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Employing instrumental conditioning methodology, this study investigated the motivational properties of masculine male sex-role action. Results indicated that, despite having the reinforcing opportunity to listen to an androgynous male on each conversation trial, female subjects that listened to a stereotyped masculine male at the onset of only some of the trials responded more slowly than subjects who had the opportunity to listen to the masculine male at the onset of all trials. These effects evidenced a striking correspondence between masculine male sex-role action and intermittent shock effects in escape conditioning. Consistent with previous reported research using a social learning methodology, the subjects also rated the androgynous male as more appropriate, more honest, more likeable, more intelligent, more moral, more mentally healthy, and more similar to herself than his masculine counterpart. The discussion focused on the implications for males in today's society, and for future research in social facilitation.
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INTRODUCTION

Of our many social roles, our sex-role may be one of the most influential factors in the overall determination of our behavior, cognitions and emotional reactions. For example, how we interact with others, how we choose our friends, how we dress, the sports we choose to play, and the language we use are all affected by our sex-role orientation. Of equal importance is the relationship between our sex-role and how others react toward us. Research investigating the effect of sex-role orientation has provided evidence that has revealed a greater degree of liking for androgynous persons (e.g., Bridges, 1981; Jackson, 1983; Major, Carnevale, & Deaux, 1981). In addition to being viewed as more socially attractive, androgynous men have also been found to be more attractive than masculine males in a romantic sense (Kulik & Harackiewicz, 1979; Orlofsky, 1982).

Given these findings, a program of research was initiated to determine whether social interaction with an androgynous male can function as a social reward. This research also investigated the possibility that a stereotyped "masculine" male can function as an aversive social experience for women.
Previous research using a three-person conversation paradigm (Bartell, 1986; Helzer, 1987) clearly indicated that a female subject will learn an instrumental response (IR), the reinforcement for which is the opportunity to listen to an androgynous male. Latency data from these latter two experiments indicated a fundamental similarity to discrete-trials instrumental conditioning, demonstrating social analogs of (a) acquisition, (b) partial reinforcement, and (c) delay of reinforcement.

The present study sought to investigate the following question: Does the opportunity to listen to an androgynous male function as a positive reinforcer (as in instrumental reward conditioning), or does its functional properties resemble that of a negative reinforcer (as in instrumental escape conditioning)? In other words, does a female subject learn a response because the interaction with an androgynous male is positively reinforcing, or is the subject's learning motivated by the aversive nature of the "masculine" male, with the androgynous male being negatively reinforcing? The question is not a trivial one from a learning-theoretical perspective: It warrants both a detailed discussion of the sex-role research relevant to the present investigation, along with a discussion of social-learning research methodology.
Sex-Roles

Traditional Sex-Roles

While the current trend within the field of psychology is toward the acknowledgement and integration of the masculine and feminine aspects that coexist within each of us, both society and psychology have historically conceptualized masculinity and femininity as bipolar ends of a single continuum. The most common definition of traditional masculinity has included "instrumental" traits (e.g., aggressiveness, dominance and independence), while the definition of traditional femininity has been comprised of "expressive" attributes (e.g., tenderness, dependency and passivity). The existence of traditional sex-role stereotypes, that is, the belief that men and women possess fundamentally different traits, attitudes and behaviors, has received empirical support (Rosenkrantz, Bee, Vogel, Broverman & Broverman, 1968; Sherriffs & Jarrett, 1953). Traditional sex-role inventories have been based on the assumption that masculinity and femininity are unidimensional and negatively correlated (Guilford & Guilford, 1936; Guilford & Zimmerman, 1949; Gough, 1964, 1966; Hathaway & McKinley, 1943; Strong, 1943; Termin & Miles, 1936). These instruments reflected the belief that a person was either masculine or feminine. This belief was to remain the standard in American psychological research for approximately four decades.
The expectations that evolve from sex-role stereotypes are not lost on children. Through a combination of rewards, punishment, and modeling processes, children are taught sex-role appropriate behaviors. It has been asserted that the male role is more narrowly defined than the female role. In their review of the literature, Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) concluded that, because of the more intense socialization experiences imposed on boys, males may be influenced more than females by societal sex-role expectations. They found, for example, that boys were the recipients of significantly more pressure against behaving in a sex-role incongruent fashion, whereas, the activities in which girls were permitted to perform appeared "much less clearly defined and less firmly enforced" (p. 348). Hartley (1959) observed that the demands on boys to conform to traditional societal expectations of gender-appropriate behaviors are enforced earlier and with considerably more pressure than are the demands on girls. Furthermore, Hartley suggested that boys are keenly aware of these expectations and restrict their interest and activities accordingly. Given these powerful and differential expectations, it can be expected that violation of cross-sex actions will result in significant penalties.
Consequences of Children's Cross-Sex Actions

Fling and Manosevitz (1972) and Lansky (1967) have reported that gender-inappropriate behaviors elicits greater concern on the part of the parents of boys as compared to the parents of girls. In addition, Levitin and Chananie (1972) found that primary school teachers reported liking girls who behaved in a role-incongruent manner (e.g., exhibited achievement-oriented behaviors) more than boys who displayed role-incongruent behaviors (e.g., exhibited interpersonal dependency). In an examination of adult male and female subjects' evaluations of boys and girls who behaved in a sex-role incongruent fashion, incongruency on the part of boys engendered more disapproval among the adult research subjects than did incongruency on the part of girls (Feinman, 1974).

Fagot (1977) reported that preschoolers generally reinforced one another for "in-role" behaviors while punishing one another for "out-of-role" behaviors. Specifically, boys who demonstrated "out-of-role" behaviors received significantly more peer criticism and fewer positive reactions than did girls who demonstrated "out-of-role" behaviors. Children's differential treatment of cross-sex behavior was also observed by Lamb and Roopnarine (1979) and Lamb, Easterbrooks and Holden (1980).
Consequences Of Adult Cross-Sex Actions

In the traditional bipolar conceptualization of sex-roles, adjustment and mental health have been defined by strict adherence to societal expectations of gender-appropriate behaviors (Kagan, 1964; Mussen, 1969). There is empirical evidence exists suggesting deviation from gender based sex-roles can result in unfavorable social reactions. Costrich, Feinstein, Kidder, Marecek and Pascale (1975), for example, reported that "perceived psychological adjustment" and "perceived popularity ratings" of the role-incongruent confederates were adversely affected. That is, they were liked less and were thought to be in more need of therapy than their role-congruent counterparts.

Another consequence of cross-sex behaviors relates to attraction. Seyfried and Hendrick (1973) tested the hypothesis that subjects would be attracted to a role-congruent stranger, but would be less attracted to a role-incongruent stranger. In general, results indicated that the role-incongruent male (expressing feminine attitudes) and the role-incongruent female (expressing masculine attitudes) were liked less than their role-congruent counterparts. In addition, role-incongruent persons were rated as less intelligent, less adjusted, and less similar to the subjects doing the rating. It should be noted that the stereotypically feminine male was
disliked more than any other stranger. These results are really not surprising given that various researchers (McKee & Sherriffs, 1959; Rosenkrantz et al., 1968; Sherriffs & McKee, 1957) had previously suggested, that within Western society, the male role is more highly valued and signifies a higher status. With that in mind, Feinman (1981) "using a status characteristic approach," suggested that the reason why boys receive more disapproval than girls for engaging in cross-sex behaviors is because males who engage in feminine behaviors are perceived by others as seeking downward mobility which ultimately results in a status loss, while females engaging in masculine behaviors are perceived as seeking upward mobility resulting in status gain.

The phenomena of high value placed on the male role was observed in a classic study conducted by Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz, and Vogel (1970). Specifically, when psychologists, psychiatrists, and social workers were asked to describe a mentally healthy adult man, woman and person (sex-unspecified), the descriptions of a healthy adult man and person were influenced, as hypothesized, by the "greater social value of the masculine stereotypic characteristics" (p. 2). In short, the description of the adult healthy male and the adult healthy person were equivalent. The healthy adult woman, on the other hand, was described by both men and women as:
...more submissive, less independent, less adventurous, more easily influenced, less aggressive, less competitive, more easily excitable in minor crises, more easily hurt, more emotional, more conceited about [her] appearance, less objective, and less interested in math and science (p.6).

In summary, it appears that individuals who express cross-sex behaviors run the risk of being rated as less attractive, less intelligent, less likeable, and more in need of therapy. However, females appear to receive less negative feedback than males when engaging in role-incongruent behaviors, resulting in women having greater latitude of freedom regarding expression of cross-sex behaviors. This finding is not surprising given different socialization practices along with the superior value placed on the male role.

**Contemporary Sex-Roles**

Recently, men and women have begun to question the utility of traditional sex-role norms. Marecek (1976) has suggested several cultural events which facilitate stretching the boundaries of traditional sex-role norms. These changes include: changes in the average life span, increased labor participation by women, changes in the availability and efficiency of birth control, and changes in marriage and divorce rates.

The key to increased sex-role freedom seems to lie in the plasticity of gender roles. By shifting our focus away from the assumption of biological dimorphism held by
early theorists, modern thinkers have begun to acknowledge the possibility of an alternate and potentially more beneficial way of relating.

It is interesting to note that other societies and cultures have evolved sex-role prescriptions that are quite different from our own. For example, in her classic study of three New Guinea societies, Mead (1935), observed that the Arapesh and the Mundugumor societies made no distinction between men and women, while the Tchambuli society defined men and women completely opposite to Western gender descriptions. Furthermore, Mead observed societies where the "ideal" sex-role was feminine rather than masculine. As Skovholt (1978) eloquently pointed out "the plasticity of gender roles have enabled societies to demand different attributes from the sexes at different times and to maximize biological differences or to minimize them" (p. 3).

The field of psychology has not been without its periods of struggle over the complex issues that surround our attempt to understand sex-role related phenomena. The utility of traditional bipolar sex-role measures became a major topic of study when researchers began to explore the possibility that masculinity and femininity could coexist within an individual (Bem, 1974; Block, 1973; Constantinople, 1973; Jenkin & Vroegh 1969). A multidimensional model of masculinity and femininity was
purposed whereby men and women could incorporate both masculine and feminine characteristics. This incorporation of masculine and feminine traits within an individual's being defines the concept of androgyny. Although, this concept appears to be new to the field of psychology, it must be noted that its novelty is more apparent than real. For example, Jung was one of the first to question the bipolarity of masculinity and femininity by suggesting that all persons have both masculine and feminine components within their personality, and the fully integrated person has the ability to express both (Harrison, 1978). With Constantinople's (1973) destruction of the "myth of masculinity and femininity as a single continuum," the idea of androgyny has been "reincarnated" and has become a legitimate topic of investigation.

Androgyny

Bem (1974) suggested that a move away from traditional sex-role stereotypes was overdue given that we live "in a society where rigid sex-role differentiation has already outlived its utility" (p. 162). She pointed out that the old bipolar paradigm "served to obscure two very plausible hypotheses" (p. 155). First, androgynous individuals maintain their gender identity, but, they also incorporate traits of the opposite sex, allowing them to respond appropriately to a variety of situations without
regard to society's conception of sex-role appropriate behavior. Secondly, she argued that sex-typed persons are limited by the range of behaviors available to them. By contrast, the androgynous person, by virtue of the range of available behaviors, could "come to define a more human standard of psychological health" (p. 162).

The birth of a new concept necessarily means the development of new ways to measure and define the new concept. In the area of sex-roles, new instruments were essential because previous sex-role inventories were bipolar and did not consider androgyny a viable alternative. Bem (1974) developed the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) to assess an individual's sex-role orientation. She originally derived sex-role classifications by the statistical use of the Student's t-ratio for the difference in total points endorsed on the masculinity and femininity scales (see Bem, 1974). Using this scoring criterion, subjects fell into one of three classifications: masculine, feminine, or androgynous.

Bem's concept of androgyny was met not only with enthusiasm, but also with criticism (Baldwin, Critelli, Stevens, & Russell, 1986; Heilbrun & Pitman, 1979; Lenny, 1979; Locksley & Colton, 1979; Lubinski, Tellegen, & Butcher, 1983; Myers & Gonda, 1982; Pedhazur & Tetenbaum, 1979; Taylor & Hall, 1982). In the controversy that ensued, Spence, Helmreich and Stapp (1974, 1975)
criticized Bem's scoring procedure because it failed to discriminate between individuals who scored high on both the masculine and feminine scales and those who scored low on both scales. Consequently, Bem (1977) revised her three-fold classification method in favor of the median-split method purposed by Spence et al. (1974, 1975). The classification procedure currently in use by most investigators divides respondents into four categories: masculine, feminine, androgynous (high masculinity - high femininity), and undifferentiated (low masculinity - low femininity). While alternative scoring procedures have been recommended (Blackman, 1982; Bobko & Schwartz, 1984; Briere, Ward, & Hartsough, 1983; Kalin, 1979; Motowidlo, 1981; Taylor & Hall, 1982), the preferred method continues to be the median-split. Not surprisingly, alternate methods of measuring androgyny have also been introduced: the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ: Spence et al., 1974), the Personality Research Form Andro scale (Berzins, Welling & Wetter, 1978), and the Adjective Check List (ACL: Heilbrun, 1976). Despite the criticisms that have been leveled against the BSRI, it is still one of the most widely used measures of androgyny (McPherson and Spetrino; 1983).

Behavioral Flexibility

The concept of androgyny led researchers to investigate whether or not the incorporation of both
masculine and feminine characteristics would translate into behavioral flexibility. Bem (1975) was among the first to demonstrate that androgynous individuals were free to respond appropriately in a variety of situations, whereas sex-typed individuals were restricted to sex-appropriate behaviors. Furthermore, Bem and Lenney (1976) found that when sex-typed individual were asked which activities (e.g., sex-typed, cross-sexed, or neutral) they would prefer to perform while being photographed by either a male or female experimenter, the sex-typed subjects were more likely to prefer sex-appropriate behaviors and resist cross-sex activities than were androgynous and cross-sex subjects. In addition, the sex-typed individuals reported experiencing the most discomfort and feeling the most negative about themselves. While conducting a conceptual replication of Bem and Lenney's investigation, Helmreich, Spence and Holahan (1979) found that both androgynous males and females expressed the greatest comfort on all of the tasks combined.

In addition to behavior flexibility, it has been reported that androgynous subjects are more willing to disclose information than are sex-typed and undifferentiated subjects (Stokes, Childs & Fuehrer, 1981). Androgynous men were also found to be higher in
expressiveness than sex-typed men (Narus Jr. & Fischer, 1982).

Adjustment

As previously noted, Bem (1974) hoped that the concept of androgyny "would come to define a more human standard of psychological health" (p. 162). She suggested that if androgynous persons are capable of responding in a situation-effective manner, then it could be argued that this ability to go against the grain of societal expectations contributes to superior adjustment and higher levels of self-esteem. Unfortunately, research in this area fails to provide a reliable answer to Bem's (1974) hypothesis, offering instead contradictory and irreconcilable results. For example, Deustch and Gilbert (1976), using the Revised Bell Adjustment Inventory (Bell, 1963), reported that androgynous females were better adjusted than feminine females; however, androgynous males did not receive higher adjustment scores than masculine males. These results are questionable, though, in light of the fact that the t-score criterion was employed to classify sex-role orientation.

Silvern and Ryan (1979) also used the t-score criterion for sex-role classification and found that masculine men were superior in adjustment to androgynous men on all measures, while androgynous women's ratings indicated superior adjustment as compared to feminine
women. These authors also interpreted their results in light of the four-fold, median-split procedure. The use of this criterion for scoring revealed no difference between the androgynous and masculine males on the adjustment measures.

To complicate matters further, Logan and Kaschak (1980) failed to find a significant relationship between sex-role orientation and adjustment, while Lee and Scheurer (1983) reported that, for both males and females, it was not androgyny (the combination of masculinity and femininity) that accounted for higher adjustment scores, but rather the presence of masculinity.

Among the most consistent findings are those which indicate that masculinity, not androgyny, is the primary indicator of high levels of self-esteem (Bem, 1977; O'Connor, Mann & Bardwick, 1978; Whitley, 1983). Kelly and Worell (1977) have suggested that these results may be due to the greater social value placed on masculine behaviors. In short, it appears that individuals who are high in masculinity enjoy greater success in a male dominated society and hence enjoy greater self-esteem.

**Consequences of Androgyny**

Unlike the correlates of androgyny (e.g., behavior flexibility, adjustment, and self-esteem), the consequences of androgyny are more social and interpersonal in nature. Recall that previous studies
investigating the effect of sex-role on attraction and liking suggested that cross-sex actions had a detrimental effect on ratings of attraction, liking, and mental health, with the stereotypical feminine male perceived as suffering more than the masculine female (Seyfried & Hendrick 1973). With the movement away from traditional stereotypes and the theoretical development of androgyny, investigators are now finding a somewhat different pattern of results. For example, O'Leary and Donoghue (1978) asked subjects to evaluate a biographical sketch and bogus BSRI describing either a masculine or feminine male stimulus person. The masculine male was described as endorsing stereotypically masculine traits and expressed an interest in pursuing a career in business, while the feminine male was portrayed as endorsing stereotypical feminine traits and looking forward to becoming a kindergarten teacher. Subjects were asked to evaluate the stimulus person on a series of 7-point scales assessing liking, preference as a work partner, attractiveness to a future employer, and perceived similarity to oneself. Contrary to previous findings, the feminine male was not disliked more than the masculine male. In fact, the subjects indicated a preference for the nontraditional male as a work partner.

To insure that the effects were not limited to the population of college students, O'Leary and Donoghue
(1978) replicated their investigation using urban, predominately lower-class, high-school students. Again, subjects did not indicate a preference for the traditional male. To examine subjects' reaction to a "real" male who deviated from the traditional male role, the authors conducted a third study in which subjects interacted in a 3-person group with a male confederate who acted either in a traditional or nontraditional manner regarding the resolution of a conflict faced by two young boys. Subjects rated each member of the group on liking, confidence in decision making, sympathy, independence, and exclusion from the group. Results indicated no significant main effects for traditionality. A significant main effect for sex of subject was obtained on three of the measurements. Specifically, female subjects rated the male confederate, regardless of sex-role orientation, as more likeable, more sympathetic, and were less inclined to exclude him from the group than did the male subjects. These results seemed to attest to the willingness of women to allow deviation from the traditional male sex-role.

The question that now arises is: How do subjects respond to an individual who is androgynous? Could the expression of both masculine and feminine characteristics serve as an asset that increases attractiveness? And, what effect, if any, does the subject's sex-role orientation have on interpersonal attraction to
androgynous individuals? As early as 1959, McKee and Sherriffs reported that women wanted men to be more expressive and emotional, traits traditionally viewed as feminine characteristics.

Major et al., (1981) reported that subjects who rated bogus androgynous PAQ protocols, regardless of sex, perceived them as more adjusted, intelligent, competent and successful than the masculine, feminine, and androgynous stimulus persons. Moreover, the androgynous stimulus persons were perceived as significantly more popular, interesting and attractive. Similarly, Jackson (1983) provided subjects with bogus BSRI protocols paired with a highly attractive, moderately attractive or unattractive photograph of the bogus protocol. The stimulus persons were rated on a variety of dimensions (e.g., likability, adjustment). The results indicated that, regardless of the level of physical attractiveness, the androgynous stimulus persons were judged to be more likeable and better adjusted than the masculine stimulus persons. These results were found regardless of the subject's sex-role orientation and gender.

Purseell and Baniklotes (1978) examined the relationship between androgyny and interpersonal attraction. The subjects were presented with BSRI protocols constructed to represent a masculine male, an androgynous male, a feminine female, and an androgynous
female. The Interpersonal Judgment Scale, (IJS: Byrne, 1971) which allows the subject to rate others on the dimensions of knowledge of current events, intelligence, morality, personal adjustment, personal feelings, and willingness to work in a future experiment, was used as the dependent measure. The results revealed a significant interaction between sex-role orientation of the subject and sex-role orientation of the protocol. Specifically, androgynous subjects appeared to be more attracted to androgynous protocols and sex-typed individuals were more attracted to sex-typed protocols. An additional interaction between the sex of the subject and the sex-role orientation of the protocol revealed that females preferred androgynous protocols of both sexes, while males preferred the sex-typed stimulus persons.

Bridges (1981), in an attempt to examine the effect of the sex-role orientation of a stimulus person on opposite-sex attraction, presented subjects with bogus BSRI protocols of androgynous and sex-typed opposite sex stimulus persons. The results indicated that the androgynous stimulus person was liked more than the sex-typed person regardless of the subject’s sex-role orientation. In addition, females, regardless of sex-role orientation, preferred the androgynous male over the sex-typed male; however, male subjects did not differentiate between the two. These results are
reminiscent of those found by Pursell and Banikiotes (1978).

Kulik and Harackiewicz (1979) also examined the effect of the stimulus persons' sex-role orientation on both platonic and romantic attraction, utilizing bogus BSRI protocols. Both sexes rated the androgynous opposite-sex stimulus persons significantly higher on a measure of platonic liking. Regarding romantic liking, the results revealed a somewhat different trend. That is, male subjects reported more romantic interest in sex-typed females than androgynous or undifferentiated females. Females subjects, on the other hand, reported more romantic attraction to the androgynous male than to either the masculine or undifferentiated male. An interesting offshoot of this research area includes Buss and Barnes (1986) reporting that women preferred as a mate someone with a combination of both masculine and feminine characteristics: considerate, honest, dependable, kind, understanding, fond of children, ambitious, career-oriented, and well-liked, whereas men preferred mates with the following characteristics: physically attractive, a good cook, and frugal. In a conceptual replication of this study, Howard, Blumstein and Schwartz (1987) found that women more than men preferred mates that were both expressive and ambitious. On the other hand, men, more than women, desired a mate that was high in physical attractiveness.
Changing Attitudes and Stereotypes

As previously mentioned, both men and women have questioned traditional sex-role stereotypes. A frequently asked question posed by researchers is whether society, as a whole, now holds a different view of sex-roles. In other words, are the sexes merging in their beliefs regarding their respective rights and roles? Harris and Lucas (1976) suggested that "traditional sex-role stereotypes are being abandoned in favor of more human and flexible standards" (p. 390) (e.g., androgyny).

Rosenkrantz et al., (1968) conducted a landmark study which revealed that strict sex-role stereotypes were firmly held by men and women. In order to determine if changes in sex-role stereotyping had occurred between 1968 and 1975, Petro and Putnam (1979) administered the same instrument introduced by Rosenkrantz et al. (Sex-role Stereotype Questionnaire; 1968) to a sample of high-school counselors, and compared the results to the original data. Comparisons revealed that the high-school counselors differentiated on only 11 of the 38 items originally judged stereotypic of men and women. This led the authors to conclude that "sex-role attitudes are substantially different in the 1970's from what they were in the decades preceding" (p. 38). A review of the literature appears to support the authors' conclusion that sex-role attitudes have changed (Helmreich, Spence & Gibson, 1982; Mason,
Czayka, & Arber, 1974; Thorton & Freedman, 1979). Researchers (Helmreich et al., 1982) have used the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS; Spence & Helmreich, 1972, 1978) to assess sex-role attitude change. They found a significant movement of both men and women toward a more androgynous way of life.

Block (1973) noted that "In defining one's ideal self, one necessarily sets forth one's values; in establishing the culturally modal definition of the ideal male and ideal female, we have a projection of the values of the culture" (p. 519). Accordingly, a brief overview regarding descriptions of the "ideal" male and "ideal" female is pertinent.

As previously noted, McKee and Sherriffs (1959) reported that they found pressure from women for men to be more orientated toward interpersonal relations, or the ability to be more expressive. These data clearly suggested that women, at least when describing the "ideal" man, described men who were able to incorporate characteristics of both sexes (e.g., androgyny).

To investigate whether traits used to describe a woman or a man were in fact being defined along more androgynous lines, Werner and LaRussa (1985) conducted an exact replication of one part of an investigation by Sherriffs and McKee (1957). Comparisons between the original and replication results indicated that sex-role
stereotypes have failed to change significantly over the past 20 years. Specifically, both men and women continued to describe men as more forceful, independent, stubborn, and reckless than women; and women continued to be described as more mannerly, giving, emotional, and submissive than men. Gilbert, Deutsch, and Strahan (1978) asked subjects to describe a "typical", "desirable" or "ideal" man and woman by using items on the BSRI. They found that when subjects were asked to describe the "ideal" man and woman, females described an androgynous "ideal" for women, but they described the male as about as masculine as the feminine "ideal" and somewhat less feminine than he is masculine. Male subjects, on the other hand, described both the "ideal" man and woman as sex-typed. Collectively, these results led the authors to conclude that traditional sex-role stereotyping is "alive and well" (p. 777). However, caution must be taken in accepting this assumption. As Werner and LaRussa (1985) suggested, sex-role stereotypes may be changing at a much slower pace. In other words, sex-role changes may have occurred for both men and women, but these changes may not have yet been incorporated into our conceptions of one another.

Using the PAQ, Ruble (1983) asked subjects to describe the "typical" and "desirable." Differences between the 1974 and 1978 ratings of the "typical" man and woman.
revealed that 53 of the 54 items discriminated between the sexes. Thus, sex-role stereotyping appeared to remain in effect. However, an examination of the ratings of the desirable man and woman revealed a somewhat different pattern of results: In the 1974 sample ratings, the "ideal" man and woman differed significantly on 83% of the items, while the 1978 sample revealed significant differences on only 22% of the items.

Kimlicka, Wakefield and Goad (1982) examined the effect of the subject's sex-role orientation (androgynous vs. sex-typed) on the rating of the "ideal" man and "ideal" woman. They found that androgynous females described the "ideal" man as androgynous, while the sex-typed females described the "ideal" man as masculine. Contrary to these results, Orlofsky (1982) reported that both feminine and androgynous women (66%) described an androgynous "ideal" dating partner, while only 32% of the men described an androgynous woman as the "ideal" dating partner. McPherson and Spetrino (1983) also found that both androgynous and feminine women's descriptions of the "ideal" man and woman were similar in nature. In addition, both the masculine and androgynous men's ratings of the "ideal" man and woman were significantly different. These results led the authors to conclude that "sex rather than sex-role distinguished subjects' beliefs in gender polarity" (p. 441).
Earlier sex-role stereotyping studies not only demonstrated the existence of sex-role stereotypes but also suggested that the masculine role was more desirable than the feminine role. More recent research has suggested that changes have also occurred in this area. For example, Korabik (1982) asked subjects to evaluate a portrait of a stimulus person differing in sex and sex-role orientation. She found that when personality traits were equated for likeableness, female subjects rated masculine descriptions less favorably than the feminine or the androgynous descriptions regardless of sex. Male subjects, on the other hand, were affected by the gender appropriateness of the stimulus characteristics.

Werner and LaRussa (1985) suggested that "there has been a change in the evaluation of the two sexes between 1957 and 1978." (p. 1098). Their results indicated that women appear to be viewed more favorably and men less favorably. This valuation appears to be especially true for the female subjects.

Contrary to popular expectation, Silvern and Ryan (1983) reported that both men and women characterized the "ideal" person as significantly more feminine than masculine. Furthermore, women polarized their views of men and women to a lesser degree, such that their
descriptions of the "ideal" person, man and woman evidenced few inconsistencies.

In summary, even though some inconsistencies exists in the available data regarding changing attitudes and stereotypes, collectively, the research appears to clearly indicate that when woman are asked to describe the "ideal" male, descriptions are not traditional, but rather a combination of masculine and feminine characteristics (e.g., androgyny). Furthermore, there appears to be a general movement away from the high value placed upon the masculine role, with the feminine role and traits being viewed in a more positive light. Given this information it is not surprising that when female subjects are confronted with an androgynous male, he is not only considered more romantically attractive, but also judged to be more socially attractive.
Statement of the Problem

General learning theory has been successful in investigating a variety of social phenomena: altruism (e.g., Baumann, Cialdini, & Kenrick, 1981; Weiss, Buchanan, Altstatt, & Lombardo, 1971); attitudes (e.g., Moran, 1981; Staats & Staats, 1958); attraction (e.g., Byrne, 1971; Cramer, Weiss, Steigleder, & Balling, 1985; Lott & Lott, 1968, 1972); attribution (e.g., Cramer, Helzer & Mone, 1986); competition (e.g., Steigleder, Weiss, Cramer, & Feinberg, 1978); emotions (e.g., Lanzetta & Orr, 1980; 1981); speaking-in-reply (e.g., Weiss, Lombardo, Warren, & Kelly, 1971). Given this success it is surprisingly that learning researchers have yet to give much attention to the study of sex-role actions.

Based on the review of sex-role literature, a program of research was initiated to determine whether an androgynous male can function as a social reward. The research also explored the possibility that an interaction with a "masculine" male functions as an aversive social experience for women. Support for this assumption was derived from several sources previously discussed and can be summarized as follows: (a) There is ample evidence to suggest that within Western society there is a general
movement away from traditional stereotypes and toward a more androgynous way of life, and that, sex-role change has occurred at a quicker pace for women than men (Harris & Lucas, 1976; Heilbrun & Schwartz 1983; McBroom 1984). (b) Female subjects have typically described an "ideal" man as androgynous rather than as sex-typed (McPherson & Spetrino, 1983; Orlofsky, 1982). (c) Female subjects have described characteristics of their preferred mate as one with a combination of masculine and feminine personality traits, rather than a man who demonstrated exclusively masculine traits (Buss & Barnes, 1986; Howard, et al., 1987). (d) And, female subjects have generally attributed greater attraction, liking and adjustment to an androgynous male, rather than to his masculine counterpart (Bridges, 1981; Jackson, 1983; Korabik, 1982; Kulik & Harackiewicz, 1979; Major et al., 1981; Pursell & Banikiotes, 1978). Given these findings, it is reasonable to suggest that a woman's interaction with an androgynous male is analogous to a social reinforcer. It is also possible that her interaction with a less preferred "masculine" male is analogous to an aversive stimulus. It is not enough, however, for a researcher to suggest that such a social interaction is an event that is analogous to other known reinforcers and aversive stimuli; rather, the researcher must demonstrate that the effects of male
sex-role action functionally resemble other known reinforcers and aversive stimuli.

The present program of research represents an extreme divergence from the traditional self-report measurements typically employed to assess a subject's reaction to another's sex-role. While self-report measures were employed to obtain evaluations of the androynous and masculine males, this was not the major dependent variable. Instead, this program of research was designed to examine the motivational and reinforcing properties of the male sex-role in a procedure analogous to instrumental conditioning, and was guided by the general approach termed "extension of liberalized S-R theory" (Miller, 1959). The intent of this program of research was to develop and test a theory of male-sex role action using modern neo-Hullian learning theory as a model for predicting the effects of androgynous and stereotypic masculine male-sex role actions. Previous research in our laboratory has demonstrated that a female subject will learn an instrumental response, the reinforcement for which is the opportunity to listen to an androynous male's comments. Latency data (see Bartell, 1986; Helzer, 1987) indicated a functional similarity to discrete-trials instrumental conditioning, demonstrating social analogs of acquisition, partial reinforcement, and delay of reinforcement.
Employing instrumental conditioning methodology, the present experiment examined the general hypothesis that a female subject would learn an instrumental response the reinforcement for which was the opportunity to listen to an androgynous male. The experiment was also designed to investigate the motivational properties of the "masculine" sex-role and its influence on the acquisition of the instrumental response by examining whether the opportunity to listen to an androgynous male functions as a positive reinforcer (as in reward conditioning) or as a negative reinforcer (as in instrumental escape conditioning). Simply stated, is the motivational properties of the "masculine" sex-role appetitive or aversive? Because intermittent shock effects are only evidenced in escape conditioning and do not exist within reward conditioning (e.g., Franchina, 1969), examining social analogs of intermittent shock conditioning provides the opportunity to differentiate between reward and escape conditioning. Accordingly, two possible influences were explored: (a) It was possible that the female subject would find the masculine male aversive, not unlike shock or white noise, and that she would learn the response because listening to the androgynous male was negatively reinforcing, as in instrumental escape conditioning. In other words, despite having the opportunity to listen to the androgynous male on each
trial the subjects that listened to the masculine male at the onset of only some of the trials would acquire the instrumental response, but would respond more slowly than the subjects who listened to the masculine male at the onset of all 10 trials. (b) It was possible that the "masculine" male would have no discernible effect on learning and that the female subject would find listening to an androgynous male positively reinforcing, as in instrumental reward conditioning.
METHOD

Subjects and Confederates

Fifty-one female volunteers enrolled in undergraduate psychology classes at California State University, San Bernardino served as subjects. The subjects ranged in age from 18 to 53 (M = 27). The subjects were randomly assigned to one of the three experimental conditions and all subjects were naive with respect to the true nature of the experiment. Four female and two male research assistants served as experimenters and two male research assistant served as the confederates.

Experimental Design

The research design may be described as a 3 X 10 (Groups X Trials) repeated measures. The first independent variable was the percentage of shock: The number of trials on which a male speaker's comments reflected a "masculine" sex-role orientation (social analog of percent shock; 100%, 50%, 30%). The second independent variable was the conversation trials. The dependent variable was the subject's response speed (100/latency) measured from the time that the conditioned stimulus ("Press switch when ready to hear Speaker 2") was presented to the IR (switch pressing). Pressing the switch afforded the subject the
opportunity to listen to the reinforcing androgynous speaker.

Deception and Masking Task

In order to prevent the subjects from discovering the true nature of the study, the experiment was described as an interpersonal communication study involving three people (a "listener" and two "speakers"). The subject was led to believe that because she was the first to arrive at the laboratory waiting rooms she would be the listener, and the two other participants would serve as the speakers. The two speakers were male research assistants whose comments were delivered on a prerecorded tape. The subject was told that the participants would not be permitted to meet in order to insure confidentiality and facilitate communication. To create the illusion that the other two participants were real people, the subject was led to believe that they would be waiting for the experiment to begin in separate rooms. Two doors adjacent to the subject's waiting room were labeled "Speaker 1" and "Speaker 2." Although neither speaker was present, the subject, while sitting alone in her waiting room, could hear both the independent "arrival" of the speakers and the experimenter delivering the instructions, in-turn, to the speakers.

During the experiment's conversation phase, the subject was informed that the speakers would be in an adjoining room containing two separate cubicles. In actuality, the subject
was listening to prerecorded taped comments controlled by the experimenter in a separate control room. Finally, it was explained that the purpose of the study was to investigate the speakers' and listener's likelihood of future behavior change as a result of having either made or listened to the comments of either one or two other people (50% and 30% condition), or two other people (100% condition). Accordingly, each conversation trial ended with the subject pressing one of the five behavior change buttons, which represented her estimate of behavior change as a result of having listened the speakers' comments. It must be noted that even though the behavior change measure was presented as the major variable of importance, in reality, it was nothing more than a masking task with no theoretical relevance.

Apparatus and Materials

Ten conversation topics were selected based on their general interest to students. Because it was the intent of the research not only to investigate the motivational and reinforcing properties of male sex-role action, but also to strengthen the external validity of the conversation information, empirically derived comments were constructed for the ten situations. Specifically, traits from the Short Form of the Bem Sex Role Inventory (s-BSRI: Bem, 1978) were used to construct the "masculine" and androgynous responses. Each "masculine" comment included two masculine traits,
(e.g., assertiveness, independence) while each androgynous response included one masculine and one feminine trait (e.g., aggressiveness, tenderness). See Appendix A for the list of questions and their corresponding "masculine" and androgynous responses. Each response was constructed to be approximately 30 s in length.

To determine if the speakers would be perceived as "masculine" and androgynous, 98 female subjects served as pre-experiment raters. Specifically, they were asked to read and evaluate on a 7-point Likert-type scale the comments ostensibly made by two undergraduate males. Higher mean scores indicated that the speakers' comments and personality were rated as more masculine and/or more feminine. As expected, the ten "masculine" responses yielded a masculine and feminine rating for the comments of $M = 5.69$ and $M = 1.98$, respectively, with a masculine and feminine rating of $M = 5.75$ and $M = 1.96$, respectively, for the speaker's personality. The 10 androgynous responses yielded a masculine and feminine rating for the comments of $M = 4.51$ and $M = 3.29$. The masculine and feminine ratings for the androgynous speaker's personality were $M = 4.75$ and $M = 3.33$, respectively. Consistent with contemporary theories of androgyny, the androgynous speaker was rated high (above the neutral point) on both the masculinity and femininity scales.
The two male confederates recorded the dialogues on a cassette tape. The order of presentation was determined randomly with both confederates serving equally as the "masculine" speaker and the androgynous speaker. For the purpose of presenting the different levels of shock (50% and 30%), the exclusion of the "masculine" speaker's comments were also randomly determined with the exception that Trial 1 was always a shock trial. Within each condition 4 versions of the taped responses were used and were identical in content except that the "masculine" speaker's comments were excluded on different trials.

The subject's room was furnished with a large table and a chair. Mounted to the top of the table, approximately 50 cm from the subject, was a 45.72 cm x 30.48 cm x 7.62 cm plywood module. The module contained four windows made of transparent mirror glass, a toggle switch with a spring-back return and a behavior change indicator. The four windows were opaque except when illuminated from behind at which time the following instructional signals appeared: "Listen to Speaker 1", "Press switch when ready to hear Speaker 2," "Listen to Speaker 2," and "Behavior Change." The behavior change indicator consisted of 5 buttons. Each button was labeled with statements designed to represent the subject's estimated behavior change and ranged from "very likely to change my behavior" to "not very likely to change my behavior".
Additional experimental materials included a microphone/headset (Califone 2960), a list of fifteen possible questions for discussion (ten experimental questions and five distraction questions; see Appendix B), and a subject's evaluation questionnaire (see Appendix C). The list of possible questions for discussion were taped to the table directly in front of the subject, and the evaluation questionnaire was placed in a packet attached to a clipboard on the right side of the table. The questionnaire was constructed with two purposes in mind: (a) to assess the subject's perceptions of the speakers' comments; and (b) to measure the subject's evaluation of the speakers' personality on a variety of dimensions. The subject indicated her evaluation by checking a 7-point scale anchored with the phrases: very unclear and very clear, masculine and not masculine, very inappropriate and very appropriate, very honest and very dishonest, and not feminine and feminine. The subject's evaluation of the speakers' personalities involved checking a 7-point scale anchored with the phrases: very likeable and not very likeable, not masculine and masculine, very intelligent and not very intelligent, not very similar to me and very similar to me, very moral and not very moral, not feminine and feminine, very mentally healthy and not mentally healthy, homosexual and heterosexual.
The experimenter's room contained a control module, a microphone/headset and a cassette tape recorder/player (Sanyo, Model RD-W44). The control module contained the controls for turning on the subject's instructional signals along with a timer to measure the subject's switch pressing response to .01 s (Colburn, Model R11-25). Additional equipment included a response timer (Layfayette, Model 45419), a mic mixer (Sony, Model MX-300), and a white noise generator (Colburn, Model S81-02) which was operated at a minimal output level to serve the purpose of masking any "tape hiss." Finally, the subject's behavior change indicator was connected to an identical panel in the experimenter's control room.

After completing the conversation phase, the subject was given a 4-item Demographic Questionnaire (see Appendix D), and an 11-item Subject Reaction Questionnaire adopted from Schwartz and Gottlieb (1980) and Pantin and Carver (1982) (see Appendix E). For the purpose of measuring the subject's reactions to an experiment involving deception, the subject was asked to indicate on a 7-point scale, anchored with phrases Not at all and Very much, how much she enjoyed participating in the experiment, to what degree she found the experiment instructive about herself and about the social sciences, and how willing she was to participate in another experiment. Each subject also indicated on a 7-point scale, anchored with the phrases Much less and Much
more changes in her trust in authority and her initial positive evaluation of experimental research after having participating in the experiment. Finally, each subject was asked to respond Yes or No to the following questions: "Should this research be permitted to continue?"; "Is this research justified?"; "Did the explanation about the experiment satisfy you?"; "Do you regret participating in the experiment?"; "Are you resentful about having been deceived?"

**Procedure**

Subjects reported individually to a suite of waiting rooms. The doors to the three waiting rooms were labeled "Listener", "Speaker 1" and "Speaker 2". The subject was greeted by the experimenter, escorted into the listener's waiting room, and asked to read an Informed Consent Form (see Appendix F). After the subject signed the consent form, she was told that she would be participating in an interpersonal communication study involving three people. She was also informed that because she was the first to arrive she would be the listener in the experiment and that two other participants would be the speakers. The experimenter stated that the purpose of the study was to examine how listening to other people comment on their behavior, compared to having expressed some action verbally, would effect estimates of future behavior change. The
experimenter then excused herself to return to the hallway to ostensibly wait for the other participants to arrive.

The close proximity of the waiting rooms not only permitted the subject to overhear the experimenter return with each bogus subject, but also provided her the opportunity to again hear the experimenter give the instructions, in-turn, to the speakers. The instructions read to the bogus speakers were identical to the instructions that the subject received except for one addition: Each speaker was asked to review a list of possible questions for discussion and note a few responses to assist them in commenting during the conversation phase.

After creating the illusion that both speakers had arrived, the experimenter returned to the listener's waiting room and escorted her to the laboratory. Just inside the laboratory, the experimenter verbally pointed out two cubicles labeled "Speaker 1" and "Speaker 2" along with the closed door leading to an adjacent room labeled "Listener." Once inside the listener's room, the subject was seated in front of the listener's equipment module. The experimenter pointed out the headset and the list of possible questions for discussion taped to the table. The experimenter explained that additional instructions would follow over the headset. Leaving the door open, the experimenter left the listener's room to "escort" the speakers, in turn, to the laboratory. During this time, the subject could hear the
experimenter exit and reenter the laboratory twice, escort
the bogus speakers to their respective cubicles, and give
them their additional instructions.

After approximately 60 s had elapsed, the bogus speakers
and the listener were requested to confirm that the
equipment was in working order by responding to the
question: "Can you hear me?" Following the speakers' tape
recorded responses: "Yes I can", and the subject's
response, the experimenter began the conversation phase by
reading the instructions to the participants. The
experimenter read the instructions because it was important
for the subject to believe the speakers' comments were
spontaneous.

The experimenter explained to the participants that
during the conversation phase she would be selecting several
common situations and asking the speakers to comment. It
was explained that the speakers would be given an
opportunity to comment on how they have behaved in that
situation or how they think they would behave if confronted
with the situation. The speakers were asked to try to limit
their comments to about 30 s in length. In order to
establish the speakers' sincerity, the participants were
further informed that only the listener would be able to
hear the comments. In addition, the experimenter instructed
the participants to observe their instructional signal
lights. The experimenter explained that when Speaker 2
finished commenting the "Behavior Change" signals would automatically be illuminated. It was at this time that the participants could estimate the likelihood of behavior change in the future, for the situation just discussed.

100% Shock Condition: In the 100% condition, an experimental trial began by the experimenter indicating the number of the situation selected from the list of possible topics for discussion, and reading the question. This was followed by the illumination of the "Listen to Speaker 1" signal on the subject's module and the simultaneous initiation of the "masculine" speaker's prerecorded comments. At the completion of the comments, the experimenter stopped the tape and the "Listen to Speaker 1" signal was extinguished and the conditioned stimulus ("Press switch when ready to hear Speaker 2 comment") was illuminated; this procedure initiated the latency timer. The subject's performance of the IR (switch-pressing) stopped the latency timer and simultaneously illuminated the "Listen to Speaker 2" signal. At this point the experimenter played the androgynous speaker's prerecorded comments. At the conclusion of Speaker 2's comments, the instructional signal ("Listen to Speaker 2") was extinguished and the Behavior Change signal was illuminated. When the subject indicated her estimate of behavior change on the 5-button behavior change panel, the conversation trial was concluded. This procedure was followed for 10 conversation trials.
Following the completion of the ten trials, the subject and the bogus speakers were instructed to complete the packet attached to a clipboard on the right side of their tables. The subject's packet contained the Subject Evaluation Questionnaire. When the subject indicated over the headset that she had completed the questionnaire, the experimenter entered the listener's room and the debriefing phase began. During this final phase, the subject was informed of the true nature of the study, and invited to ask any additional questions. The subject was then asked to complete a Subject Reaction Questionnaire and Demographic Questionnaire. After completing the questionnaires, the subject was thanked for her participation and dismissed.

50% and 30% Shock Condition: The 50% and 30% shock conditions were similar to the 100% shock condition except that Speaker 1 ("masculine" comments: social analog of shock) were heard on only 50% or 30% of the trials. The subject was informed that if Speaker 1 was not required to comment on a particular situation, the "Listen to Speaker 1" signal would not be illuminated and instead there would be a 30 s pause. Having Speaker 1 comment on only some of the trials was in keeping with the study's rationale. Recall, that preliminary instructions stated that the research was interested in investigating behavior change when someone commented or only listened.
RESULTS

Response Speeds

Figure 1 shows effects that are analogous to intermittent shock effects in escape conditioning. Despite having the opportunity to listen to the androgynous male on each conversation trial, subjects that listened to the "masculine" male at the outset of only some of the trials acquired the IR, but responded more slowly than the subjects who listened to the "masculine" male at the outset of all 10 trials. A 3 X 10 (Groups X Trials) repeated measures ANOVA revealed a significant groups effect, F(2,48) = 7.99, p < .01, and a significant trials effect, F(18,288) = 6.52, p < .001. Just as in learning research, the experimental groups began at a similar low level of performance and then gradually diverged across the 10 conversation trials. Simple effects tests indicated that all groups acquired the IR: 100% shock, F(9,144) = 3.49, p < .001; 50% shock, F(9,144) = 1.76, p < .08; and 30% shock, F(9,144) = 2.98, p < .002.

Post-Conversation Evaluations

Both the "masculine" and androgynous speakers' comments were rated as more masculine than feminine ("masculine" speaker M = 6.31 and M = 1.61, respectively, and the androgynous speaker M = 5.43 and M = 2.35, respectively).
Figure 1

Intermittent shock and continuous analogs: Acquisition curves of instrumental response speed following the intermittent and continuous presentation of comments from the masculine male.
with the greatest difference being evidenced by the "masculine" male. The speakers' personality ratings showed a similar pattern: for the "masculine" speaker (masculinity $M = 6.00$; femininity $M = 1.69$), and for the androgynous speaker (masculinity $M = 5.78$; femininity $M = 2.41$). Again, the greatest discrepancy between the masculinity and femininity ratings occurred for the "masculine" speaker. The influence of the androgynous speaker's voice appears to have resulted in an augmentation of his masculinity ratings and an attenuation of his femininity ratings compared to the ratings obtained in pretesting.

A 3 X 10 (Groups X Speaker) repeated measures MANOVA was performed on the post-conversation evaluations. The MANOVA indicated that the combined evaluations were significantly affected by the speakers' sex-role, $F(13,36) = 13.79$, $p < .001$; neither the groups effect nor the interaction was statistically reliable. Univariate tests were performed to more precisely investigate the subjects' evaluations of the speakers' comments and personalities; the means and standard deviations are presented in Table 1. The androgynous male was rated more favorably than the "masculine" male on several dimensions. The androgynous male's comments were rated as more appropriate, $F(1,48) = 100.61$, $p < .001$, and as more honest, $F(1,48) = 12.05$, $p < .001$. The speakers' comments were rated as very clear. The androgynous male was also judged more likeable, $F(1,48) =$
Table 1

Evaluations of Masculine and Androgynous Speakers and Their Comments by Subjects Following Intermittent Shock Conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION ITEM</th>
<th>MASCULINE SPEAKER</th>
<th>ANDROGYNOUS SPEAKER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of comments</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of comments</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty of comments</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeableness</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar to me</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morality</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexuality</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 51. Mean ratings reflect a scale of 1 = Not Very to 7 = Very.
98.88, p < .001, more intelligent, \( F(1,48) = 36.64, p < .001 \), more moral, \( F(1,48) = 53.62, p < .001 \), more mentally healthy \( F(1,48) = 20.47, p < .001 \), and more similar to herself \( F(1,48) = 108.13, p < .001 \) than his "masculine" counterpart. Finally, the speakers did not differ on the sexuality dimension.

**Subjects Evaluation of the Experiment**

As evidenced by the results presented in Table 2, the subjects' evaluation of the experiment were very positive. Specifically, the subjects reported that they enjoyed participating in the experiment \( (M = 6.39) \), found the experiment instructive about themselves \( (M = 4.65) \), and were quite willing to participate in a future experiment \( (M = 6.77) \). The subjects' also indicated that they found the experiment quite instructive about the social sciences \( (M = 5.09) \). Consistent with previous research \( \text{(Cramer, McMaster, Bartell, & Dragna; 1986)} \), the subjects reported that their trust in authority was not affected by their participation in an experiment involving deception \( (M = 4.26) \). Finally, the majority of the subjects indicated that their initial positive evaluation of experimental research was the same or somewhat more positive after having participated in the experiment \( (M = 5.04) \).

All of the subjects reported that they thought the research should be permitted to continue, while explanations about the experiment were rated as satisfactory by 94.1% of
Table 2

Percent Of Subjects' Response To Questions About The Experiment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Some-what</th>
<th>Quite</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. enjoyed participating</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. instructive about social sciences</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. instructive about myself</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. willing to participate in another experiment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Much less</th>
<th>Less</th>
<th>Somewhat less</th>
<th>Somewhat Same</th>
<th>Somewhat more</th>
<th>Much more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. trust in authority</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. evaluation of experimental research</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent based on N=51
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Should the research be permitted to continue?</td>
<td>Yes: 100.0, No: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Is the research justified?</td>
<td>Yes: 96.1(^a), No: 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Did the explanations satisfy you?</td>
<td>Yes: 94.1, No: 5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Do you regret participating?</td>
<td>Yes: 2.0, No: 98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Are you resentful about having been deceived?</td>
<td>Yes: 5.9, No: 94.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Percent based on \(N=50\)
the subjects. Additionally, 94.1% of the subjects indicated that they were not resentful about having been deceived. Almost all of the subjects (96.1%) reported that the research was justified, and 98% that they did not regret participating in the experiment.
DISCUSSION

Social Learning Effects

As expected, the use of general learning theory was valuable for investigating male sex-role action. The present study clarified the motivational properties of the male sex-role and its influence on the acquisition of an instrumental response. Despite having the opportunity to listen to the androgynous male on each conversation trial, subjects that listened to the stereotyped "masculine" male at the onset of only some of trials acquired the instrumental response, but responded more slowly than the subjects who listened to the "masculine" male at the onset of all ten trials. In addition, the experimental group factor did not interact with the subjects' perception of the speakers' comments or personality ratings. This clearly indicated that the intermittent shock effects resulted from the differential group manipulation and not different between-group perceptions of speakers' characteristics. Accordingly, listening to a "masculine" male was aversive, whereas listening to an androgynous male was negatively reinforcing, as in escape conditioning (see Bartell, 1986).

Subjects' Evaluations of the Speakers

The assumption that the "masculine" male's comments motivated subjects' escape responses was further supported
by the subjects' ratings of the speakers' comments and personalities. For example, the androgynous speaker's comments were judged to be more appropriate and more honest than the "masculine" speaker's comments. These results do not appear to have occurred from differing perceptions of clarity, as both speakers were evaluated as approximately equal on this dimension. The androgynous speaker was also rated more likeable, more intelligent, more moral, and more mentally healthy. In addition, subjects found the androgynous male to be more similar to themselves compared to the "masculine" male. Finally, the speakers were not differentially rated on the sexuality dimension.

Though this experiment represents a departure from popular methodology (e.g., short written protocol or trait descriptions) typically employed in sex-role investigations, the subjects' evaluations of the androgynous and "masculine" male are strikingly similar to previously reported research (see Jackson, 1983; Korabik, 1982; Kulik & Harackiewicz, 1979; Major et al., 1981). Hence, not only does this research provide consistent information regarding the subjects' interpersonal evaluations of the androgynous male and "masculine" male, but it also contributes importantly to our understanding of the dynamics underlying male sex-role action.
Subjects' Evaluations of the Experiment

The ethical question regarding the use of deception in psychological research has been a major area of concern and controversy that continues to plague the field of psychology. Although the present study's methodology included deception, the results clearly indicated that not only was valuable information obtained regarding male sex-role action, but the experiment also served as an educational and positive experience for the subjects. For example, subjects reported that they found the experiment quite instructive about themselves and the social sciences. In addition, the subjects indicated that they enjoyed participating in the experiment and were quite willing to be participants in future experiments.

Tesch (1977) argued that effective post-experimental debriefing includes insuring: (a) that subjects who participated in the experiment do not leave the experimental setting with negative feelings about themselves; and (b) that the experiment also serves as an educational function for the subjects in return for their time and effort. With Tesch's suggestions in mind, an interactive debriefing session was designed that provided subjects with valuable information regarding (a) the true purpose of the experiment; (b) the reasons for the use of deception in social science investigations; (c) the confidentiality of individual results; and (d) the use of group data in
experimental research. Of equal importance, this interactive approach served to provide an environment that was conducive to reducing any negative feelings that could have arisen. Specifically, time was set aside for open dialogue which established a positive and equal rapport between the subjects and the experimenter. Besides using this time to help alleviate any negative feelings, this time was used to answer any additional questions the subjects may have had.

These debriefing sessions appeared very effective, as is reflected in the subjects' positive evaluations. For example, subjects reported that their evaluations of experimental research were somewhat more positive after having participated. Consistent with previous research (Bartell, 1986; Cramer, McMaster, Bartell, & Dragna, 1987; Helzer, 1987) the subjects reported that their trust in authority was not affected by their participation. A majority of the subjects indicated that the explanations regarding the purpose of the experiment were satisfactory and that they were not resentful about being deceived. Finally, almost all of the subjects reported that the research was justified, and all of the subjects agreed that the research should be permitted to continue.

Implications for Future Research

The results of the present study, and the results of a similar study (Bartell, 1986) indicated that the "masculine"
male functioned as an aversive social stimulus. Subjects exposed to the "masculine" male on all of the conversation trials performed the instrumental response faster than subjects exposed to him on only some of the trials. The effects show a striking correspondence with effects observed in escape conditioning using conventional noxious drives such as shock and white noise. The results also imply that much can be learned from the continued exploitation of the escape conditioning paradigm. However, it would be a mistake for learning theorists to feel compelled to use only the escape model.

One avenue for future research on the "masculine" sex-role involves one of social psychology's most frequently studied phenomenon, social facilitation. Social facilitation effects pertain to the observation that in certain circumstances a person's performance is facilitated by the presence of others, whereas, in other circumstances, the presence of others retards performance. These apparently contradictory effects are explainable in terms of learning-theoretical models of social facilitation (Zajonc, 1965; Weiss & Miller, 1971). For example, Weiss and Miller argued that the presence of an audience during the performance of a task functions in a manner analogous to a noxious drive such as shock or white noise. The results of previous research indicated that subjects performing a task in the presence of an audience report being frustrated.
and/or anxious. Weiss and Miller (1971) argued that the audience (learned drive) has the effect of energizing all of the subject's response tendencies, with the greatest benefit accorded the dominant responses. Therefore, performance on a task requiring the subject to use a dominant response would be facilitated by the energizing audience. On the other hand, performance on a task requiring a non-dominant response (a response a subject has little skill in performing) would be retarded by the audience energizing dominant but competing responses. Performance is retarded when the audience energizes responses that compete with the response required for the successful completion of the task.

Several predictions regarding the effects of the presence of a "masculine" male on a women's task performance can be offered using the theoretical scheme briefly outlined above. Suppose a female subject is asked to perform a task in the presence of either an appetitive androgynous male or an aversive "masculine" male. Both types of men, because they represent an audience, would be expected to energize the subject's response tendencies. However, given the results of the present study, it can be argued that the "masculine" male would be expected to result in greater energization of the subjects' responses than his androgynous counterpart. Consistent with Weiss and Miller's theory, the "masculine" male, compared to the androgynous male, would be expected to facilitate the female's performance on a task.
she was competent to perform. The "masculine" male would be expected to retard the females performance on a task were energized competing responses would interfere with the response necessary to successfully complete the task. The predictions outlined above are intended to be illustrative rather than exhaustive. The predictions, however, do indicate that future research on the male sex-role can benefit from the use of learning models other than escape conditioning. The results of the present study, therefore, not only extends the work of sex-role researchers, but also contributes to expanding the range of potentially useful learning paradigms.

Implications of Results for the Modern Male

Besides the cultural changes previously mentioned that appear to necessitate sex-role change and readjustment, the results of this study attest to the assumption that there appears to be a general movement away from traditional sex-role norms. As previously reported, the androgynous male, not the stereotyped "masculine" male, was rated as more likable, more intelligent, more honest and more appropriate by females subjects. These results lend support to Pleck's (1976) assumption that "...there is ample reason to believe that men have considerable gains to make in loosening and changing their role" (p. 162).

Within our modern technological society, the traditional man is obsolete and gradually having the same destiny as the
"Big American Car." Physical and emotional strength once required for hunting, fishing and combat are now replaced by the need for interpersonal skills, which are necessary for smooth collaboration in today's modern society.

As Boles and Tatro (1980) pointed out "androgyyny is seen by many as inevitable" (p. 234). However, the demand to incorporate both masculine and feminine characteristics into male behavior repertoires is often met (not surprisingly) with a general pattern of gender-role conflict and strain resulting from rigid sex-role socialization experiences imposed on males (O'Neil, 1981). As O'Neil suggested, "...many men develop a fear of femininity while trying to prove the superiority of their masculinity" (p. 206).

Biggs and Fiebert (1984) reported that"... a quite liberal set of attitudes is growing for men and stands in sharp contrast to the traditional perspective across a wide spectrum of life activities" (p. 116). However, males felt that the "loss of the traditional male role is accompanied by a loss of face and power" (p. 115). Similarly, Mirra Karousky, (cited by Boles and Tatro, 1980), found that even though the men she interviewed expressed nontraditional attitudes they still measured themselves against the traditional male stereotype. Moreover, the men were aware of the cost involved in adhering to traditional sex-roles but they were still willing to pay the price.
Consistent with O'Nell's (1981) fear of femininity assumption, Boles and Tatro (1980) noted that men see femininity as the only alternative to masculinity. It must be noted that old standards are not completely thrown out, rather "new dimensions are incorporated and old norms modified." For example, Tavris (1977) conducted an interview of 28,000 males and females in order to identify the modern views of masculinity. She found that females characterized the "ideal" modern male to be physically strong as well as gentle, to display emotional strength while demonstrating sensitivity, and being expressive while remaining stable. The results of this study provided additional evidence that, not only have views about masculinity changed, but that female's responses to these changes were positive.

As O'Leary and Donoghue (1978) pointed out, "if there is one tragedy associated with the adult male role as traditionally defined, it is perhaps men's belief that deviation from that role will result in negative consequences" (p. 25). Perhaps the positive results of studies such as the present one can help assure men that their fears are not warranted. Without these fears, O'Leary and Donoghue (1978) suggests men may be more able to enjoy the "freedom from artificial constraints imposed on all of us by sex-roles" (p. 25).
APPENDIX A

Hypothetical Question and Response Sets

Question 1: It is past time for your 90 day review which involves discussion of your work performance and a raise. Your supervisor has not yet set up a time and date for the evaluation. What would you do in this situation?

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

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

Question 2: A friend has just ended a long-term relationship and you think he may be upset about it. What would you do in this situation?

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

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

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

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

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

Question 4: You are watching a sad movie at home with your girlfriend and you feel as if you are about to cry. What would you do in this situation?

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

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

**Question 5:** Your car breaks down and the gas station mechanic says that it will cost $500.00 to fix it. What would you do in this situation?

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

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

**Question 6:** You have been waiting patiently in line when a woman cuts in front of you. What would you do in this situation?

**Speaker 1's Response:** Well let's see...I can see myself being forceful in a situation like this. I would simply direct the woman to the end of the line. My time is just as valuable as hers...If I have to wait, why shouldn't she? If she refused to go to the end of the line, I might have to be even more assertive. I wouldn't think twice about telling the person in charge and having them escort her to the back of the line.

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

**Question 7:** Your sister is going out of town for the weekend and she needs to leave her 3-year-old son with you. What would you do in this situation?

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

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

**Question 8:** You have been offered a new job that involves a promotion and a pay raise. The job would require that you and your family move across the country, and they need an answer as soon as possible. What would you do in this situation?

**Speaker 1's Response:** Well...being a competitive person, I could not let an opportunity like that pass me by. I know mobility is a criterion for climbing the corporate ladder and I know my family would be excited and back me 100%. Yah, the decision would be easy to make. I'd let them know we could have our bags packed by the end of the week!

**Speaker 2's Response:** That sounds great. But...if I had a family there would be a lot of things to consider...I would definitely be sensitive to their needs...In the end it would have to be a family decision. And...if we all agreed it was a good move, I'd take the job. I'm really ambitious and would enjoy the challenge that goes along with a new job and a move across the country.
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Question 9: You are attracted to someone in one of your classes. What would you do in this situation?

Speaker 1’s Response: Well...Let’s see....If I were attracted to someone, I would just be assertive and go up to her on the break and start talking about the professor....or the homework. I’m not afraid to talk to girls....I’d ask her for her phone number so we could go out sometime. I like to take my dates out to dinner and a movie. Of course, in this kind of situation you run the risk of her saying no, but I wouldn’t let that stand in my way...I’d ask her out.

Speaker 2’s Response: Well...You know in situations like this I can be shy because you can never be sure if she is going to like you too. There is definitely a risk involved...But I’m sure I would take the risk and find an excuse to talk to her so I could get to know her a little better and find out the kind of things she likes to do. I know everyone is not interested in the same things, but I’m sure we could find something we could both enjoy doing.

Question 10: Your mother is ill and your father is out of town. You have just been called home to help out in this situation. What would you do?

Speaker 1’s Response: Well...I’d certainly go home if my family asked me to and act as the leader by taking over the responsibilities of running the house. The first thing I would do is call my sisters to come over and do the cooking and cleaning...I would take care of the yard...or make sure the car is running O.K....or fix anything that was broken...In situations like this you just need to take charge, and I have leadership abilities so I’m sure I could handle it.

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

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

2. You are required to complete some community volunteer work for a class you are enrolled in. What would you like to do?

3. A friend has just ended a long-term relationship and you think he may be upset about it. What would you do in this situation?

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

5. If you had the opportunity to use a VCR, what programs would you tape for later viewing?

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

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

8. You have a Saturday afternoon free from all commitments. How would you spend this time?

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

10. Your sister is going out of town for the weekend and she needs to leave her 3 year-old son with you. What would you do in this situation?
11. You have been offered a new job that involves a promotion and a pay raise. The job would require that you and your family move across the country, and they need an answer as soon as possible. What would you do in this situation?

12. If you had unlimited time and money what career would you pursue?

13. You are a member of a campus club and it is time for the group to decide how to spend the money it has raised. How would you handle this situation?

14. You are attracted to someone in one of your classes. What would you do in this situation?

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

Post-Conversation Questionnaire

Listener, since you have had the opportunity to hear Speaker #1 and Speaker #2 comments, we would like you to complete these questionnaires. Please evaluate each of the Speakers by placing a check in the blank space that best describes how you feel. The Speakers will not be made aware of your evaluations.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unclear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masculine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very inappropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very honest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feminine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

not masculine

very appropriate

very appropriate

very dishonest

not feminine
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2. After listening to Speaker #1 (2), I found Speaker #1 (#2) to be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very likeable</th>
<th>not very likeable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>masculine</td>
<td>not</td>
<td>masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very intelligent</td>
<td>not very</td>
<td>very intelligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>similar to me</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>not very similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to me</td>
<td></td>
<td>to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immoral</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>immoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feminine</td>
<td>not</td>
<td>feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentally healthy</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>mentally healthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heterosexual</td>
<td></td>
<td>heterosexual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX D

Demographic Questionnaire

1. How old are you? ____

2. Sex
   
   male ____
   
   female ____

3. Education
   
   A. Level (please check one)
      
      freshman ____
      
      sophomore ____
      
      junior ____
      
      senior ____
      
      graduate ____
      
   B. Major (please check one)
      
      Administration/Business ____
      
      Education ____
      
      Humanities ____
      
      Natural Sciences ____
      
      Social & Behavioral Sciences ____
C. Highest degree you plan to obtain (please check one)
   B.A./B.S. ______
   M.A./M.S. ______
   Ph.D./M.D. ______
   Other ______

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

   If yes, approximately when did you participate?
APPENDIX E

Subject's Reaction Questionnaire

Please place a check in the blank space to the right of the statement presented on the left.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not At All</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Quite</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. I enjoyed participating in this experiment
   
2. I found the experiment instructive about the social sciences
   
3. I found the experiment instructive about myself
   
4. I am willing to participate in another experiment in the future
Appendix E (cont'd)

As a result of participating in this experiment I am:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less</td>
<td>less</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Trusting in authorities</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Positive about my evaluation of experimental research</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Should this research be permitted to continue?</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Is the research justified?</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Did the explanations about the purpose of the experiment satisfy you?</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. Do you regret having participated in the experiment?</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11. Are you resentful about having been deceived?</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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APPENDIX F

Consent Form

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

NAME__________________________

(PRINT)

SIGNATURE_____________________

DATE__________________________
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