to be more attracted to role congruent, or masculine gender-typed men than to men with feminine characteristics (Seyfried & Hendrick, 1973; Kimlicka, Wakefield, & Goad, 1982). However, for a committed romantic partner in an established relationship, positive feminine personality traits may be more linked to relationship satisfaction than are positive masculine personality traits (Schullo & Alperson, 1984). Still, men tend to be the leaders in heterosexual relationships (Gerber, 1988; Alperson & Friedman, 1983), and a majority of women seem to prefer it that way (Tavris, 1977; Townsend, 1987). One form of leadership in a marriage is being the breadwinner. Success and success-related characteristics are more important criteria for women than for men in their heterosexual partners (Buss, 1988; Buss & Barnes, 1986; Howard et al, 1987; Tavris, 1977; Townsend, 1987; Townsend, 1990). Sprecher (1989), however, found that earning potential in a prospective dating partner equally affects romantic liking in both genders, but women attribute greater importance to earning potential in their attraction than men do.

**Friendship**

Although Townsend and Levy found that male success was a factor in attracting women for all six levels of relationships examined, none of these
levels were specifically stated to be limited to friendship and all could be interpreted as levels of romantic relationships. Obviously, the lowest of these levels overlaps with friendship activities, but “meeting for coffee and conversation” is not exclusively a friendship activity. Would success still be important in a male friend? Would other male gender role factors, such as masculine personality traits, be as important to men in attracting female friends as in attracting female relationship partners?

Female same-gender friendships “tend to focus on nurturing, sharing, personal communication, and general expressiveness,” (O'Meara, 1989, p. 528) while male same-gender friendships tend to be more goal-oriented (Fox, Gibbs, & Auerbach, 1985). O'Meara also pointed out that society has no consistent roles or guidelines for cross-gender friendships, and that cross-gender friends must often make their own rules on personal interaction. Lacking a socialized cross-gender friendship role definition, would many women feel friendship attraction toward expressive men who remind them of their female friends? Or would they respond to societal pressure (O'Meara, 1989) to follow gender roles as defined in a romantic relationship, and choose instrumental, masculine men as friends?

**Purpose of the study**

Several studies have used written descriptions of stimulus persons (Hammon & Peters, 1977; Kulik & Harackiewicz, 1979; Tilby & Kalin, 1980); several have examined masculinity and femininity in attraction and relationships (Buss, 1988; Buss & Barnes, 1986; Cowan & Koziej, 1979; Kulik & Harackiewicz, 1979; Schullo & Alperson, 1984); some have examined negative as well as positive masculine and feminine traits or behaviors (Autor et al, 1988;
Buss, 1989; Cowan & Koziej, 1979; Schullo & Alperson, 1984; Spence, Helmreich, & Holohan, 1979), and many have examined the responses to gender role incongruent traits or behaviors exhibited in others (Cowan & Koziej, 1979; Feinman, 1974; Feinman, 1981; Hammen & Peters, 1977; Tilby and Kalin, 1980). Townsend (1990) examined success (a combination of income and occupational status) as a factor in men's and women's criteria for attraction and relationships. Sprecher (1989) examined attraction as a function of a gender role related variable (expressiveness) and a success related variable (earning potential) using a between-subjects factorial design and asking subjects to rate their romantic liking for a stimulus person. However, no study to date has simultaneously examined several levels of each of these variables by asking female subjects to compare and rate several stimulus males on romantic liking scales and apparently no study to date has examined the effects of any of these variables on friendship liking. Finally, no study to date has compared the romantic and friendship desirability of positive traits to negative traits in SPs.

In the present study the effects of income, occupational status, positive and negative trait types and masculine and feminine gender role trait types on attraction were examined using several separate within-subjects factorial design comparison groups. By asking research participants to rate several stimulus males, it was expected that they would compare the SPs and rate each SP relative to the others in their set. It is believed that this approach of presenting several stimulus males simulates the dating and relationship choices that women make in daily life. This study appears to be the first to simultaneously examine the effects of four levels of trait types (positive and negative masculinity and femininity) and four levels of success (high and low
income and occupational status) in stimulus males on attraction in women. It should be noted that Townsend and Levy (1990) combined income and occupational status variables rather than varying them independently as was done in the present study.

In the present study, bogus written examples from the EPAQ were used to manipulate levels of gender role congruent and incongruent personality traits and bogus “background” information on these SPs was used to manipulate yearly income and occupational status levels to create believable SP profiles.

A secondary purpose of the present study was to compare romantic to friendship liking and to examine the effects of gender role traits and success on romantic attraction and friendship ratings. No other empirical study to date has investigated the stimulus person characteristics that determine romantic liking versus the stimulus person characteristics that determine friendship liking.

**Hypotheses**

The general trait type and success factors were each divided into two independently varying factors. Trait type was examined in terms of the valence and gender role of traits. Valence refers to the positivity or negativity of the traits and gender role refers to the masculinity or femininity of the traits. Success was examined by independently varying levels of income and occupational status. Hypotheses are listed in descending order of predicted main effect strength:

**H₁:** The most obvious prediction was that, regardless of their masculinity or femininity, male SPs with positive EPAQ traits would receive higher ratings on both friendship liking and romantic liking measures than those with negative EPAQ traits. This valence effect was expected to be far stronger than any other effect. Since Spence et al (1979) constructed the
EPAQ's positive scales to represent traits that are desirable for both genders and the negative scales to represent traits that are undesirable for both genders, women's preference for male SPs with desirable traits over male SPs with undesirable traits was expected to be the strongest main effect for both friendship and romantic liking.

**H2:** Male SPs with positive masculine EPAQ traits were expected to receive higher romantic liking scores than those with positive feminine traits. Because masculine traits have been found to be generally preferred over feminine traits, and gender role congruity has been found to be generally preferred over gender role incongruity, especially for men, it was predicted that women would prefer male SPs with positive masculine traits over those with positive feminine traits.

**H3:** Male SPs with negative masculine traits were expected to receive higher romantic liking scores than those with negative feminine traits. The same reasoning as for H2 applies for this hypothesis.

**H4:** The reverse of H2 was expected for friendship liking. It was predicted that women would rate male SPs with positive feminine traits higher on friendship liking scales than those with positive masculine traits.

**H5:** The reverse of H3 was expected for friendship liking. Male SPs with negative feminine traits were expected to receive higher friendship liking scores than those with negative masculine traits.

**H6:** High income SPs were expected to receive higher romantic liking scores than low income SPs.

**H7:** High occupational status SPs were expected to receive higher romantic liking scores than low occupational status SPs.
H8: Income and occupational status were not expected to be factors in friendship liking.

H9: When comparing friendship liking to romantic liking scores, feminine positive and feminine negative SPs were expected to receive higher friendship liking scores than romantic liking scores.

H10: When comparing friendship liking to romantic liking scores, masculine positive and masculine negative SPs were expected to receive higher romantic liking scores than friendship liking scores.
METHOD

Participants

Ninety-six female college students were recruited from Psychology classes at California State University in San Bernardino and Chaffey Community College. For approximately half of the subjects, the experiment was run in classrooms at these two institutions and for the other half it was run in a laboratory room at the former institution. In both cases, subjects were run in groups. Most subjects received extra credit for their participation in the study and all were treated in accordance with the ethical standards of the American Psychological Association.

Independent Variables

All gender role and valence IVs were based on Spence, Helmreich, and Holohan's (1979) Extended Personal Attributes Questionnaire (EPAQ). The EPAQ measures masculinity and femininity in terms of scale ratings of 40 items that correspond to either masculine, feminine, or bi-polar M-F traits. The 16 masculine, agentic items are divided into a set of eight positive, desirable traits (M+) and eight negative, undesirable traits (M-). The 16 feminine, communion items are similarly divided into F+ and F- traits, but in addition, the eight F- items are divided into two four-item subsets. Spence distinguished these two subsets as F-C traits relating to unmitigated communion traits, which profile "the doormat," and F-VA traits relating to verbal passive-aggressiveness, which profile "the nag." Spence's negative masculinity scale was not similarly named.
The present study drew from EPAQ traits to create gender-role-based personality descriptions, or “profiles.” Antonyms were found for each of the EPAQ traits. As a manipulated variable, it may not be enough to simply use, for example, “not confident” as the opposite end of a continuum that has “confident” at its other end. This makes the continuum only unipolar rather than bipolar and tells subjects what the scale is examining. The antonym used for “confident,” for example, was “insecure.” All 32 EPAQ traits and the antonyms chosen for them can be found under the “Personality” headings in Appendix A. These were listed in random order to lessen the likelihood that subjects would recognize the pattern of four gender role categories. At the top was the statement, “Based on your conversation with this person, rate him on the following measures”, followed by the “Personality” heading. The items in larger sized print on the right side of Appendix A will be discussed later with the explanation of the success level manipulation.

There were eight points in each trait scale, and all trait scales were structured so that the item above the number one indicated the opposite, not just a low value, of the item of interest on the right above the number eight. Each of the traits as described to subjects scored a seven or an eight (see Appendix E) and each trait rating included a one or two sentence description of the bogus SP’s statements or behaviors in the “comments” section, which will be explained later.

Each of the stimulus male profiles contained four traits, and all of the traits for any given stimulus male were from the same scale (e.g. they each had traits that were all masculine or all feminine, and all desirable or all undesirable). Since the F-scale factored into two separate subsets, it may
seem unrealistic for an SP to have both F-C and F-VA traits. Thus, F-C and F-VA were presented as two separate four-trait profiles. To compare F- to the other three scales, M+, F+ and M- were each divided by the investigator into two equal subsets of four traits that appeared to be compatible together. The intention was to balance the other scales with the F- scales and to create a number of believable SP personalities based on EPAQ scales to compare to each other, while controlling or minimizing confounding variables. To minimize possible confounding produced by particular combinations of traits in this arrangement, the original eight M+, F+, and M- scales, or trait types, were again divided into alternative arrangements of four compatible traits. Thus, two different arrangements of each set of eight traits were used. Each set of traits was then randomly ordered. The division of the F- traits remained the same because they were already divided into two distinct subsets, each with four compatible traits. However, as an alternative arrangement of F- traits, the order of presentation of the traits was different for each of the two presentations. Thus, by dividing the eight traits of each trait type into four different arrangements of four traits within each trait type, four distinct "personality profiles" of SPs resulted for each trait type, totaling 16 personality profiles. Appendix B shows four variations each of M+ on page 71, F+ on page 72, M- on page 73, and F- on page 74. Subjects were exposed to all four levels of any trait type variable that was presented to them. For example, subjects presented with M+ males rated all four M+ profiles as different males.

Since any given trait was exposed to subjects in two different SP profiles, a different behavioral example for each occurrence of any given trait was needed. To distinguish the two examples as belonging to different SPs, in as
much as possible, one example was given in terms of statements made by a
bogus SP, and one in terms of nonverbal behavior exhibited by a bogus SP.
For example, for the trait “confident”; in the profile in the third column of the first
page of Appendix B it is defined in terms of his voice, posture, and “body
language”. In the profile in the fourth column, it is defined in terms of convincing
statements he made about himself.

The purpose of the comments section was to concretely define each of
the four traits for subjects in terms of behaviors or statements made by the SP to
enhance the believability of the bogus previous study. They were written from the perspective of a bogus previous subject’s observations. The behavioral
examples were the product of a pilot study, in which male and female
participants were asked to describe a randomly selected set of adjectives from the EPAQ in terms of statements or nonverbal behavior they might notice in someone they were having a conversation with. For example, for the trait “confident”, pilot study participants were asked: “Let’s say you were having a conversation with someone, and you found this person to be very confident. What would you notice in his statements and/or nonverbal behavior that would give you that impression?” The same process was used for examples of all 32 EPAQ traits. The most relevant and clearest examples were selected by the investigator. They were then rewritten from the perspective of a female interviewer who had rated a subject and had explained her ratings. Where no satisfactory example was found, one was created by the investigator. The appropriate example was then written under the comments section of the trait.

Income and occupational status were also manipulated in each SP
profile. Appendix A shows the blank form of the background section used in SP
profiles on the right side, in normal sized print. Above the “Background” heading was the statement, “Based on your conversation with this person, rate him on the following measures.” This section contained blank spaces for all of the questions that are answered for subjects in each SP’s profile.

Appendix E shows a completed sample profile. The bottom of the left side of the sample profile contains the completed background section. Male SPs were identified by three-letter initials at the top and the fifth and sixth items were the manipulations for the occupational status and income variables. Of the eight SPs in each subject’s booklet, four were laborers and four were professionals, and four had the lowest and four had highest income range. For the income variable, four possible ranges of yearly income were presented to subjects: “0-$15,000,” “$16,000-$30,000,” “$31,000-$79,000,” and “$80,000 or more.” The income ranges were numbered one to four, one indicating the lowest range and 4 indicating the highest range. The number circled represented a bogus previous rater’s assessment of the SP’s yearly income. The number was actually circled by the investigator before running the experiment. For all SPs, either a one or a four was circled. Income was manipulated such that none of the SPs were in the middle ranges of yearly income. These middle ranges were included to give the appearance that a true questionnaire had been given to the SPs and to imply to subjects that there may have been other SPs that did score in the middle ranges of income. The middle ranges of income were not circled.

Similarly for the occupational status variable, none of the SPs were indicated as having an “average” occupational status. Three possible occupational areas were presented to subjects: “Laborer,” “Average,” and
“Professional.” For any SP's profile, either “Laborer,” numbered one on the left, or “Professional,” numbered three on the right, was circled. The “Average” occupational area, numbered two, was not circled for any of the SPs.

Low occupational status was indicated by circling the number one for “Laborer” and high occupational status in SPs was indicated by circling the number three for “Professional” on the occupational area question (see Helgeson, 1990); low income was indicated by circling the number one for the “$0-15,000” range and high income was indicated by circling the number four for the “$80,000 or more” range on the yearly income question (see Townsend and Levy, 1990). Unlike Townsend and Levy’s (1990) study, in which income varied proportionally to occupational status as part of the same variable, the present study divided income and status into two separate variables. Thus, a high income SP did not necessarily have a high occupational status and a low income SP did not necessarily have a low occupational status. The remaining questions were created simply to disguise the success level manipulation and were either held constant or randomized. These items are discussed later.

The Personality and Background items were combined in so that trait type and success variables were manipulated in each SP profile. On the top left side of the sample profile was the completed form of the Personality section in which the trait type IVs were manipulated. The only aspect of the trait type manipulation shown for the sample in Appendix E that can not also be seen in its counterpart in Appendix B is that scores of seven and eight were circled for the sample in Appendix E.
Dependent Variables

All five romantic liking questions were those used by Sprecher (1986) except that an eight point scale was used rather than a seven point scale. Eight increments, rather than an odd number of increments, were used in measuring liking to prevent the possibility of subjects giving a completely neutral rating that was between liking and disliking. The five romantic liking questions were:

1. "If you were available, how desirable would this person be as a potential partner?" (1 = not at all desirable to 8 = very desirable).
2. "If you were available, how much would you want to date this person?" (1 = not at all to 8 = very much).
3. "In general, to what degree do you think you would be attracted to this person if you had a chance to meet him/her?" (1 = not at all to 8 = a great deal).
4. "All things considered, to what extent do you think you would have a satisfying relationship with this person?" (1 = not at all satisfying to 8 = very satisfying).
5. "Considering everything, do you want to go on a date with this person?" (1 = definitely no to 8 = definitely yes).

Two friendship liking scales were also included. They were created for the present study and were worded similarly to romantic liking so that they would appear to subjects to be part of the same scale:

1. "How desirable would this person be as a friend?" (1 = not at all desirable to 8 = very desirable).
2. "Is this the type of person that you could be 'friends for life' with?" (1 = definitely no to 8 = definitely yes).

**Design**

To systematically vary the presentation of independent variables in this study without overly burdening subjects with 16 sets of rating tasks, the overall 4 (M+, M-, F+, and F- trait type categories) X 2 (high vs low income) X 2 (high vs low occupational status) design was divided into six separate 2 (M+ vs F+, or one of six possible pairs of the four trait type categories) X 2 (high vs low income) X 2 (high vs low occupational status) within-subjects factorial designs with each subject rating 8 SPs. Thus, each participant rated two of the four gender types (M+, F+, M-, F-) combined with the four variations of income and occupational status (HIHS, HILS, LIHS, and LILS). Subjects were randomly assigned to one of the six designs which will henceforth be referred to by the SP trait type comparison involved: M+/F+, M+/F-, M-/F-, M-/F+, M+/M-, and F+/F-. Friendship and romantic liking scores were analyzed separately in each of the six designs.

**Materials and Procedure**

After reading and signing a consent form (see Appendix C), subjects were given a booklet. The trait type comparison involved in the booklet randomly assigned the subject to one of the six comparison groups mentioned earlier. When all subjects were seated and ready, they were asked to turn the booklet over. At this time the experimenter read the written instructions aloud to reduce the chance of misinterpretation of instructions that can occur in paper-and-pencil studies. The top page introduced the deception and gave detailed
instructions for the study. On the first page (see Appendix D) subjects were led to believe that the study was examining how singles meet and evaluate each other at social events. Rather than asking participants what traits they desired in a man, they were asked to indicate their attraction to various men. They were told that in a previous study five female subjects evaluated 50 target males after conversing individually with them for 20 to 30 minutes, that their booklet contains eight of these evaluations, and that each evaluation is of a different male, but that more than one of the evaluations may have been completed by the same female. This was done to justify to subjects any similarity of writing style they might have recognized. Subjects were asked to view these previous evaluations as being accurate, objective, and representative of how other women would respond and to base their own evaluations on those of the previous female rater. This was done so that subjects could both respect the competence and accuracy of the bogus previous female raters and accept the previous ratings but use their own judgments in rating the males. They were also verbally asked to form their own impressions of the male SPs before evaluating them. This instruction was added to lessen the likelihood that a subject would go beyond relating to the perspective of the bogus rater to the point of evaluating each SP based on whether or not she thought the (bogus) previous subject liked or disliked the male. Subjects were asked to keep in mind how they meet other singles, or if they were married, how they used to meet other singles, and to respond as a single female would as realistically, fully, and honestly as possible. Subjects were told that the second page showed a copy of the original form these (bogus) previous subjects used to
evaluated the male targets, and they were asked to turn to that page (see Appendix A).

Next, subjects were asked to examine pages three through 10. Subjects were told that pages three through 10 contained summaries of the evaluations of eight of the target males. These were actually randomly ordered bogus evaluations created by the experimenter as the manipulated IVs. On the left side was the completed bogus evaluation summary in which the IVs were manipulated. At the top of the page was the statement, “Based on your conversation with this person, rate him on the following measures.” The “Personality” heading was just below the statement. The same statement also appeared further down the page, above the “Background” heading.

Under the Personality heading were four traits that subjects were told were the highest scoring traits for that particular male of the original 32 traits on which he was rated. Subjects were told that the previous female raters explained their ratings in the comments section below each rating. Subjects were also told to regard items not included in any particular profile as traits that did not characterize that particular male, since those items scored in the medium to low range.

As discussed earlier, the success variables were manipulated in the fifth and sixth lines of the background section. The remainder of the items in this section were filler items. These filler items included the SP’s name, gender, county of residence, marital status, relationship status, openness towards entering a relationship; and a numbered item circled for reason enrolled in psychology. For the name, one of eight three-letter initials, supposedly hand-written by the previous female rater, but actually hand-written by the
investigator, was randomly assigned to each background profile, and no subject was exposed to the same initials on any other SP’s background profile. Initials rather than names were used because it was believed that many of the participants could have attributed to familiar named SPs characteristics that existed in a person they knew by that name but did not necessarily exist in the SP. Male was indicated for gender on all profiles. This item was included to remind subjects that all SPs were male and to add to the suggestion that the background section was a standardized and established survey questionnaire. County of residence, marital status, relationship status, openness towards entering a relationship were included to indicate that all SPs were single, available males from San Bernardino County who were open to a possible relationship. For the item indicating the SP’s reason for being enrolled in Psychology, two numbered reasons were listed: “Requirement (for General Ed or Degree)” or “For own knowledge (for career or daily life)”. However, for all SPs the number two was circled, indicating that the SP was taking Psychology only for their own knowledge. This item was included partly to add realism to the bogus previous study by implying that the SPs were recruited from psychology classes. It was anticipated that subjects might believe that laborers would be difficult to recruit for an experiment unless they were also in college. This item was also included so that subjects would be less likely to assume that SPs who were professionals were more educated than those who were laborers. A sample completed background section is shown in Appendix E.

On the instruction sheet, subjects were asked to take both the Personality and the Background into account. However, a verbal disclaimer was given before subjects began filling out the questionnaire that our intent was only to be
sure that they were aware of all of the information, and that it was not our intent to establish any S's criteria for her.

On the right side of pages three through 10 as shown in Appendix E were seven questions asking subjects to evaluate the male they had read about on the same page. These were actually the friendship and romantic liking scales mentioned earlier.

The last page provided space for subjects to freely give any written comments relating to the study (see Appendix F). This added depth to the study by collecting more descriptive information, served as an open-ended check on the clarity of the instructions or transparency of the deception, and gave subjects the opportunity to give additional information they may have felt was necessary to explain their responses. By doing this, subjects were given the opportunity for greater involvement and satisfaction with their participation in the experiment.

Finally, the experimenter asked subjects to turn in their booklet as soon as they were finished and not to discuss the contents of their own booklet or anyone else's booklet until they were outside the room or until everyone in the room was done with the experiment. Once the experimenter was finished explaining the instructions to the subjects, he asked the subjects to begin the experiment. Subjects worked at their own pace. In the laboratory setting, the experimenter then left the room and entered an adjacent room to observe subjects through a one-way mirror; in the classroom setting, he remained in the classroom, sitting on a chair at the front of the room, and made an effort to inconspicuously observe subjects while pretending to read from a clipboard, which held a stack of standardized debriefing sheets, concealed by other
sheets. All subjects were observed to work quietly and attentively on the booklet.

Although subjects participated in groups, they were debriefed according to when they finished, so those who did not finish at the same time as anyone else were debriefed individually. When subjects stood up to turn in their booklets, the experimenter met them at the front of the room, collected their booklets, verified that no relevant information was missing, and gave them standardized debriefing forms (see Appendix G). He then led them to an outside hallway, out of hearing distance of other subjects, and offered them the opportunity to ask any questions and express any concerns they may have had about the experiment. Once subjects were debriefed they were thanked for their participation.

The rank order data gathered by asking participants to list SPs in descending order of preference was discarded because it was only descriptive in nature and added nothing that was not already found by analyzing the ratings data.
RESULTS

Overview of Trait Type as an Overall Factor

Since the study was divided into the six comparison groups previously mentioned, predictions regarding trait type were tested using these comparison groups. The overall trait type factor involved the four gender role dimensions of Spence, Helmreich, and Holohan's (1979) EPAQ, M+, F+, M-, and F-. The two dimensions being compared defined each of six comparison groups and which trait type effect was being examined. In each trait type comparison two of these four dimensions were contrasted on valence (e.g. M+/M- or F+/F-), gender role (e.g. M+/F+ or M-/F-), or mixed trait type variables (e.g. M-/F+ or M+/F-). The present study was designed not to test interactions or additive effects between valence and gender role effects. Because the effect of the valence difference was expected to overwhelm the effect of the gender role difference in the mixed trait type comparisons, they were treated as valence comparisons, with the exception of brief descriptive commentary on the differences among the findings for pure valence comparison groups and for mixed trait type comparison groups. Significant trait type effects were found in all six comparison groups. Significant trait type effects in M+/F+ and M-/F- groups refer only to the significance of gender role effects, significant trait type effects in M+/M- and F+/F- groups refer only to the significance of valence effects, and significant trait type effects in the M+/F- and M-/F+ groups refer to both valence and gender role effects, although they will be treated mostly as valence effects.
Valence

H₁ was confirmed. Positive, desirable traits were found to be preferred over negative, undesirable traits for both friendship and romantic liking. Table 1 presents significant F values for the trait type X income X occupational status ANOVAs for romantic liking scores and Table 2 presents F values for those effects for friendship liking. These two tables show that very strong valence main effects were found for the M+/M- and F+/F- comparison groups, with their F values exceeding 200 for romantic liking and 100 for friendship liking.

The M+/F- and the M-/F+ comparison groups were included with the M+/M- and F+/F- comparison groups as valence comparisons to test H₁. Treating the mixed trait type main effects in the M+/F- and F+/M- comparison groups as valence effects, the F values for these effects were nearly as high as those in the nonconfounded groups, exceeding 100 for romantic liking and 60 for friendship liking.

Trait type effects for friendship and romantic liking were much stronger for both the confounded and the nonconfounded comparison groups than for the M+/F+ or the M-/F- comparison groups where valence was held constant. Table 3 presents the means and standard deviations of the significant trait type main effects for the four groups that involved valence comparisons. The pattern of these means shows that for both romantic and friendship liking, significant trait type effects for valence were in the predicted direction: positive traits were greatly favored over negative traits.

Gender Role

Table 1 and Table 2 also present F values for trait type effects in the M+/F+ and M-/F- groups. Significant trait type effects in the M+/F+ and M-/F-
Table 1

Analysis of Variance F Values for Trait Type X Income X Occupational Status for Romance Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>M+</th>
<th>M+</th>
<th>M-</th>
<th>M-</th>
<th>M+</th>
<th>F+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trait Type (A)</td>
<td>6.32*</td>
<td>106.51***</td>
<td>5.80*</td>
<td>132.67***</td>
<td>236.93***</td>
<td>413.48***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (B)</td>
<td>8.03*</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status (C)</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXB</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXC</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>12.49**</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BXC</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>9.75**</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXBXC</td>
<td>4.57*</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05  **p<.01  ***p<.001
Table 2

Analysis of Variance F Values for Gender Role X Income X Occupational Status for Friendship Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Trait Type (A)</th>
<th>Income (B)</th>
<th>Status (C)</th>
<th>AXB</th>
<th>AXC</th>
<th>BXC</th>
<th>AXBXC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M+</td>
<td>M+</td>
<td>M-</td>
<td>M-</td>
<td>M+</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>vs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F+</td>
<td>27.22***</td>
<td>67.57***</td>
<td>11.81**</td>
<td>204.73***</td>
<td>272.04***</td>
<td>185.72***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXB</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXC</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>5.62*</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BXC</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>11.26**</td>
<td>5.12*</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXBXC</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05  **p<.01  ***p<.001
Table 3
Means and Standard Deviations for Significant Trait Type Main Effects in the M+/F-, M-/F+, M+/M-, and F+/F- Groups for Romantic and Friendship Liking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Main Effect</th>
<th>Romantic</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Friendship</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M+/F-</td>
<td>Trait Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M+</td>
<td>5.631</td>
<td>2.068</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.625</td>
<td>2.246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>1.828</td>
<td>1.150</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.547</td>
<td>1.743</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-/F+</td>
<td>Trait Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M-</td>
<td>1.353</td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.445</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>6.027</td>
<td>1.742</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.844</td>
<td>1.586</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M+/M-</td>
<td>Trait Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M+</td>
<td>5.375</td>
<td>1.838</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.016</td>
<td>1.764</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M-</td>
<td>1.379</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.430</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F+/F-</td>
<td>Trait Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>6.843</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.453</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F-</td>
<td>1.788</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.492</td>
<td>1.628</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
comparison groups, indicating significant gender role effects, were found for both friendship and romantic liking. Table 4 presents the means and standard deviations of the significant main effects for the M+/F+ and M-/F- groups and reveals the direction of these effects. In the M+/F+ comparison group, male SPs with feminine positive traits received significantly higher romantic liking and friendship liking scores than did those with masculine positive traits. This indicated a reversal of the predicted effect in H2 that higher romantic liking scores would be given to masculine positive SPs than to feminine positive SPs. In the M-/F- comparison group, male SPs with feminine negative traits received significantly higher romantic liking scores than did those with masculine negative traits. This finding was a reversal of H3, which predicted that masculine negative SPs would receive higher romantic liking scores than feminine negative SPs. In the M+/F+ comparison group, male SPs with feminine positive traits received significantly higher friendship liking scores than those with masculine positive traits. This finding confirmed H4. In the M-/F- comparison group, male SPs with feminine negative traits received significantly higher friendship liking scores than did those with masculine negative traits. This finding confirmed H5.

Success

Predictions regarding success factors pertained to all comparison groups, since all participants experienced all levels of success. Income and occupational status were the two independent variables which composed the success factor. H6 received support in only one of six comparison groups. Table 1 presents F values for the income main effect in the M+/F+ group. Income was a factor only in romantic liking and only in the M+/F+ comparison
Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations for Trait Type and Income Main Effects in the M+/F+ Group and for the Trait Type Main Effect in the M-/F- Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Main Effect</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M+/F+</td>
<td>Trait Type (A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M+</td>
<td>4.934</td>
<td>1.700</td>
<td>5.305</td>
<td>1.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>6.003</td>
<td>1.533</td>
<td>7.156</td>
<td>1.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Income (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>5.942</td>
<td>1.515</td>
<td>6.454@</td>
<td>1.293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4.997</td>
<td>1.719</td>
<td>6.008@</td>
<td>1.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-/F-</td>
<td>Trait Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M-</td>
<td>1.503</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td>1.766</td>
<td>0.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F-</td>
<td>2.131</td>
<td>1.340</td>
<td>3.086</td>
<td>1.964</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

@ effect was N/S for these means
group. Table 4 presents the means and standard deviations of the significant main effects for the M+/F+ group. High income SPs with positive masculine and feminine traits received significantly higher romantic liking scores than low income SPs. The results for occupational status failed to confirm H7. Table 1 and Table 2 reveal that occupational status was not found to be a factor in romantic liking in any of the six comparison groups. As expected for H8, no significant income or occupational status main effects were found for friendship liking.

Interactions

No interactions were expected but six were found. Although occupational status was not a significant main effect in any part of the present study, it was the only factor that was involved in all six interactions and was a significant simple effect in many of these interactions. The F values of three of the six interactions are presented in Table 1 for romantic liking and the F values of the other three interactions are presented in Table 2 for friendship liking.

Table 1 reveals that a trait type (gender role) X income X occupational status interaction was found in the M+/F+ comparison group for romantic liking scores. The means and standard deviations related to this interaction are presented in Table 5. As reported earlier, significant gender role and income main effects were found, but no occupational status main effect was found. The only important deviation from this pattern can be seen in the change in romantic liking means across changing occupational status within the low income condition. To examine occupational status simple effects, comparisons between high income, high occupational status (HIHS) and high income, low occupational status (HILS) conditions and between low income, high
Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations for the Significant Trait Type X Income X Occupational Status Interaction in the M+/F+ Group for Romantic Liking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M+, High Income, High Occupational Status</td>
<td>5.413</td>
<td>1.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M+, High Income, Low Occupational Status</td>
<td>5.350</td>
<td>1.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M+, Low Income, High Occupational Status</td>
<td>3.862</td>
<td>1.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M+, Low Income, Low Occupational Status</td>
<td>5.112</td>
<td>1.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F+, High Income, High Occupational Status</td>
<td>6.313</td>
<td>1.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F+, High Income, Low Occupational Status</td>
<td>6.688</td>
<td>1.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F+, Low Income, High Occupational Status</td>
<td>5.600</td>
<td>1.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F+, Low Income, Low Occupational Status</td>
<td>5.412</td>
<td>1.594</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
occupational status (LIHS) and low income, low occupational status (LILS) conditions were conducted for M+ and for F+ using Fisher's protected t-tests (see Howell, 1987). An additional Fisher's protected t-test comparison between M+ and F+ in the LILS success conditions was also conducted. The increase in romantic liking from LIHS to LILS for M+ males produced a significant simple occupational status effect, \( t(15) = 2.85, p < .05 \). No other simple occupational status effects were found, \( ps > .05 \). The sharp increase from LIHS to LILS elevated romantic liking for M+ males to a level comparable to that of F+ males in the LILS success condition, and no significant difference in romantic liking was found between M+ and F+ males with low income and low occupational status.

Table 1 and Table 2 also reveal that significant trait type (valence) X occupational status interaction were found in the M-/F+ comparison group for romantic and friendship liking, respectively. Table 6 presents the means and standard deviations for both interactions. Fisher's protected t-test comparisons between the low occupational status and high occupational status conditions for M- and F+ males were conducted for friendship and romantic liking means.

High occupational status F+ males scored significantly higher than low occupational status F+ on the romantic liking scale, \( t(15) = 2.325, p < .05 \) and marginally higher on the friendship liking scale, \( t(15) = 1.702, p < .06 \), but no significant difference was found between low occupational status M- males and high occupational status M- males for friendship or romantic liking, \( p > .05 \).

Table 1 and Table 2 also show income X occupational status interactions in the M-/F+ comparison group of for friendship and romantic liking and in the M+/M- comparison group for friendship liking only. Means and standard deviations
Table 6
Means and Standard Deviations for Interactions Between Trait Type and Occupational Status in the M-/F+ Group and Between Income and Occupational Status in the M-/F+ and the M+/M- Groups

| Interaction                      | Romantic |  |  | Friendship |  |  |
|----------------------------------|----------|  |  |           |  |  |
|                                  | M        | SD | M        | SD |
| Trait Type X Status for M-/F+ group |          |  |  |           |  |  |
| M-, High Status                  | 1.200    | 0.264 | 1.360   | 0.604 |
| M-, Low Status                   | 1.506    | 0.757 | 1.531   | 0.859 |
| F+, High Status                  | 6.500    | 1.560 | 7.063   | 1.336 |
| F+, Low Status                   | 5.913    | 1.925 | 6.625   | 1.837 |
| Income X Status for M-/F+ group |          |  |  |           |  |  |
| High Income, High Status         | 3.825    | 0.941 | 4.125   | 1.085 |
| High Income, Low Status          | 4.025    | 1.561 | 4.313   | 1.629 |
| Low Income, High Status          | 3.875    | 0.882 | 4.297   | 0.854 |
| Low Income, Low Status           | 3.394    | 1.120 | 3.844   | 1.067 |
| Income X Status from M+/M- group |          |  |  |           |  |  |
| High Income, High Status         | 3.482@   | 1.133 | 3.719   | 1.358 |
| High Income, Low Status          | 3.707@   | 1.594 | 4.129   | 1.443 |
| Low Income, High Status          | 3.357@   | 1.199 | 3.625   | 1.211 |
| Low Income, Low Status           | 2.918@   | 1.233 | 3.328   | 1.237 |

@ effect was N/S for these means
related to these interactions are shown in Table 6. The patterns of the three income X occupational status interactions in the M-/F+ and M+/M- comparison groups were similar to each other in that the greatest differences in liking means were in the low occupational status condition, where high income SPs were favored over low income SPs. Fisher’s protected t-test comparisons revealed significant income simple effects in the low occupational status condition for friendship liking, \( t(15) = 2.46, p < .05 \), and romantic liking, \( t(15) = 2.90, p < .05 \), in the M-/F+ comparison group; and for friendship liking in the M+/M- comparison group, \( t(15) = 2.28, p < .05 \). No simple income effects were found in the high occupational status condition for any of these three interactions. There was another similarity among the three income X occupational status interactions. From the high occupational status to the low occupational status success conditions, liking scores increased for high income SPs but decreased for low income SPs in each of these interactions. Significant occupational status simple effects were found for low income SPs for romantic liking, \( t(15) = 2.21, p < .05 \) and friendship liking, \( t(15) = 2.38, p < .05 \), in the M-/F+ comparison group. However, Fisher’s protected t-test comparisons revealed no significant simple occupational status effects in the M+/M- comparison group, \( p > .05 \). Furthermore, no simple occupational status effect was found in high income SPs in the M-/F+ comparison group for friendship or romantic liking income X occupational status interactions, \( p > .05 \).

**Distinguishing Mixed Trait Type from Valence Trait Type Comparisons**

Although the M+/F- and the M-/F+ comparison groups were included with the M+/M- and F+/F- comparison groups as valence comparisons in testing H1, both valence and gender role effects were involved in the M+/F- and the M-/F+
comparison groups. As stated earlier, all four comparison groups supported 
H1. However, there were some minor differences in the findings among the 
comparison groups. First, the comparison groups involving only the valence 
factor had noticeably higher F values for romantic liking than did comparison 
groups involving both valence and gender role factors, as is shown in Table 1, 
although this is not the case for friendship liking in Table 2. Secondly, 
comparison groups involving both valence and gender role yielded more 
interactions than those involving only the valence factor. In the M-/F+ 
comparison group, trait type X occupational status and income X occupational 
status interactions were found for both romantic and friendship liking; whereas 
in the M+/M- comparison group, only an income X occupational status 
interaction was found for romantic liking.

Friendship versus Romantic Liking

Table 7 presents F values, means, and standard deviations for post-hoc 
analyses of variance for type of liking scale as a factor on the magnitude of 
liking scores for each trait type in each comparison group. Type of Liking X 
Income X Occupational Status analyses of variance were conducted separately 
for each Trait Type within each comparison group. In nine of 12 comparisons, 
friendship rated significantly higher than romantic liking. Significant type of 
liking effects were found for all F+ and F- SPs, regardless of which comparison 
group they appeared in. Examination of the means and standard deviations 
reveals that in each of these significant effects, friendship liking scored higher 
than romantic liking. This finding supported H10. However, the findings did not 
support H9, which predicted higher scores for romantic than friendship liking for 
M+ and M- males. Also, the type of liking effect did not appear as often for M+
Table 7

F Values, Means, and Standard Deviations of Type of Liking Main Effects in
Post-Hoc Type of Liking X Income X Occupational Status Analyses of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait Type</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Type of Liking</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Romantic Liking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M+</td>
<td>M+/F+</td>
<td>9.65**</td>
<td>4.934</td>
<td>1.700</td>
<td>5.305</td>
<td>1.821</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M+/F-</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>5.631</td>
<td>2.068</td>
<td>5.625</td>
<td>2.246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M+/M-</td>
<td>19.25***</td>
<td>5.375</td>
<td>1.838</td>
<td>6.016</td>
<td>1.764</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F+</td>
<td>M+/F+</td>
<td>28.45***</td>
<td>6.003</td>
<td>1.533</td>
<td>7.156</td>
<td>1.090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M-/F+</td>
<td>31.29***</td>
<td>6.027</td>
<td>1.742</td>
<td>6.844</td>
<td>1.572</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F+/F-</td>
<td>23.81***</td>
<td>6.843</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td>7.453</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-</td>
<td>M-/F+</td>
<td>17.12***</td>
<td>1.503</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td>1.766</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M-/F-</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>1.353</td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td>1.445</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M+/M-</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>1.379</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>1.430</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-</td>
<td>M+/F-</td>
<td>20.93***</td>
<td>2.131</td>
<td>1.340</td>
<td>3.086</td>
<td>1.964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M-/F-</td>
<td>19.36***</td>
<td>1.848</td>
<td>1.486</td>
<td>2.547</td>
<td>1.743</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F+/F-</td>
<td>10.38**</td>
<td>1.788</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>2.492</td>
<td>1.628</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001
and M- SPs. Significant type of liking effects were found for M+ in the M+/F+ and in the M+/M- comparison groups but not in the M+/F- comparison group. For M-, a significant type of liking effect appeared only in the M-/F+ comparison group and not in the M-/F- or the M+/M- comparison groups. Also, in contrast to the effects predicted by H9, the means and standard deviations of friendship and romantic liking in the M+/M- comparison group reveal that friendship liking scored higher than romantic liking.
DISCUSSION

To summarize the overall results, significant trait type main effects were found for both friendship and romantic liking in all six comparison groups. Although some of these were reversals of predicted hypotheses, nearly all trait type main effects had much greater F values than was found in the singular occurrence of income as a main effect in the M+/F+ comparison group. The weakest trait type main effects were those that compared positive masculine to positive feminine SPs and negative masculine to negative feminine SPs. Six unexpected interactions were found, all of which involved occupational status. Finally, males of every trait type in all six comparison groups were rated higher on the friendship liking than the romantic liking scale.

Though not all of the predicted effects were confirmed, the relative strength of each effect was in the predicted order and will be discussed in that order. The most obvious prediction that males with positive traits would be liked more on friendship and romantic scales than males with negative traits was confirmed. Since EPAQ positive traits have been shown to be more socially desirable than negative traits (Spence, Helmreich, & Holohan, 1979), it is not surprising that the valence main effects dominated all other main effects in these groups, and were even far more powerful than the gender role main effects. In retrospect, it was not necessary to compare positive traits to negative traits, because it is obvious that positive traits are far more desirable than negative traits. However, despite what seemed intuitively obvious, these
comparisons nevertheless were made because no direct empirical evidence could be found that such comparisons would be unnecessary.

When comparing two sets of traits in which valence was held constant, feminine SPs were preferred as friends over masculine SPs, as predicted. However, the reversal of the predicted effect for romantic liking was found. Feminine SPs were preferred as dating partners over masculine SPs. Masculine traits consistently received higher romantic liking scores than feminine traits only when they were positive traits and were being compared to negative traits, and feminine traits were less preferred than masculine traits on either liking scale only when they were negative traits and were compared to positive traits. Despite this reversal of the two predicted effects for romantic liking, gender role as a whole was a consistently strong effect in both friendship and romantic liking for all six comparison groups.

The most obvious conclusion for gender role traits is that women are more attracted to men with feminine traits than men with masculine traits. Perhaps feminine traits are more important to women than masculine traits for male relationship partners as well as friends. Since feminine traits are more oriented towards relationships, it is not surprising that participants indicated that males with feminine traits would make better friends than males with masculine traits. However, for romantic relationships, it was believed that traditional female role expectations to desire instrumental, masculine characteristics in men would outweigh the relationship-orientation appeal of emotionally expressive men, so that masculine men would be preferred as dates. Instead, women liked feminine males more than masculine males both as friends and as dating partners, and friendship liking scores were consistently higher than
romantic liking scores for all SPs, regardless of their gender role traits. The negative feminine males were expected to be the least romantically liked males, but they were found to be preferred over the negative masculine males.

Evidence by Buss (1989) suggests a possible explanation for the preference of negative feminine males over negative masculine males. Some of the behaviors Buss (1989) found to elicit anger and upset in relationships related to some of the traits in the negative masculinity scale of the EPAQ. Buss’ self-centeredness, abusiveness, and condescending behavior relate to behavioral descriptions of SPs in the present study with these EPAQ traits: “only looks out for self,” “egocentric,” “arrogant,” and “hostile.” However, no such counterpart for EPAQ negative femininity exists in Buss’ list of behaviors. If SPs with EPAQ negative masculine traits and related behaviors elicited more anger and upset in participants than SPs with EPAQ negative feminine traits and related behaviors, perhaps this could have created a negative halo effect for some of the participants in the present study, causing them to completely devalue negative masculine SPs because of the anger they may have felt when reading about these SPs. It is possible that some of the negative masculine EPAQ traits are more extreme examples of negative masculinity than the negative feminine traits are of negative femininity.

Income and occupational status were not predicted to be factors in friendship liking, and no income or occupational status main effects were found for friendship liking. Although occupational status was not found to be a factor in any of the six comparison groups, the predicted effect of greater romantic liking for SPs with high income than those with low income was confirmed in the M+/F+ comparison group. This isolated income main effect was as powerful as
the trait type (gender role) main effect in the same comparison group. However, in any group comparing positive traits to negative traits, the trait type (valence) main effect was overwhelmingly more powerful than the income or status factors. Thus, in these cases, these very powerful main effects may have enveloped much of the variance, leaving little for weaker factors. However, in the two groups in which valence was held constant, the gender role main effects were not overwhelming. It was in these two comparison groups that hypotheses for income and occupational status main effects had the best chance of being confirmed. Only in one of these two groups, the M+ versus F+ group, was income found to be a factor, and occupational status alone was not found to be a factor for either type of liking in any comparison group. It may be that income does not become a criterion for women in evaluating men unless personality criteria are satisfied. Income may be irrelevant to women in a man who has generally negative traits. This may explain the finding of an income main effect in the M+/F+ comparison group but not in the M-/F- comparison group. SPs in the M-/F- comparison group may have been so thoroughly disliked that it did not matter to the participants how much money these SPs made or what their occupational status was. Many participants in this group reported on the comments page or during debriefing that it was difficult to choose among the SPs because they were all undesirable (see Appendix F). Perhaps subjects were not affected by the success levels of negative SPs. Perhaps what mattered more to the participants in the M-/F- group was that the negative feminine males were not as undesirable or offensive as the negative masculine males. On the other hand, it is also possible that women usually take income into account, except for men with undesirable personality traits. Income level
may be an irrelevant criterion for undesirable men because most women may reject these men completely. Since all traits in the present study were either desirable or undesirable, there were not enough levels of desirability to pinpoint the emergence of income as a factor in romantic liking. This could be a useful project for future research.

Findings by Townsend (1990) suggest that another possible explanation for these findings is that the participants were responding genuinely for their choices of friends and dating partners, but for possible marriage or sexual partners, income and occupational status would be crucial criteria. Also, in his study, income and occupational status were grouped together under the term "status," in which the level of income was matched with a specific occupation having an equivalent level of status. This may have provided more discrete levels of success than in the present study, in which income and occupational status were separate IVs. Perhaps these variables are highly correlated and should not have been separated. Additionally, language used on dependent measures in Townsend and Levy's (1990) study was clearly delineating different levels of involvement and included the greater involvement of marriage; whereas in the present study, which used Sprecher's (1986) measures, marriage potential was not included and the language in these measures may not have made very clear distinctions among levels of involvement, which may explain the high correlation and lack of separate factors that Sprecher found among her five attraction measures. Finally, Townsend found that success level became more important to female subjects when male SPs' physical attractiveness was ranked in the high or in the medium-low range. Although SPs in the present study were presented as
being equally physically attractive, some subjects may have imagined all SPs to be very attractive and others may have imagined them to be less attractive, which may have introduced an additional source of variance. Also, many subjects may have found the lack of specific physical attractiveness information to be a conservative influence on their judgments, so that only the most obvious factors would affect their ratings. In retrospect, had we foreseen this possibility, we could have attempted to reduce such variance while enhancing the effects for income and occupational status by stating that all SPs were highly physically attractive. Future relationship studies should separate dating attraction from marriage potential attraction as Townsend and Levy (1990) did.

If women take income into consideration only with men who have positive personality traits, perhaps even more specific circumstances are required for women to take a weak factor such as occupational status into account. Since occupational status was involved in all six of the interactions found, it is possible that these interactions represent specific circumstances in which occupational status was a reliable factor in attraction.

For the trait type (mixed comparison) X occupational status interaction for romantic and friendship liking in the M-/F+ comparison group, occupational status was a factor on attraction for F+ males, but not for M- males. Women were more attracted to F+ males with high occupational status than they were to F+ males with low occupational status, and only when they were compared to negative masculine males. Recall in the M+/F+ group that expressive traits tended to be more important to women than instrumental traits. Perhaps high occupational status is only important in romantic liking when both positive and
expressive personality trait criteria have been met, and when men meeting both criteria are compared to those meeting neither criterion.

The existence of simple occupational status effects is also important in explaining the income X occupational status interactions in the M-/F+ comparison group. On both friendship and romantic liking scales in the M-/F+ comparison group, income was a factor only for low occupational status SPs and occupational status was a factor only for low income SPs, suggesting that high income compensates for low occupational status, and high occupational status compensates for low income. Perhaps subjects had less respect for males who had not achieved at least one aspect of success. However, this explanation may not readily apply to the M+/M- comparison group because, although an income simple effect was found, no occupational status simple effect was found.

Strangely, occupational status seemed to have the opposite effect on the desirability of low income M+ males in the M+/F+ comparison group than on low income males in the M-/F+ comparison group. Although gender role was a main effect, an unexpected increase in romantic liking of M+ males from LIHS to LILS produced comparable romantic liking scores for M+ and F+ males in the LILS success condition. This similarity in romantic liking scores in LILS suggests that whether a man's positive traits are instrumental or expressive may be irrelevant to women if he has a low income, low occupational status career.

Although income and occupational status only seemed to emerge as factors under specific conditions, type of liking was one of the most consistent findings of the present study. Males of all trait type in all comparison groups were liked more as friends than dating partners. Friendship liking was only
predicted to score higher than romantic liking for positive and negative feminine SPs, regardless of income or occupational status. Romantic liking was predicted to score higher than friendship liking for positive and negative masculine SPs. However, in all levels of gender role in all six groups, friendship liking scored higher than romantic liking, regardless of income and occupational status. There are a number of possible explanations for the finding of greater liking scores for friendship than romantic liking. One is that it reflects a general caution in women towards men that they do not know yet. An acquaintance or superficial friendship may be seen as less intimate and thus "safer" than dating. According to Hendrick & Hendrick (1986), women's approach to relationships is more pragmatic than that of men. A similar explanation is that the subjects may not have been given enough information, particularly about the attractiveness of the males, to be able to feel romantic attraction or speculate about how much romantic attraction they would feel for the SPs in a real-life encounter, so they tended to favor friendship. Another possible interpretation is that the characteristics portrayed were more conducive to friendship attraction than romantic attraction, although this seems unlikely. However, there are two explanations with greater implications for understanding female responses to relationships. One is that women may want their partners to be friends more than lovers. However, this may be a socially desirable rather than a genuine response. Women may view the ideal man as having the same traits that a good friend would have, but in daily life may distinguish between the more rugged, masculine man, whom they would find more appealing, and the more expressive, feminine man, whom they would find too nice or too "soft" (quotes from a participant's comments, see Appendix F) to
be anything more than a friend. If participants were aware of the variables being manipulated, the stimulus males may have been viewed as ideal constructs rather than as real people, and they may have responded ideally, in terms of social desirability, rather than realistically.

One disadvantage of using a within-subjects design in this type of study may be that when IVs are manipulated, subjects might detect a pattern in which items change and which remain constant, and could then correctly guess what the IVs are, and could thus be biased by social desirability in their responses. The present study, with its six separate within-subjects comparison groups, may have been fully vulnerable to these pattern-recognition cues and social desirability effects.

Perhaps a better alternative would be a between-subjects design. The pattern recognition cues mentioned earlier could be eliminated in a well-executed between-subjects design such as Sprecher's (1986), in which only one level of each IV was presented along with a number of neutral, constant items, to any given subject. Subjects would not know which items were changing and which stayed constant because they would not see more than one level of the IV. Thus, this design could eliminating pattern-recognition cues and reducing social desirability attributable to knowledge of IVs.

Why would social desirability affect the ratings of male SPs if research participants recognized that this study examined male gender role factors? Jean & Reynolds (1984) concluded that survey-type studies on gender roles are vulnerable to the effects of social desirability and suggested that in these studies, liberal rather than conservative attitudes are socially desirable. To minimize social desirability bias the purpose of the study was disguised to
participants. It was thought that if participants did not know the purpose of the study, they would be less likely to respond exclusively to the social desirability of SPs. Next, we asked participants to respond fully and honestly. Finally, rather than asking participants what traits they desired in a man, we asked them to indicate their attraction to various men. By examining attraction responses in women to male SPs rather than women's self-report idealizations of the desirable man, it was believed that a more genuine level of participant responding would be elicited, rather than a socially desirable response. Self-report responses were used only for participant commentary to the present study. Excerpts from this data were referred to in this discussion (see Appendix F), but the descriptive nature of the data did not lend itself to statistical analysis.

In theory, the present study was a dating simulation, but in retrospect, it seems likely that in practice this paper-and-pencil study was more like a survey or questionnaire than a dating simulation. We asked subjects to rate eight males, each with an obviously discrete set of characteristics, on liking measures. This may not have been effective in creating a dating simulation and was probably more similar to a self-report survey indirectly measuring male gender role attitudes in women. Efforts were made to ensure realism in presenting SPs in terms of ratings made by subjects from a previous study, and most of the participants in the present study who volunteered additional comments during debriefing said that they believed that the stimulus males were real. Efforts were also made to ensure realism in participant responses by asking them to respond as they would in real-life when rating the desirability of the SPs described to them. However, despite these efforts at realism,
participants may have seen that there was a pattern among these males and thus may have suspected that this study was examining gender roles. With that suspicion, participants may have chosen to give a socially desirable response (preferring the "sensitive" male) rather than what they truly preferred (possibly the "strong" male). Jean and Reynolds, (1984, p. 813) suggested that, "The ability to manipulate gender role concepts to intentionally present the self in a liberal manner, regardless of actual feelings, may be a useful measure of awareness and integration of feminist attitudes." This ability may also be an indication of the social desirability for college women of displaying somewhat liberal, feminist attitudes. It is possible that a modern social desirability bias may be towards liberal feminist attitudes, or at least away from conservative, traditional attitudes. The reason that subject responses in the present study may have been biased by this type of social desirability is that the approval of sensitivity in men may be interpreted by many as a position reflecting liberal gender role attitudes. For example, one woman in the M-/F+ comparison group rated the feminine positive males far more favorably on both friendship and romantic measures, but on the comments page wrote, "Although the men I ranked highest had qualities that are important to me in a relationship, I am often disinterested in men that are 'too nice' and show extreme interest in others (or in me), although those are usually the type I choose as friends. I usually choose relationships that end up disastrous" (see Appendix F). During debriefing, she explained that she is usually attracted to the "bad boy" type of male, similar to some of the negative masculine males portrayed in the present study.
The success factors may have been even easier for subjects to identify. Out of four possible ranges of income, all SPs fell into either the highest or the lowest, and either the highest or lowest of three possible status categories. This pattern may have been more easily recognized than the personality trait patterns because it could be seen at a glance rather than only upon careful reading because it would only involve checking which one of three numbers for status and one of four numbers for income were circled. Furthermore, on the comments page, several participants went out of their way to point out that they were not motivated by money or job status in choosing their relationship (see Appendix F). Whether this was a denial or an affirmation of the truth about their choices, it seems obvious that subjects making such statements were aware that these were IVs in the experiment and it thus seems likely that this may have been the case for many other subjects. Knowing that we were examining the importance of income and status in dating, subjects may have chosen to portray themselves as having very little interest in how much money a man made or what the status of his career was.

Because of the emergence of more liberal gender role attitudes in mainstream American society, differences in gender role assignment of men and women may be more difficult for many people to justify today than 30 years ago. However, different gender roles still exist for men and women, even today. If these differences are more difficult to justify, they may only be obvious among people who openly display a strong belief in very traditional gender role attitudes. For mainstream society, however, gender role differences have become more subtle. This may especially be the case for the personality traits and behaviors that people say they look for in a romantic partner. In his study of
mate attraction tactics, Buss (1988) listed 20 behaviors that participants judged to be most effective for men in attracting women and 20 that participants judged to be most effective for women in attracting men. Most of these behaviors appeared for both men and women.

No longer do most people tend to blatantly express different expectations for men and women or openly express preferences for gender-typed behavior or personality traits. Modern gender role research must carefully examine more subtle gender role differences. In order to do that, reliable but subtle gender role stimuli must be used to tease out subtle gender role expectations. For example, masculinity and femininity can be examined in terms of physical characteristics of SPs, such as voice, height, and muscular build; masculine and feminine personalities of SPs can be portrayed behaviorally to subjects without naming the particular personality traits involved; and the success level of SPs can be implied by their expressed attitudes, style of dress, and by mentioning the SPs career occupation. Gender roles will probably be increasingly difficult to examine effectively with only paper-and-pencil measures of responses to written descriptions of SPs. Future gender role research may need to rely more on role-playing SPs to examine the more subtle gender role differences between men and women.

The purpose in doing the present study was to examine women’s role in maintaining the male gender role. The socialization process of forming and maintaining the gender roles, combined with the symbiotic nature of male and female gender roles, suggests that one important factor in the persistence of the male gender role through more than a generation of feminism is women’s reinforcement of the male gender role. This may not necessarily be the
strongest factor and it is most certainly not the only factor in maintaining the male gender role. Society as a whole reinforces the male gender role. Womanhood may not be responsible for the present or future state of the male gender role; however, the choices that people make are a more meaningful statement of their values than the idealized responses they tend to give in opinion polls and surveys. Warren Farrell (1986) points out that women continue to be socialized to “fall in love within a framework” (pp. 40-43, 46-47, 62) of male success or status and socialized toward “hero selection” (p. 42) of ideal potential husbands. He cites examples of columns in popular women’s magazines that instruct women on how to make men commit to them, or make men become more sensitive, or encourage women not to settle for anything less than a man who is successful, confident, intelligent, romantic, handsome, and sensitive. Farrell encourages women who are dissatisfied with their relationships with financially successful, but insensitive, unaffectionate men to re-examine their desire to expect their partners to become more sensitive and affectionate and to instead choose men who already have these qualities, whether or not these men are financially successful. We believe that inherent in genuinely making that choice is an awareness in women of the relative importance of masculinity and success versus sensitivity and the capacity for emotional involvement in a male relationship partner; as well as an openness to interacting with sensitive men who may not necessarily also be highly masculine and successful. The results of the present study suggest that women may be beginning to choose more sensitive men, and it is hoped that this is the case.
Although women's choices can be important, men's choices can be far more important in changing the male gender role. Why should men change? Certainly, there are excellent reasons for a man to change. One may be to improve his physical health. In coronary disease, for example, the link between high positive masculinity and Type A behavior (Auten, Hull, & Hull, 1985; Grimm & Yarnold, 1985; Stevens, Pfost, Ackerman, 1984) and effect negative masculinity has on heart attack severity (Helgeson, 1990) and subsequent recovery (Helgeson, 1991). The Berkeley Men's Center Manifesto (referred to in Lewis, 1978) offers other reasons for men to change: "We, as men, want to take back our full humanity. We want to relate to both women and men in more human ways, with warmth, sensitivity, emotion, and honesty. We want to share our feelings with one another to break down the walls and grow closer. We want to be equal with women and end destructive, competitive relationships between men. We are oppressed by this dependence on women for support, nurturing, love, and warm feelings. We want to love, nurture, and support ourselves and other men, as well as women. We want men to share their lives and experiences with each other in order to understand who we are, how we got this way, and what we must do to be free."

Although how women respond to men can play a large part in changing or maintaining the male gender role, it should not be this way. Should men change? This is a personal decision for individual men to make, and should not be done solely to appeal more to women.

Fortunately, emotional expressiveness in men is no longer strictly prohibited in today's society. According to Pleck (1981), in place of the traditional male gender role, a modern male gender role is beginning to
emerge. The traditional role emphasized physical strength, aggression, and a
detachment from women. The only acceptable emotion for men was anger and
only men were allowed sexual freedom. Validation of masculinity came from
other men. The modern role emphasizes financial success, status, and power.
Uncontrolled anger is undesirable. Sensitivity and emotional expressiveness
are desirable, but only with women, who provide men with the only acceptable
source of emotional supportiveness and whose sexual satisfaction validates
their masculinity. Although the modern male gender role may be an alternative
to the traditional male gender role, it is still a gender role, and gender roles are
contradictory, inconsistent, and psychologically dysfunctional by nature,
according to Pleck's (1981) Sex Role Strain paradigm. This more androgynous
modern male is not necessarily more liberated or more favorable for men.
Many men who examine the added requirements and responsibilities of the
modern male gender role may feel that it is not so much more flexible as it is
more demanding than the traditional male role, especially in relationships. The
key difference may be in locus of control. Males might be better off to become
more liberated for their own benefit, not because they feel it is expected of them.
According to Farrell (1986), men lose respect in the eyes of women when they
“walk on eggshells” trying to become more sensitive just to please their partner.

Gender role research examining subject responses to manipulated
gender role variables in SPs often finds that the changing of each gender’s role
has implications for the other gender’s role. However, each gender must take
responsibility for its own transformation in gender role behavior and attitudes. If
a man becomes less gender-typed, it should be because he wants this for
himself, not to please women.
### APPENDIX A: Bogus "Original Rating Form"

**BASED ON YOUR CONVERSATION WITH THIS PERSON, RATE HIM OR HER ON THE FOLLOWING MEASURES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Respectful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Agreeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Ambitious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Caring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Professional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BACKGROUND**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (Initials):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of residence:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason that this person is enrolled in Psychology:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement (for General Ed or Degree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicate this person's occupational area:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicate the range of this person's yearly Income:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If unmarried, is this person currently involved in a committed relationship?:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would this Person be open to a possible relationship if the right was met?:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: Trait Type Manipulation of Stimulus Male Profiles

### All M+ Personality Profiles

#### BASED ON YOUR CONVERSATION WITH THIS PERSON, RATE HIM OR HER ON THE FOLLOWING MEASURES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONALITY</th>
<th>PERSONALITY</th>
<th>PERSONALITY</th>
<th>PERSONALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gives Up</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unambitious</td>
<td>Unambitious</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Unambitious</td>
<td>Unambitious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments: He said, &quot;I hate to lose.&quot;</td>
<td>Comments: He spoke in a voice that was firm, but relaxed. His posture and other body language was consistent with this. For example, he did not twitch or show other signs of being nervous, but his shoulders did not slump down either, so he was not overly relaxed or depressed either.</td>
<td>Comments: He seems self-reliant, He said that he bases his decisions on his own values, not on other people's opinions. He seems to be very clear on what his values and beliefs are.</td>
<td>Comments: He seemed like someone who can get things done for himself. He said that he doesn't ask other people to solve life's problems for him.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### BASED ON YOUR CONVERSATION WITH THIS PERSON, RATE HIM OR HER ON THE FOLLOWING MEASURES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONALITY</th>
<th>PERSONALITY</th>
<th>PERSONALITY</th>
<th>PERSONALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Falls</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stands Up</td>
<td>Stands Up</td>
<td>Stands Up</td>
<td>Stands Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments: He never stops and relaxes. He was never nervous, but his shoulders did not slump down either, so he was not overly relaxed or depressed either.</td>
<td>Comments: He seemed like someone who can get things done for himself. He said that he doesn't ask other people to solve life's problems for him.</td>
<td>Comments: He seemed like someone who can get things done for himself. He said that he doesn't ask other people to solve life's problems for him.</td>
<td>Comments: He seemed like someone who can get things done for himself. He said that he doesn't ask other people to solve life's problems for him.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### BASED ON YOUR CONVERSATION WITH THIS PERSON, RATE HIM OR HER ON THE FOLLOWING MEASURES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONALITY</th>
<th>PERSONALITY</th>
<th>PERSONALITY</th>
<th>PERSONALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lazy</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments: He described his life events in terms of what he did, not in terms what happened to him. He seemed to speak from an active, rather than a passive, perspective.</td>
<td>Comments: He seemed like someone who can get things done for himself. He said that he doesn't ask other people to solve life's problems for him.</td>
<td>Comments: He seemed like someone who can get things done for himself. He said that he doesn't ask other people to solve life's problems for him.</td>
<td>Comments: He seemed like someone who can get things done for himself. He said that he doesn't ask other people to solve life's problems for him.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All F+ Personality Profiles

Based on your conversation with this person, rate him or her on the following measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONALITY</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Unemotional</strong></td>
<td>He used his hands to express himself while he spoke. He has a very expressive face, because I think I could tell what he was feeling at any given moment when we talked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Emotional</strong></td>
<td>When we talked about communication, he said that many people, especially his friends, have told him that he is a good listener and is sensitive to their feelings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Inensitive</strong></td>
<td>He told me that he has done volunteer work for years, helping disabled children and adults. He said that there were times when this volunteer work interfered with another job (a paying job) and with his social life. &quot;But, those people,&quot; he said, referring to those he helped, &quot;were more important to me than that other job or a few nights out.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Aware</strong></td>
<td>Soft-spoken man. Also, he closed the office door and laid his backpack down very gently when the experiment began.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Rough</strong></td>
<td>He said that when he is disappointed by someone, he tries to still accept that person and have empathy for that person. He told me that women often say to him, &quot;Thank you for being so understanding.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Gentle</strong></td>
<td>Seemed like a very calm and patient person. He seems mild mannered in that he does not seem intentionally offend anyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Indifferent</strong></td>
<td>He smiles a lot when we talked. He said he enjoys making people smile and feel good about themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Understanding</strong></td>
<td>Seems like a very warm in relations with others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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All M-Personality Profiles

BASED ON YOUR CONVERSATION WITH THIS PERSON, RATE HIM OR HER ON THE FOLLOWING MEASURES.

PERSONALITY

Very Very Humble
Denying
Comments: He often talked as if he was more important than anyone else around him.

Very Very Optimistic
Comments: "Life is about three things: survival, power, and pleasure," he said, and he added, "Love? Happiness? Peace? Give me a break! Those are modern myths!"

Very Very Bashful
Comments: He seemed to intentionally project a sense of superiority over others. His head was tilted back slightly, and he looked downward at me when he spoke, as if I was 2 feet shorter than him (which I wasn't).
All F- Personality Profiles

Based on your conversation with this person, rate him or her on the following measures.

**PERSONALITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Sharp</th>
<th>Very Guileful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: When I joked with him about the experiment, he was extremely sensitive. He got embarrassed and told me that he is often the victim of pranks and jokes, and that he never seems to catch-on.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Brave</th>
<th>Very Spineless</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: He backed down on every point that he was making at a given time. Whenever I disagreed with him, he even changed his views on a few issues to conform to my views, I never pressured him to do this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Aggressive</th>
<th>Very Submissive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: He seemed to assume that he does not have the right to offend others by confronting them. Apparently, from what he told me of his past and recent events in his life, he would rather sacrifice his dignity than offend or anger others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totally Dominate</th>
<th>Subordinates Self Totally To Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: When explaining why he did not confront others, he seemed to assume that he does not have the right to offend others by confronting them. Apparently, from what he told me of his past and recent events in his life, he would rather sacrifice his dignity than offend or anger others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Sharp</th>
<th>Very Guileful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: He tried to start talking about more positive things that people have said of him. He said that the other day he overheard a woman say the most wonderful thing about him: "he said he's a 'puppy-dog.'" He thought she meant he was "cute." I think she was referring to his submission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Easy To Please</th>
<th>Very Fussy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: He complained a lot about the way he deals with adversity by passively "letting it pass," even if the source of adversity is another person.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Appraised</th>
<th>Very Please</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: He tried to start talking about more positive things that people have said of him. He said that the other day he overheard a woman say the most wonderful thing about him: "he said he's a 'puppy-dog.'" He thought she meant he was "cute." I think she was referring to his submission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Easy To</th>
<th>Very Fussy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: During this 30 minute conversation he asked me to close the blinds (because it was too bright outside) and raise the thermostat (because it was too cold in the room). More than that, he made it seem as if it was very important that it be done.
APPENDIX C: Consent Form

Department of Psychology
California State University, San Bernardino

PARTICIPATION CONSENT

This study is designed to investigate the factors involved in women's preferences for potential dating partners. More specifically, we are examining how women feel about the relationship potential of men with various kinds of characteristics.

Participation involves simply reading about several men and answering questions about them. You will not actually meet any of the men in this study, and none of your responses will be made available to them in any way. You will be asked to read the ratings and descriptions that other female subjects in a previous study have completed after talking with these men for 30 minutes. Then, you will be asked what you think of these men, based on the ratings and descriptions of these men given by your female peers in the previous study.

Participation in this study does not depend on whether or not you are currently in or not in a committed relationship. Because these questions regard romantic liking and attraction for a partner in a "what if you were available" situation, please volunteer only if you feel comfortable with the study.

Participation will involve about 30 minutes of your time reading from a booklet of descriptions of eight males and answering questions in that booklet. Once you have finished the booklet, you will be provided information about the background and importance of the study and will have the opportunity to give feedback to the researcher and to discuss with him any questions or concerns you may have. Group results of the study when it is completed will be made available to you at your request.

Your participation is greatly appreciated.

1. This study has been explained to me and I understand the explanation that has been given and what my participation will involve.

2. I understand that I am free to discontinue my participation in this study at any time without penalty.

3. I understand that my responses will remain anonymous, but that group results of this study will be made available to me at my request.

4. I understand that, at my request, I can receive additional explanation of this study after my participation is completed.

Signed: _______________________________ Date: ________________
APPENDIX D: Instructions

This study examines how singles meet and evaluate each other at social events. You will be asked to read carefully through summarized forms of evaluations that were completed in a previous study by 5 female college students after interactions of 20 to 30 minutes with male target persons. Although the 5 students evaluated a total of 50 male targets, you will only be asked to examine summarized evaluations of eight of the males, so, although all of the target males are different, it is possible that the same student may have evaluated two or more of the males in this particular booklet. For all eight of the evaluations of the target males that you see, assume that these students' ratings were objective, accurate, and typical of how other women rate him. You will also be asked to rate each of these eight males based on the ratings given by the female subjects. Finally, you will be asked to keep in mind how you meet other singles in social settings and to respond in the questionnaire as you would respond in a real-life setting. If you are married or in a committed relationship, perhaps you could think about how you used to meet singles, or how you met your current partner, and respond accordingly in the questionnaire.

On the next page you will see a copy of the original blank form used to evaluate each of the target males (please examine this form now). On it you will find all of the traits that the female students were asked to look for while they talked with the male targets. The students used this form as part of a study on perception of men by women. Note that there are two sections to this form: the Personality section and the Background section.

On the left side of pages 3 through 10 you will find summaries of the evaluations of the eight target males (please refer to those now). On each of
these evaluation summary pages, your will find that Background information was presented in full, but only four of the Personality traits were presented. The reason for not including all of the Personality trait ratings in each summary evaluation is that we believe that the most effective and concise way to present the Personality ratings for each of the target males is to give the four highest rated characteristic. This summary reduces the unwieldy number of 32 traits down to a manageable four traits and focuses attention on the most noticeable characteristics of the stimulus male.

The number circled represents how strongly the female rater considers the trait to be present in the male target person. These ratings can vary from a low of 1 to a high of 8. Note that a score of 1 indicates the opposite of that trait, not just a low value of it. For example, for the trait Kind, if the 8 is circled it would indicate that the target seems to be very kind, but a 1 would go beyond “not very kind” and indicate that the target male is very mean. Since the Background section consists of only a few questions, it did not need to be edited, so all of the Background information was included.

Please keep in mind that all of the target persons were rated on all if the Personality characteristics, but only the highest-scoring characteristics were extracted from the completed original form to be included in the summary evaluation. Assume that any of the characteristics from the original form that were not included in the summary for any given target male were left out because they did not characterize the person, since those traits were in the medium to low range. Please try to take these four Personality traits at face value. Try to think of the target male’s personality only in terms of these four traits, and please try not to speculate about exactly how low he scored on other traits.
Included on each of these pages are the comments that the female students wrote justifying and explaining each Personality trait rating for each target male by describing an aspect of his behavior or statements during the conversation that indicated to the student that the target male had that particular trait. On each of these pages you will also be asked to rate the desirability and dating potential of each of these males based on the Personality and Background ratings given by the female college students. However, before you evaluate these target males for desirability, it is important that you have as clear a picture as possible of what they are like, in terms of non-physical characteristics.

After reading about a target male, you will be asked to answer some questions about him. On the right side of pages 3 through 10 you will be asked to rate each of the target males based on your impressions of them after you examined all of their Personality and Background ratings. Please take all of the Personality and Background information into account before rating these target males.

If you have any questions about these instructions, if at any time during the study you are not clear on what it is you are being asked to do, or if you have any other questions related to your participation in this study, please feel free to ask. Also remember that you may discontinue the experiment at any time without penalty. Please respond fully and honestly.
APPENDIX E: Sample Stimulus Male Profile with Desirability Rating Form

### PERSONALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Modest</th>
<th>Very Boastful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: Rather loud when talking about himself. He bragged about his accomplishments in life, rather than simply stating them.

### BACKGROUND

**Name (initials):** T. N. J.

**Sex:** Male

**County of residence:** San Bernardino County

**Reason this person is enrolled in Psychology:***
- Requirement for general education (or General Ed or Degree)
- For own knowledge (or for career or study)

**Indicate this person's occupational area:**
- Laborer
- Average
- Professional

**Indicate the range of this person's yearly income:**
- <$10,000
- $10,000-$19,999
- $20,000-$29,999
- $30,000-$39,999
- $40,000-$49,999
- $50,000-$59,999
- $60,000 or more

**Marital status:** Single

If unmarried, is this person currently involved in a committed relationship? Yes

### DESIRABILITY

Please answer the following questions about the desirability of this person as a relationship partner.

| If you were available, how desirable would this person be as a potential partner? |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Not At All | Very Desirable |
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |

| If you were available, how much would you want to date this person? |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Not At All | Very Much |
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |

| How desirable would this person be as a friend? |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Not At All | Very Desirable |
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |

| In general, to what degree do you think you would be attracted to this person if you had a chance to meet him? |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Not At All | A Great Deal |
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |

| Is this the type of person that you could be "friends for life" with? |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Definitely | Definitely |
| Yes | Yes |
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |

| All things considered, to what extent do you think you would have a satisfying relationship with this person? |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Not At All | Very Satisfying |
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |

| Considering everything (not including your present relationship status) do you want to go on a date with this person? |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Definitely | Definitely |
| Yes | Yes |
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
APPENDIX F: Written Comments of Participants

M+/F+ Comparison Group

S#2: There really is not enough information on these men. Their personality traits are based on someone else’s subjective observation. You can never really judge anyone until you personally have a chance to meet them and talk with them over a substantial amount of time.

S#5: Normally, I’m very particular in dating, so I’m a little apprehensive to answer these questions. But, I am one to go out on a blind date if someone suggests it.

S#6: For each man, I pictured a person that I already knew that fit that person’s description.

M+/F- Comparison Group

S#18: Investigator’s note: This participant did not write a comment at the back of the booklet, but wrote notes next to each SP, perhaps to distinguish them from each other. She indicated that the M+ male shown in the fourth column of Appendix? was “Okay.” She wrote that the M+ male shown in the second column was “Too stuck-up,” that the M+ male shown in the first column had “No time,” and that the M+ male shown in the third column was “Too strong.” She indicated that all F- males were too weak.

S#20: The guys I have met have always had one hang up or another. For instance, if he is a leader and likes everyone to look up to him, it’s more out of inferiority than anything else. If I were to find all the qualities that T. N. J. had, I would die. (Investigator’s note: T. N. J. in her booklet was the M+ male on the third column of page 71 in Appendix B)
S#22: Either the majority of the men used as subjects for this study are incredible losers, or there is something terribly wrong with me. I sincerely hope it is the former. Thank you!

S#29: I think the survey concisely presented the most important characteristics I would look for in a man; i.e., personality and background. I noticed the characteristic of “humor” was lacking in each one of them, one of the most important to me.

To summarize, those who were confident “doers” are attractive to a degree; but I am wary of their over-zealousness in controlling everything, thinking they count more than anything else, including a partner. Will they consider my opinions and feelings and accomplishments as worthwhile? Will their partners be more than just ornamental?

Forget the whiners, naggers, and depressives, no matter how much money they make. Also, as a 32-year-old college graduate, “serious” woman, I look for someone who is self-reliant, but not self-obsessed. Yes, it is important that he make a decent living, but maybe some of the lower income men are young and haven’t reached their “true” earning potential. The money alone isn’t enough to see or not see a man romantically. Some of the personality traits, however, do offer enough reason for me not to go out with some of them.

M-/F- Comparison Group

S#34: Maybe I’m too selective, but I wouldn’t want to have a friend/boyfriend which has his four strongest personality traits in any of the areas described. One in two, combined with two personality traits, that I feel are important to me, would probably be alright.
S#35: It seemed that none of the males had any positive traits, which seemed somewhat unrealistic to me. I think leaving the yearly income on the background sheet may unfairly influence some of the decisions.

S#36: Quite honestly, I had a hard time distinguishing which of them I liked better because I disliked all of them, they were either wimps or arrogant and I don’t think it’s possible to judge on extremes!! Because I think most people I know would be turned off also!!

S#38: Good, interesting study, although all of these men had extreme personalities. Most females want a strong-willed, mature partner who also have sensitivity. Someone to feel secure with, but who also feels for others needs. To me, this was very negative.

S#39: I would never allow any of these men within five feet of me. Based on the personality traits alone, I would not want to know any of these men. When looking at the incomes of these men, it came to my mind that they must have some redeeming quality to make as much as they do (Investigator's note: This participant then listed the four high income SPs in parentheses), but the scores they received were enough to conclude that any career building skills they might have were not enough to overcome the total lack of other redeeming qualities evident in each one.

S#40: All of these men profiled were pretty undesirable in my opinion. I would rather meet/date the submissive ones than the hostile greedy ones. None were desirable and I’d prefer not to meet or date any of them.

S#42: These men seemed like either macho, egotistical bullies or spineless, whiny wimps — neither of which I could be interested in. Any of them I could probably be friends with but probably not for long and in column B, I would
avoid these men. (Investigator's note: Here this participant was referring to a section of the booklet that was later thrown out asking participants to list the males they would reject. Her list contained three M-males and one F-male.)

S#45: In my opinion, I find these men either too arrogant and self-centered, or very wimpy and passive. I would like a relationship that is mutual and equal. Both partners must attain respect for one another, with an openness for each of them to express how they feel about one another or a situation. These men in the evaluation, except for F. T. S., with exceptions, wasn't compatible to myself. (Investigator's note: F. T. S. is an F-male shown in Appendix B on the first column of page 74) Either they were too dominant, assholes, or too wimpy. Where were the men who were more liberal minded and who were willing to see life and other social situations in a profound manner? Overall, the evaluation was fun and interesting.

S#48: I found it hard to want to date any of the men who were discussed. Especially the aggressive arrogant ones. I would stay clear from them no matter what they looked like or how much money they made.

M-/F+ Comparison Group

S#50: It doesn't matter to me how much money the person makes, if they are very self-centered or cruel, they are not worth knowing. This is especially true since I am a humanitarian and also feel that in order to be a good person or potential partner you must be able to love others in order to love yourself, and me. I like people who measure success in terms of fulfilling desires without hurting other people in the process. Sometimes it is inevitable but it should be avoided when possible.
S#55: Life is too short to waste on negative, hostile, or self-centered people.

S#58: I have a problem with all of these men because there are only four traits to look at. They either appear to be all jerks or all too soft. Someone you walk all over.

S#61: There were no “middle of the road” guys. The ones presented here seemed either great or terrible!

S#62: Although the men I ranked the highest had qualities that are important to me in a relationship, I am often disinterested in men that are “too nice” and show extreme interest in others, or in me, although those are usually the type I choose as friends. I usually choose relationships which end up disastrous.

**M+/M- Comparison Group**

S#70: I thought it was difficult to rank the last four D. M. R., H. J. B., F. T. S., and T. N. J. as they were all equally uninteresting to me. (Investigator’s note: By rank this participant was referring to a task in which Ss were asked to rank-order the SPs. This data was later thrown out. The four SPs were the ones she most disliked, and they are the four M- males)

S#71: Men that hurt others, are greedy, feel superior to everyone . . . do not interest me. I only want a strong, but sensitive and kind man.

S#73: Sort of fun!

S#74: I think the questionnaire was too cut and dry. Either the men were one way or the other. The only way that I had to decide was by what the females said, and that wasn’t even that much. One girl couldn’t even speak that well, so I didn’t know if it was her or the male I didn’t like!
S#76: It's very difficult making judgments without having the opportunity to meet them. I, myself am a very visual person and sometimes can be quite intuitive when I have the opportunity to see how one responds to questions. They may answer in one way, but their body language, voice inflection — all are a great tool for me to be able to look beyond their actual answer.

F+/F- Comparison Group

Investigator's note: None of the 16 participants in this comparison group, Ss# 81-96, offered written commentary at the end of their booklets.
APPENDIX G: Debriefing Form

Explanation of the Study

The present study was designed to examine what effect a male's positive or negative masculine or feminine personality, income and occupational status would have on women's preference for him over other males. None of the males that you read about really exist. The "previous female raters" whom you were told had rated the males did not exist, either. All of the profiles and comments for each male were originally designed and written by the investigator such that each male had either high (over $80,000) or low (0-$15,000) income, either high (professional) or low (laborer) occupational status, and had one of four stereotyped sex role traits: masculine in a positive way (e.g. "confident"); masculine in a negative way (e.g. "egotistical"); feminine in a positive way (e.g. "gentle"); or feminine in a negative way (e.g. "nagging" or "spineless"). We were careful to avoid including characteristics such as physical attractiveness, physical appearance, or age in the profiles you read. While we acknowledge that such characteristics are very important in attracting people, we felt that the effects of these characteristics could interfere with the effects of the male sex role variables that we were interested in. The importance of this study is that it examines relationships in terms of two important aspects of the male sex role: masculinity and success. Although much has been said lately about today's women wanting men to be more sensitive (emotional, gentle, aware of the feelings of others, etc.), and we do agree that women say they want "a sensitive man," we believe that the kind of men that women tend to choose indicates that traditional masculine traits (confidence, independence, decisiveness, etc.) are more important to women than sensitivity for a male relationship partner to have.
Another important aspect of the male sex role is success. We believe that professional, high income men are more desirable to women than low income laborers.

If you have further questions about this study, please don't hesitate to ask. You can receive more information about the study, including the final outcome, by calling Stephan Desrochers at 714-984-2468. Please do not discuss this study with anyone on campus. Thank you again for participating in this study.
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