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ABSTRACT

Although reactions to women's sex-role behavior have been studied extensively, reactions to male's sex-role behavior have been virtually neglected. Subjects listened to a male confederate give traditional "masculine" responses to questions posed by an experimenter. Subjects then performed the instrumental response, the reinforcement for which was the opportunity to hear another male confederate respond in an androgynous manner. As expected, the speed of the instrumental response increased with the number of trials. Also, as expected, self-report measures indicated that subjects rated the masculine speaker higher than the androgynous speaker in most areas. No effect for sex-role orientation of the evaluator was found. Discussion focuses on the difference of self-report and behavioral measures, and the possible meanings behind these results.
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INTRODUCTION

One of the most popular research topics in the field of social and behavioral science in the last ten to fifteen years has been that of male and female sex roles. Literature abounds concerning topics extending from sex-role learning (Bandura, Ross & Ross, 1963; Mischel, 1970), to sex-role preferences (Raskin & Israel, 1981). Sex-role behavior has been studied in relationship to marital satisfaction (Singer-Hendrick, 1981), depression (Small, Gessner,& Ferguson, 1984; Klienke, Staneski & Mason, 1982), and androgyny (Bem, 1974, 1975). The majority of these studies, however, have been conducted using either women or children as subjects. Women have been studied due to the interests associated with the feminist movement, while children have been studied to explore the earliest forms of acquisitions of sex-role behavior. Although there have been a handful of mixed gender studies, practically none have focused exclusively on males.

One major area that has not had much attention paid to it is that of sex-role congruence in males. That is, little research has been directed towards males who behave in a traditional versus a non-traditional manner. In order to address this issue we must first examine sex-role behavior in children which serves as the precursor for adult
sex roles.

Children's Sex Roles

Bandura (1963) studied sex-role learning in children from preschool age to age eight. He hypothesized that sex roles are learned much like any other type of behavior. He believes sex roles are learned through modeling, imitation, reinforcement, and punishment. Mischel (1970) also examined preschool and young children in relation to sex-role learning, and found that children acquire sex-role behavior through typical learning methods (i.e., classical conditioning, instrumental learning, shaping, operant learning).

Both of these researchers found sex-typed behavior in children as young as three years old. For example, Mischel and Bandura both had preschool children (male and female) watch an appropriate sex model and an inappropriate sex model. The models were female and male. They found that girls tended to exhibit less same-sex imitation than boys, but both groups exhibited imitation only when the behavior was perceived as sex-role appropriate, whether male or female. The tendency for girls to imitate less than boys supports the idea of greater role flexibility for girls and greater status/power for the male sex role (Lynn, 1959; Bandura, Ross, & Ross, 1963).

In addition to sex-role learning, researchers have also investigated sex-role stereotypes held by children. Focusing on children from preschool age to age eight, studies
have shown that children expect a lower level of competence from females than they do from males (Bridges & Del Ciampo, 1981). Birnbaum, Nosanchuk, and Croll (1980) found that boys prefer boy-toys more often than girls prefer girl-toys. Also, boys perceive themselves in a more sex-typed way than do girls. Boys in first and third grades believed that boys were more competent than girls at neutral activities whereas girls did not allow gender to influence their ratings of competence (Bridges & Del Ciampo 1981). Moreover, boys engage in more sex-typing of household chores than do girls. Lamb, Easterbrooks, and Holden (1980) studied children who engaged in a ten minute play period. Reinforcements and punishments from peers were recorded and results support the idea that boys reinforce and punish one another in line with traditional sex-role stereotypes when entering into free play.

Birnbaum et al. (1980) also found that children possess pronounced stereotypes about sex differences in emotionality. They associate anger with maleness and happiness, sadness, and fear with femaleness. They concluded that children's stereotypes are similar to those held by adults, but are largely dissimilar to actual sex differences in emotionality. These data suggest that stereotypes held by adults begin at a very early age and are deeply ingrained by adulthood.
Children's Sex-role Acquisition and Role-congruency

One of the main ways in which children acquire their sex roles is through peer reinforcement and punishment. Bridges and Del Ciampo (1981) found that children are rewarded and punished most often by same gender peers, and that boys are punished more severely than girls for out-of-role behavior. In addition, adults mete out more punishments for incongruent male behavior than incongruent female behavior. These actions by adults may contribute to boys' stronger beliefs about sex-appropriate behaviors than girls.

Further support for theories of peer reinforcement and punishment comes from a study by Lamb, et al. (1980). They showed that sex-role inappropriate acts are terminated more quickly than sex-role appropriate acts when these acts are followed by punishment. Interestingly enough, children were found to reinforce one another primarily for gender-appropriate activities. This study coincides with others which demonstrate that preschoolers administer reinforcements and punishments in accordance with conventional sex-role stereotypes (Fagot, 1977; Fagot & Patterson, 1969; Lamb & Roopnarine, 1979).

Another way children learn their sex roles is through imitation and modeling. Raskin and Israel (1981) studied the child, the sex of the model, and the sex-appropriateness of the modeled behavior. Results in this study
correspond to previous research in this area. Boys imitated less than girls when exposed to sex-role inappropriate models. In fact, sex-role appropriateness undermines the hypothesis of same-sex imitation. It appears to be far more important for the model to behave in a sex-role appropriate manner than to be of a certain gender. Furthermore, a male model exhibiting inappropriate behavior is less imitated than a female model showing inappropriate behavior by both gender children (Raskin & Israel, 1981). These findings indicate the importance of sex-role congruence to children of a very young age.

Adult Male Sex Role

If as these studies show, children punish and reinforce one another for sex-role congruent and incongruent behavior, might the same be true of adults? Further, if male children are punished more severely and consistently for out-of-role behavior, are adult males treated the same? Finally, if male children both engage in more stereotyping and behave in a more sex-typed manner than female children, is this also the case with adult males?

Few researchers have addressed these questions in relation to adult males. Some have looked at the new male sex role (Pleck, 1976; Moreland, 1980; Boles & Tatro, 1980) in relation to the issues, effects, and limitations of the changing role for men. Others have examined the emerging male sex role in relation to the concept of androgyny
(Boles & Tatro, 1980; Fasteau, 1974; Pleck, 1976). Still others have looked at the issues involved in shedding the traditional male sex role and adopting a new one (Bear, Berger, & Wright, 1979). However, none of these studies have focused specifically on individual's reactions to adult males in various sex role behaviors. Instead, most have examined attitudinal reactions to males using written scenarios or character descriptions of male sex role behavior. The few studies that have used behavioral reactions to males have utilized women as subjects (Bartell, 1986).

It is important to understand how males react to other males in various sex role behaviors as well, in order to eliminate some of the confusion which comes with changing from the traditional to a more androgynous role.

Before addressing this issue the traditional male sex role must first be defined. Historically men are "supposed" to be strong, unemotional, tough, silent, competent, and fearless. They are not allowed to be vulnerable, weak, needy, or in any way possess feminine traits (Boles & Tatro, 1980). The new or non-traditional male sex role offers some alternatives to men. The concept of androgyny allows an individual to encompass both stereotypical masculine and feminine characteristics. Hence a person can be both competent and emotional, strong, and nurturant, vulnerable and fearless. Unfortunately, this avenue has been most open to females. Males and females alike have
been less tolerant of males who aspire to androgynous characteristics than females who do likewise. For example, in his book *Men and Masculinity*, Joseph Pleck (1976) narrates example after example of men being punished for breaking out of the traditional male sex role. From the smallest infractions such as refusing to participate in sports, to larger, more socially unacceptable ones, such as announcing one's gayness, Pleck supports the notion of the restrictive nature of the male sex role.

Besides being constrictive and unrealistic, the cost of failure in the traditional male sex role is high. Boles and Tatro (1980) have shown that lost social status for men can precipitate alcoholism, suicide, depression, mental illness, and physical illness. Trying to maintain oneself in such a role is an exhaustive and risky business. At the same time, the existence of two sets of contradictory standards (traditional and non-traditional) can produce considerable stress. Men who try to oscillate between the two, or to incorporate new androgynous characteristics are caught in a double-bind situation. Conflict regarding the appropriateness of the new male sex role may cause just as much stress as trying to live up to the traditional "macho" image of the male sex role.

In his review of the current literature, Moreland (1980) suggests that the male sex role cannot be understood without adopting a developmental approach. Within this
framework he sees men as reevaluating their sex roles at crucial periods throughout their lives. Thus, their sex roles are challenged periodically by physical changes, social responsibilities, and existential introspection. Therefore, there are several opportunities for men to change and incorporate new aspects into their sex roles.

Bear, Berger, and Wright (1979) address the issue of the incorporation of new aspects into a man's existing sex role. This study is enlightening as to some of the institutional constraints placed on men, as well as the social ones, when trying to change their prescribed sex roles. The traditional role with its emphasis on physical prowess, production, and lack of affect is being mediated with new androgynous concepts. The working world does not allow men to totally disregard the old standards. Nor may men totally incorporate a new sensitivity, or emotionality into their lives. Clinicians trying to aid men in their struggles to define and assimilate aspects of androgyny have a delicate line to balance. Men must both hold onto some of the old standards while attempting to incorporate some of the new concepts. David and Brannon (1976) summarize these issues with this statement: "Man's body as the primary tool in shaping the world is nearly obsolete and the distinctions between men that were created on the basis of it have lost their validity." (p. 109)

In previous times men were to be brave, independent,
and strong; they feared weakness, illness, and vulnerability. Unfortunately, in industrial societies with their complex divisions of labor, it is increasingly difficult for men to act in an independent and self-reliant manner. Instead, negotiation, cooperation, and group effort are increasingly important for success, and even survival.

In summary then, it seems as if some alternative sex role behaviors are becoming available, and perhaps even necessary to men. Historically the old sex role may have been adaptive, but these constraints are beginning to seem not necessarily conducive to today's society. Whether or not men aspire to these new androgynous sex roles, however, depends on many aspects of their lives.

Adult Sex-role Stereotypes

Most of the authors who have addressed the new male sex role have done so from a theoretical approach with little information to support their hypotheses. To understand how these hypotheses translate into behavior it is important to look at the sex-role stereotypes placed on men's behavior.

A review of the studies concerning sex-role stereotypes points to a rather consistent group of findings regarding expectancies. One of the most frequently cited findings is in regard to the perceived psychological health of certain personality characteristics. For example, in one group of studies (Feinman, 1974; Seyfried & Hendrick, 1973;
Stereotypical masculine traits (e.g. competence, achievement) were perceived as healthier than stereotypical feminine traits (e.g. nurturance, emotionality). Scher (1984) reports that traditionally masculine characteristics have become more acceptable for women because they are viewed as more socially desirable and psychologically healthier by both genders. The reverse, however, is not true. Males attempting to develop their feminine characteristics (e.g. gentleness, cooperativeness) do not find the bonus in self-esteem nor the social approval afforded to women.

Feinman (1984) attributes this phenomena of less social approval for men aspiring to androgyny to the relative status of the male role in society. Because "masculine" traits are usually ranked higher than "feminine" ones, men acquiring feminine traits are seen as moving down the social ladder, rather than toward androgyny. Women, however, are seen as moving up the ladder when moving toward androgyny. This was the case when ratings were done by both males and females.

Stereotypes also effect perceptions of what is considered appropriate behavior for both genders. In one study, a greater permissiveness was found in women's sex roles than in men's (Canter & Meyerowitz, 1984). On self-report measures men and women reported their own involvement in masculine and feminine sex-typed behaviors; they
also rated other men and women on their involvement in these behaviors. Overall, both genders rated involvement consistent with a sex-typed manner, and perceived men in a more sex-typed way.

At the same time, this constrictiveness does not allow men to incorporate new traits into their sex roles. An example of this is in the area of self-disclosure. In one experiment measuring subject's evaluations of self disclosure, attributions of mental illness were based on the extent to which self-disclosure deviated from appropriate sex-role behavior. (Banikotes, Kubinski, & Pursell, 1981). Subjects rated males as better adjusted when they did not engage in self-disclosure, and females better adjusted when they did. This study is consistent with the findings of Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz, and Vogel (1970), Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman, and Broverman, (1968), and Pedhazur and Totenbaum (1979). These studies showed that self-disclosure in males is often interpreted as a sign of weakness (and thus out-of-role) and not reacted to positively by others.

In summarizing the sex-role stereotype literature thus far, the following points are salient. First, sex-role stereotypes do exist and make their appearance at a very young age in children; second, female traits tend to be devalued compared to male traits; third, because of the rigid sex role labeled male, men have less opportunity to
expand and incorporate new androgynous traits into their roles. Finally, amongst the sex-role stereotype literature, self-disclosure has been extensively studied, and within these studies we find again and again males are more restricted than females in the area of sex-role behaviors that are considered appropriate for them.

Sex-role Congruence

Attribution Theory. One of the ways in which sex-role congruent behavior has been viewed is in relationship to attribution theory. Cowan and Koziej (1979) studied in-role and out-of-role behavior via dispositional (internal) and situational (external) perceptions. They found sex-role congruent behavior perceived as externally controlled and sex-role incongruent behavior as internally locused. Male and female college students rated stimulus persons via taped scenarios and results indicated that out-of-role behavior is seen as more internally locused, especially for females. However, Bond (1981) found the opposite with appropriate sex-role behavior being perceived as internally directed and inappropriate behavior as having external causes.

Galpher and Luck's (1980) study attempted to clarify this discrepancy. Their study consisted of brief behavioral descriptions of males and females. Some of the descriptions were sex-role violating behaviors, others were not. Subjects rated the behaviors and gave causal
attributions for the behaviors. Attribution patterns displayed a double-standard in which different criteria were applied to males and females. For males, role violations elicited more internal attributions than role-congruent behaviors. For females, attributions appeared to be dependent on the type of behavior described—good or bad—rather than the role-appropriateness. Also, females bad behavior was seen as internally locused. These results support earlier studies (Feinman, 1974, 1981, 1984) that suggest males are judged on whether or not they subscribe to normative (and therefore healthy) masculine behaviors. When males engage in incongruent behavior, they are not only deviating from the male sex role, they are also behaving contrary to the cultural norm of what is valued. However, women are allowed greater freedom in cross-sex behavior, therefore their behavior is judged on its value—good or bad—rather than congruency to a sex role.

Work Place Evaluations. Another avenue researchers have taken in studying sex-role congruency/incongruency is in the area of work place settings. Cohen and Bunker's (1975) study was one of the first to examine job applicants in terms of sex-role congruency. They provide evidence that both male and female applicants for sex-incongruent positions are viewed less favorably than applicants for sex-congruent positions. They found that males seeking careers in traditionally female fields (such as nursing)
were subjected to the same discrimination as females seeking jobs in traditionally male fields (such as construction).

Sharp and Post (1980) added an additional dimension to the basic tenet of Cohen and Bunker's study. These researchers sought to discover whether the sex-role orientation of the evaluator would effect their evaluation of a sex-role incongruent job applicant. Their study found that endorsement of traditional sex role stereotypes was associated with negative evaluations of sex-role incongruent job applicants.

In a similar study examining the effects of sex-role orientation on job evaluation, Motowidlo (1982) supported the finding that highly androgynous persons are more accepting of nontraditional job changes. Motowidlo concluded that because androgynous individuals are less constrained by sex-roles themselves, their attitudes and reactions towards persons in jobs unusual for their gender are less negative than persons who are considered to be sex-typed.

Further support for these studies come from Collins, Waters, and Waters (1979). These researchers found that sex-typed males and females were less favorable about women performing in managerial roles.

In contrast to these studies that find a difference between androgynous and traditional evaluator's opinions of sex-role incongruent job applicants come two studies.
Remland, Jacobson, and Jones (1983) and Paludi (1984) both found that androgynous subjects were just as likely as sex-typed subjects to be stereotypical in work related evaluations. One possible explanation for these contradictory findings could be that since these studies occurred in a work setting, even sex-typed individuals are aware of social pressures and legal considerations. That is, they would be less likely to hold onto traditional (and therefore discriminating) beliefs in the face of business related evaluations. Hence, the evaluations by androgynous and sex-typed individuals would be similar. Several other variables could be playing a part in the differential findings; among them social desirability, methodology differences, and truly greater egalitarianism in business environments.

**Androgyny and Evaluator Orientation.** The handful of studies that have examined orientation of the evaluator in settings other than the workplace also have shown inconsistent results. Korabik (1982) hypothesized that androgynous evaluators would be less susceptible than sex-typed evaluators to be biased against people with sex-incongruent characteristics. She found sex-typed subjects to be significantly more negative towards reverse role behaviors than androgynous subjects, particularly androgynous female subjects. In addition, she found that men were more sex-typed than women, supporting the hypothesis that males have
little room for role incongruency.

In a series of experiments, Saul Feinman studied cross-sex-role behavior in males and females. Results from the first study (Feinman 1974) supported the contention that cross-sex-role behavior of boys is more highly disapproved than that of girls. He concluded "... it may be that the greater range of approved behavior experienced by young girls leads to the greater tolerance shown by adult females for cross-sex-role behavior of both sexes. (p. 446)

The second study (Feinman 1981) supported these findings with the additional result that males who performed out-of-role behavior were punished more severely than females due to a perceived downward step in status and mental health. The third study (Feinman, 1984) focused on the loss of status for men acting in an incongruent manner. These results indicated that lesser approval of cross-sex-role behavior of men has much to do with the status of the male sex role. Men behaving in an incongruent manner are seen as moving down the social ranks and thus are frowned upon. This may be why fewer men attempt cross-sex-role behaviors. By behaving out-of-role they are not only losing masculinity, but status and mental health as well.

Finally, Stoppard and Kalin (1983) found results inconsistent with the above mentioned studies. Contrary to popular hypotheses, they found gender appropriateness of the evaluator to have no significant effects on
evaluations. Instead, evaluations were strongly influenced by the type of evaluations made. Whether male or female was not important, instead the social desirability of the masculine or feminine traits was what was important. This is in line with what we know about personality and people's ratings. That is, the more we know about an individual, the more we rate them on specific characteristics. The less we know about them, the more we use gross gender-appropriateness to judge them. In this study, the masculine individuals were rated higher when they had socially desirable traits such as competence, etc., whether or not it was a male or female individual that was seen as masculine. On the other hand, feminine individuals were rated higher when they possessed socially desirable traits such as cooperation, etc., whether they were males or females who were seen as feminine. Thus, gender-appropriateness did not play an important role.

Although masculinity is often rated as healthier, in terms of adjustment, than femininity, androgyny is also seen as a healthy alternative. McPherson and Spetrio (1983) examined the dimension of sex-role orientation of the evaluator in self-report ratings of ideal men and women. Subject's ratings showed that androgynous and feminine women rated the ideal man and woman in similar fashion, they rated her as less sex-typed than the typical woman and him as more feminine than the typical man.
Masculine and androgynous men, however, rated the ideal man and woman differently. They rated the ideal female as more feminine and the ideal man as more masculine, thus prescribing to traditional sex-typed views of the two sexes.

Another study using self-report (Gilbert, Deutsch, & Strahan, 1978) measures had subjects rate the typical, desirable, or ideal man and woman. Both sexes agreed that it is desirable for a man to be higher in masculinity than a woman. Males also endorsed this pattern in their descriptions of an ideal man. They believed the ideal man should be masculine sex-typed, not androgynous or cross-sex-typed. These results support an earlier study by Deutsch and Gilbert (1976) that found sex-typing in males to be associated with good adjustment. Men in this study showed congruence between their beliefs about women's ideal male and women's actual ideal. Both gender's ideal was high in masculinity. These researchers concluded that males need not adopt feminine traits to be adjusted in a masculine society because masculinity is the norm for cultural socialization and the standard by which adult mental health is measured.

In a study to investigate further the relative desirability of the four sex-role categories (Masculine, Feminine, Androgynous, and Undifferentiated) to members of the opposite sex, Kimlicka, Wakefield and Goad (1982) had subjects rate themselves and the ideal member of the opposite
sex. They found that high masculinity in males was an advantage. Masculine males attracted all types of females. Feminine males attracted none, but pursued feminine females. Androgynous males attracted feminine and androgynous females, but tended to select feminine females. Undifferentiated males attracted undifferentiated females. They concluded that femininity in males was a disadvantage, unless combined with high masculinity.

In an earlier report by Pursell and Banikotes (1978), they reported that androgynous individuals tended to be more attracted to androgynous stimulus persons and sex-typed individuals to sex-typed ones. Because these authors tested both same-sex and opposite-sex attraction, but did not report any findings, it is difficult to draw firm conclusions from this study. In an effort to clarify this, Bridges (1981) examined the effects of sex role of the stimulus person on opposite sex attraction. Using bogus protocols, subjects rated the sex-typed and androgynous stimulus person on three dimensions: liking, desire to date, and over-all impression. They found that females preferred the androgynous stimulus person regardless of their sex-role orientation. Men, however showed a lack of preference, regardless of orientation. The sex-typed stimulus person was rated as more physically attractive by both genders.

Finally, in an attempt to discover the degree of
sex-typing or androgyny college students desired in their ideal dating partners or potential spouses, Orlofsky (1982) had subjects classified according to psychological sex-type themselves and then rate their ideal partners. All subjects described ideals who manifested complimentary traits. All traditional males described feminine-typed ideals while androgynous males exhibited a preference for androgynous and female-typed females. No same-sex preferences were reported.

In summary, if we look at the literature as a whole we find an enormous deficit in the area of same-sex ratings for both genders. Further, many studies utilized only self-reports and traditional attitudinal measures. Findings indicate that while women often rate androgynous males as desirable partners, males rate sex-typed (feminine) women as desirable much of the time. Other studies have shown that androgynous persons are attracted to others of the same orientation, and the same holds true for sex-typed individuals.

Purpose of the Study

While the reactions to male sex-role incongruency have been examined, there are serious problems with the research to date. On the whole the studies have used traditional attitudinal measures and focused on non-behavioral aspects of the subjects. Also, the data have not been consistent as to the effects of sex-role orientation on the
evaluations of male incongruent behavior.

The present study addressed some of these deficiencies. Specifically, behavioral reactions to males in a naturalistic, conversational setting were examined, along with attitudinal measures. Reactions to traditional masculine males were compared to androgynous males. Males who were androgynous were found to exhibit both masculine and feminine characteristics rather than strictly feminine and therefore incongruent characteristics. Behaviorally it was expected that similar to females (e.g. Bartell, 1986) males would demonstrate an attempt to escape from very traditional males, and find androgynous males less aversive. However, on traditional attitudinal measures it was expected they would respond in a manner consistent with the traditional response, and rate the traditional male as healthier. In other words, behaviorally, males would show a preference for the less traditional, more androgynous male, but due to social desirability, they would respond in a traditional manner on traditional attitudinal measures. Given the literature on the adult male sex role, it appears if social desirability is removed, males prefer a less constrictive, more flexible role. Thus, our expected findings would be mixed.

Further, it was expected that these hypotheses would be tempered by the individual sex-role orientation of the evaluator. Androgynous individuals would be less inclined
to discriminate against the androgynous males, while masculine sex-typed males would not find the traditional male aversive.
METHOD

Subjects

Subjects were selected from a pool of male students enrolled in undergraduate social science courses at a small southwestern state university (N=55). While the initial subject count was sixty-three, eight were dropped due to a failure to complete the experiment and/or the questionnaires. All subjects were volunteers, most of whom received extra credit from instructors for their participation.

Design

Subjects participated in a 2 (subjects' masculinity: high, low), by 2 (subjects' femininity: high, low), by 10 (trials) experiment, and were randomly assigned to one of five experimenters.

Measures

Apparatus. An electromechanically controlled machine measured the subject's escape response from the aversive stimuli, via speed. There was a headset with microphone attached to the subject's machine, which consisted of a control panel divided into smaller individual panels which become illuminated as the experiment progressed. Instructions on the panels lit up to guide subjects in their actions throughout the experiment in the following order:
Listen to Speaker #1, Press Switch to Listen to Speaker #2, Listen to Speaker #2, and Indicate Behavior Change. These panels read from left to right and below the Behavior Change light the following options were listed: 1) very likely to change 2) likely to change 3) undecided 4) unlikely to change 5) very unlikely to change. Responses were recorded via push buttons that lit up when pressed. This behavior change indicator was used as a bogus task to conceal the true measure in the experiment, latency of response.

The experimenter also used an electromechanically controlled machine which was connected to the subject's unit. The experimenter's equipment consisted of a headset with microphone, a cassette tape player, and a control panel. This panel contained the necessary electronics to illuminate the panels on the subject's unit and measure the subjects button pressing (latency), or speed of response. Subjects' were requested to press a button to indicate readiness to switch speakers; this speed was then recorded by the experimenter from the control booth.

**Evaluation of Speakers.** Subjects evaluated speakers using a list of adjectives and descriptive terms arranged in a Likert format. Scales ranged from one (most like the descriptive term) to seven (least like the descriptive term). The following terms were used: very clear - very unclear; traditionally masculine - not traditionally
masculine; very appropriate - very inappropriate; very honest - very dishonest; traditionally feminine - not traditionally feminine; very likable - not very likable; very masculine - not very masculine; very intelligent - not very intelligent; very moral - not very moral; very feminine - not very feminine; very mentally healthy - not very mentally healthy; and heterosexual - homosexual.

**Bem Sex-Role Inventory.** Subjects' sex-role attitudes were discerned by use of the BSRI (Bem 1974). The Bem is based on the belief that masculinity and femininity are traits on a continuum rather than being a bipolar dimension. It consists (in short form) of ten feminine, ten masculine, and ten neutral items. Subjects are required to rate themselves for each descriptive adjective on a scale from one to seven. One refers to the lowest frequency of having the trait, while seven indicates the highest frequency of possessing the trait. Scores are interpreted to fall in one of four categories: masculine sex-typed (high masculinity, low femininity), feminine sex-typed (low masculinity, high femininity), androgynous (high masculinity, high femininity), or undifferentiated (low masculinity, low femininity). Bem reports her scale has internal consistency and test-retest reliability (Bem 1974).

**Demographics.** Demographic data were gleaned from a demographic questionnaire. The questionnaire included questions about the subjects' age, year in school, proposed
degree, and major.

Attitude Towards the Research. A subject's reaction questionnaire was completed by each subject in order to gain an understanding of their feelings towards participation in the experiment. We were interested in obtaining information about their feelings towards the experiment itself, the deception involved, any change in their trust in authorities, and the value they placed on the research.

Tapes. A pre-recorded tape was used in lieu of the two speakers. Two men answered ten situational questions, either in a role-congruent, or role-incongruent manner. Answers were scripted ahead of time. Side A had one voice recorded as the role-congruent speaker, and another as the role-incongruent; side B reversed this order to control for voice tone and/or quality confounding the experiment. Counterbalancing of the tapes was performed for every other subject.

Procedure

Explanation and Consent. Subjects were asked to participate in a communication study and were told they would be either a listener or a speaker. They were informed the time involved was approximately one hour. Upon arrival to the waiting rooms the subject was taken to a small hallway which had four doors leading off of it. Outside the hallway was a sign which read Experimental Psychology Waiting Rooms. Two doors on the right were labeled Listener and
Speaker #2. One door on the left was labeled Speaker #1, the other door was an office. All doors were closed upon the subject's arrival.

The subject was seated in the Listener's waiting room and asked to sign a consent form. He was told he would be participating in a communication study involving three people, and since he was the first to arrive, he would be the listener. He was then instructed to wait until the experimenter returned to take him to the lab, and invited to browse through some magazines.

Masking Task. In order to convince the subject that there were three participants involved in the study the experimenter closed the subject's waiting room door when leaving. She then went through the same sequence of events two more times. The doors marked Speaker #1 and #2 were left ajar so the listener could hear the experimenter repeating the instructions to the two fictitious subjects. After each set of instructions, their doors were closed also.

The subject was then escorted down another hallway to the experimental room. A sign on the lab door announced Experiment in Progress. Subject was led down a small hallway, with a wall on the right, a partition on the left, and a door straight ahead. The partition was divided by two signs, one Speaker #1, the other Speaker #2. The door to which the subject was led was labeled Listener. Against
the left wall was the panel atop a desk sized table with a chair for the subject. The subject was seated, given a headset, and told that all instructions would be given over the headset. The experimenter again left the door ajar and repeated this process for the other two alleged subjects. The door to the listener's room was then closed and the experimenter went to the control booth which was actually behind the partition.

Instructions. The experimenter switched on a button to commence communication with the subject and read the following instructions to both speakers and the listener.

As I mentioned before, we are interested in finding out how someone listening to two people comment on their behavior affects how a listener would behave. In addition, we are interested in finding out how the speaker's own behaviors may change as a result of having talked about how they would behave. After the comments have been made, each of you will be asked to estimate how likely you would be to change your behavior.

I will now give the instructions to Speaker 1 and Speaker 2.

The experiment is designed to be like a conversation except that it is set up so that Speaker 1 and Speaker 2 will be asked to comment only at certain times and only on one topic at a time.

During the course of the experiment, I will describe several common situations. These situations will be selected from the list of topics you have already reviewed. After I have read the situation, Speaker 1 and Speaker 2, both of you will be given an opportunity to comment on what you have done or think you would do in that particular situation.

I will now explain how to use the panel in front of you. You will notice that your panels contain a "comment" signal light and a "behavior change" indicator. Speaker 1 will always give his
comments first.

Therefore, Speaker 1, after I have finished reading the situation, your "comment" signal light will be illuminated and you are free to begin commenting on the situation described. Please limit your comments to about five seconds in length. Only the listener will be able to hear your comments.

Speaker 2, you will also be given the opportunity to speak when your "comment" signal light is illuminated and you are free to begin commenting on the situation described. Please limit your comments to about five seconds in length and only the listener will be able to hear you.

Speaker 1 and Speaker 2, it is very important that both of you watch the "comment" signal light in order to know when to make your comments. I will explain the use of the "behavior change" indicator in a moment, after I have given the listener's instructions.

Listener, it is your job to pay very close attention to the comments made by Speaker 1 and Speaker 2. When speaker 1 comments, the box on the left side of your panel labeled "listen to Speaker 1" will light up automatically and will remain on during Speaker 1's comments. When it is Speaker 2's turn to comment, the box at the top of your panel labeled "press switch to listen to Speaker 2" will be illuminated.

To listen to Speaker 2, please press the switch located in the center of the panel. Please press this switch now for practice. As you can see, pressing the switch will cause the box on the right hand side of your panel, labeled "listen to Speaker 2" to light up and remain on during Speaker 2's comments. Pressing the switch will also let Speaker 2 know that he may begin speaking.

The remaining instructions are for both of the speakers and the listener.

I will now explain the "behavior change" indicator on the right side of each of your panels. After the comments have been completed, the "behavior change" signal will light up automatically. The signal light will come on only if you have commented on the situation or listened to the comments. At that time, we would like each of you to indicate the likelihood of you changing your behavior for the situation just discussed. You may do this by pressing one of the buttons beside the statement that best estimates your
behavior in the future. The equipment will automatically record your individual responses. When the "behavior change" light goes off, we will be ready to begin another conversation sequence with a new situation upon which to comment.

The tape was then turned on and the experimenter asked a question which each speaker answered. In each case the role-congruent speaker was (Speaker #1) followed by the role-incongruent speaker (Speaker #2). This was repeated for all ten situational questions.

Following completion of the ten trials, the subject was asked to locate a clipboard placed in the cubicle. The packet contained the BSRI, and post-conversation evaluations for the speakers. When he was finished he communicated this over the headset to the experimenter.

**Debriefing.** The experimenter went into the lab and debriefed the subject as to the real purpose of the study. The experimenter answered all questions to the satisfaction of the subject, and accepted suggestions. Each subject was offered the opportunity to receive the results of the study. The subject was then asked to complete a demographic and reaction questionnaire. The extra credit slip was given to the subject, and the subject was then thanked and dismissed.
RESULTS

Reaction Speed

Our first consideration was the subject's reaction speed in switching from the role-congruent speaker to the role-incongruent speaker. A 2 (subject's masculinity: high, low) X 2 (Subject's femininity: high, low) X 10 (trials) analysis of variance with repeated measures was conducted on the reaction times. The only significant effect was the trials main effect, $F(9,459) = 7.53$, $p < .0001$ (Geisser and Greenhouse, 1958 correction; see Figure 1). This indicated that reaction speeds increased significantly over trials. To examine the differences among trials, Tukey HSD pairwise comparison tests were utilized. First, the reaction speed increased from Trial 1 to Trial 3. Second, trials 3, 4, 5, 6, and 9 were not significantly different from each other, indicating a leveling off of speed during the middle trials. Third, speed again increased significantly from Trial 6 to Trial 7. Finally, Trials 7, 8, and 10 were not significantly different from one another indicating another general leveling off during the latter trials.

Evaluations of Speakers

While the reaction speeds increased over trials, suggesting that subjects were escaping the role-congruent
Fig 1  Speed of Response Across Trials
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speaker, subject's self-report evaluations of the speakers' personal attributes suggest a more favorable evaluation of the role congruent speaker (see Table 1). Specifically in a 2 (Subject's masculinity: high, low) X 2 (Subject's femininity: high, low) X 2 (Speaker 1, Speaker 2) analysis of variance, a speaker's main effect was found for two (mental health and clarity) of the seven attributes as the role-congruent speaker was seen as mentally healthier and clearer than the role-incongruent speaker.

Of the five remaining personal attributes (likability, appropriateness, intelligence, honesty and morality), see Figures 2 and 3, significant differences accounted for by the Bem Sex Role Inventory were found on four. First, for honesty, a main effect for masculinity approached significance as subjects low in masculinity perceived the speakers to be more honest than did subjects high in masculinity. Similarly, for appropriateness, the main effect for masculinity approached significance as subjects low in masculinity rated the speakers as more appropriate than did subjects high in masculinity. This was qualified by a Masculinity by Femininity interaction. One significant difference among the groups was found as feminine sex-typed subjects rated the speakers as more appropriate than did androgynous subjects. Next, as expected, a significant Trials by Masculinity interaction was found for likability as subjects high in masculinity found the role-congruent
Table 1: Evaluation of Speakers Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Role Congruent</th>
<th>Role Incongruent</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentally healthy</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.62*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>5.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trad. Masc.</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>16.02***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trad. Fem.</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>6.61***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>13.93***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femininity</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>14.42***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexuality</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>9.97***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Masculinity main effects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>High Masculine</th>
<th>Low Masculine</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.86*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.50*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trials by Masculinity interaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Hi Masc</th>
<th>Lo Masc</th>
<th>Hi Masc</th>
<th>Lo Masc</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likable</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>7.41***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trials by Femininity interaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Hi Fem</th>
<th>Lo Fem</th>
<th>Hi Fem</th>
<th>Lo Fem</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>7.31***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trad. Fem.</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.85*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femininity</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.01*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Masculinity by Femininity interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Hi Masc</th>
<th>Lo Masc</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hi Fem</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lo Fem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** df = 1, 50. Abbreviations: Trad = Traditional; Masc = Masculinity; Fem = Femininity; Hi = High; Lo = Low. 1 = very high on the stated characteristic, 7 = very low on the stated characteristic. Subscripts: means that have the same subscript are not significantly different from one another.

*p < .10; **p < .05; ***p < .01;
Fig. 2: Masculinity by Speaker Interaction
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speaker more likable than did subjects low in masculinity. A similar trend in the opposite direction was noted for the role-incongruent speaker as subjects low in masculinity found the role-incongruent speaker more likable than did subjects high in masculinity. However, these two groups were not significantly different from each other. Finally, subjects high in femininity rated the role-congruent speaker significantly more intelligent than did subjects low in femininity while there were no differences concerning intelligence for the role-incongruent speaker.

Masculinity/femininity. As expected, all groups of subjects evaluated the role-congruent speaker as more masculine, more traditionally masculine, less feminine, and less traditionally feminine than the role-incongruent speaker. The judgements of femininity and traditional femininity were qualified by Trials by Femininity interactions. Subjects low in femininity rated the role-congruent speaker less feminine and less traditionally feminine than did subjects high in femininity. There were no differences for the role-incongruent speaker who was rated more feminine and more traditionally feminine by all groups regardless of sex-role.

In line with these results was the analysis of the sexual orientation of the speakers. The role-congruent speaker was seen as primarily heterosexual while the sexual orientation of the role-incongruent speaker was more
ambivalent, approaching the mid-point on the 7-point scale.
DISCUSSION

The hypothesis that males would demonstrate difference between their behavioral reactions, and reactions on traditional attitudinal measures, to role-congruent and role-incongruent males, received support. Similar to results reported in other studies (Paludi, 1984; Remland, Jacobson, & Jones, 1983), all subjects, regardless of their own sex-role orientation, rated the role-congruent speaker higher than the role-incongruent speaker on most scales. That is, subjects perceived the role-congruent speaker as healthier, more intelligent, and more masculine than the role-incongruent speaker. Because this was an attitudinal measure to be read and rated by others, social desirability may have played a large part in these ratings, similar to the effects reported by Stoppard and Kalin (1983). In the present study, rating the role-congruent (i.e. more masculine) speaker more positively than the role-incongruent (i.e. less masculine) speaker appears to be more socially desirable.

In contrast, when subjects were measured in a manner that was not as obvious, the reaction speed measure, they showed the opposite behavior. Specifically, subjects evidenced an increased speed of response across trials. This could be due to one of three factors. First, it may
demonstrate an escape response to an aversive stimulus. It could be that the role-congruent speaker was found to be aversive and the subject's speed increased in an effort to terminate the aversive emotional response. This escape conditioning paradigm has been used in other studies and shown similar effects with other types of aversive stimuli (Weiss, Boyer, Colowich & Moran, 1971).

Second, it may be an appetitive drive. That is, the subjects may find the role-incongruent speaker rewarding and increase their responses to hear the rewarding stimulus. Either case may be viable, with no data from the present study allowing support for either position. Third, the response could be a practice effect. Specifically, subject's increased response as they became more familiar with the apparatus. However, in a pilot study in which the speaker order was reversed (i.e. the role-incongruent speaker was first, the role-congruent speaker second) no increase in reaction speed across trials was found. This suggests that practice does not account for the effect, and leads us to lean towards an aversive or appetitive drive causation theory.

Finally, one other possibility exists. The role-incongruent speaker may serve as a novel stimulus. That is, the subjects are escaping the traditional speaker to hear the more novel, androgynous speaker. Although this is a worthwhile consideration, most studies concerning novel
stimulus have been conducted using infants and small children as subjects. (Rheingold & Eckerman, 1969; Kagan, 1970; Lewis, 1967; McCall & Kagan, 1967). Therefore, it is not clear what the effect may be with adults.

The incongruency between the subjects' attitudinal and behavioral measures speaks to the state of societal confusion which males may experience. On one hand, masculine traits are valued and desired (e.g. career success, competitiveness). On the other hand, males in this study avoided an individual who demonstrated such traits. Besides giving a contradictory message to men about desirable behavior around other men, there seems to be a value predicament. Males who are willing to express these role-incongruent, and therefore more unfamiliar values may be placed in a double-bind situation. Given that this unfamiliarity may create aversive reactions, individuals may be more likely to resort to traditional sex roles, the dominant response, when faced with ambiguous messages, thereby reducing the anxiety caused by unfamiliar responses.

Results regarding the sex-role orientation of the evaluator were unexpected. In one of the few areas on self-report measures in which sex role was significant, subjects high in femininity rated the role-congruent speaker as more intelligent than the role-incongruent speaker. While the opposite was expected, because of
similarity effects, it could be that those subjects high in femininity thought more highly of the role-congruent speaker than those subjects high in masculinity, who were more similar to the role-congruent speaker.

As various studies have shown androgynous individuals to be more flexible and tolerant (e.g., Korabik, 1982; Motowildo, 1982), it was expected that they would be equally accepting of the role-congruent (sex-typed) and the role-incongruent (androgynous) speaker. However, on the behavioral measure, no significant differences were found between their escape response and that of non-androgynous individuals. This indicates that androgynous individuals, although possessing both masculine and feminine characteristics, were not any more accepting of another male with a different orientation and, therefore, different attitudes, than were sex-typed individuals. These results are in line with Stoppard and Kalin's (1983) study that showed no effect for sex-role orientation of the evaluator.

Since masculine sex-typed individuals possessed an orientation most similar to that of the role-congruent speaker's orientation, it was expected that they would not show an escape response. However, this was another example of where measuring attitude and behavior yielded two different results. These sex-typed male subjects also escaped the role-congruent speaker while rating that speaker higher than the role-incongruent speaker. It appears that what is
measured makes a great difference. It is important to note that the present study was specifically designed to make the stimulus more salient compared to other studies where only paper and pencil measures have been utilized.

Due to the relative recency of this area of research there are many as yet unexplored avenues and many ways to direct it. Some of the ideas that seem most prominent are the following. First, women need to be used as subjects. One recent study (Bartell, 1986) indicated that women may show more congruency between evaluations on attitudinal and behavioral measures. Possibly, women may be more aware of their feelings and so more easily able to express them. This, in turn, makes it easier to deal with the role-incongruency in males.

Second, another avenue of study is using a truly "feminine" male as one of the speakers. Our study used a more androgynous individual and found him to be less acceptable on an attitudinal measure but more acceptable on a behavioral measure than the role-congruent speaker. The use of a more sex-typed, feminine male is likely to result in a stronger preference for the more masculine, socially acceptable male who would then seem less stereotypical.

Finally, this study examined reactions of males to other males with whom they had no acquaintance. Results may vary when speakers who are close friends or relatives are utilized. Kelley (1985) asked subjects to imagine as a
close friend a male actor who expressed either secure or insecure feelings. Both male and female subjects rated the insecure actor more negatively than the secure actor on self-report measures. Thus, while males may not reject a stranger who expresses role-incongruent statements, they may not want a role-incongruent individual as a close friend.

There are numerous variations on this theme, all with valuable information to be gained. This study was one of the first in this area to bring attention to the little researched area of the male sex role. Understanding the reactions of others to males who behave in and out of role may lead to a greater understanding of male sex role socialization, behavior, and sex-typing.
APPENDIX A

Verbatim Transcripts of Speakers' Dialogues

Question 1: You are attracted to someone in one of your classes. What would you be likely to do?

Speaker 1 (confederate A): Well, let's see...I would...I'm kinda the outgoing type, so what I'd probably do is go up to her at break and, you know, start talking about the professor, or possibly the homework, and...just...I'm really not afraid to talk to girls, so I'd just probably tell her that I noticed her at break, and get her telephone number so that, you know, we could probably go out...uh, go out sometime. And...I usually like to take my dates to dinner or possibly a movie.

(confederate B): Well, let's see...I'm really outgoing, so, you know, I'd probably just go up to her at the break and start talking about something...like the professor, or homework, or you know...whatever. I'm not afraid to talk to girls, and oh, I could tell her that I noticed her and ask her out on a date. You know, I...I like to take my dates out for...maybe dinner and a movie or something like that.

Speaker 2 (confederate A): Well...I was afraid you were gonna ask that one. Well, I hate to admit it, but I...I'm kinda shy around girls. Oh, I really don't know what to do
around them. Um...well, I'd probably just let her make the first move and come over and talk to me, you know. I'd hope she'd ask me out on a date, 'cuz I'm too afraid to talk to her.

(confederate B): Well, gee, I don't know. Uh...I doubt if I'd do anything, really...'cuz, I'm, you know, a pretty shy guy, so...I probably...I'd be afraid to let her know I was interested in her because she may not like me anyhow. I'd just, you know, kinda hope that she'd like me, too, and maybe she'd come and talk to me and ask me out on a date.

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

Speaker 1 (confederate A): Well, let's see...in the first place I don't even watch sad movies. The kind of movies I like to watch are probably westerns, science fiction...comedies I like. But if I had to sit there and watch a sad movie I'd probably be bored to death, and I wouldn't...uh...I wouldn't cry. 'Cuz I don't think that would do any good anyway...because it's only just a movie.

(confederate B): That's a real easy question, Um...you know, I don't watch sad movies. I like westerns, and uh, science fiction. I really enjoy comedies, though...they're my favorites. But, you know, if I had to
sit there and watch a sad movie, man, I'd really be bored. I'd never cry. What good would that do? It's only a movie. Speaker 2 (confederate A): Oh, crying at sad movies, huh? I, you know...I usually don't hide my emotions. You know, it really doesn't matter who I'm with or where I am, you know. I...I've always kinda been that way, you know. I've been to a lot of movies and movies bring out a lot of sad emotions sometimes. And, you know, if it's real sad my girl friend and I'd probably both be crying. Uh...you know, afterwards we could talk about it. (confederate B): Well, you know, I usually don't hide my emotions, and it really doesn't matter where I am or who I'm with...so, I usually just go ahead and cry. Um...some of the movies bring out a lot of different emotions anyway, so, you know, if it was a real sad movie, me and my girlfriend would probably both be crying, you know. But then we could talk about it afterwards.

Question 3: You are required to complete some community volunteer work for a class you are enrolled in. What would you like to do? Speaker 1 (confederate A): Well, let's see...being the ambitious type person, I've always been interested in firefighting. So I'd, you know, probably choose something like that, or I could...I could coach a Little League team, either football or baseball would be alright. Let's
see...what else? I'd also be good in probably the Sheriff's Reserves.

(confederate B): What would I like to do? Um, you know, I'm really ambitious and I've always been interested in firefighting, so I think I'd choose to do something like that. Or, um, I could coach a Little League football team or basketball team...that'd be kinda neat. Um, I think I'd also be good in the Sheriff's Reserves.

Speaker 2 (confederate A): Oh, volunteer work, huh? Well, what ever I do I'd like to be part of something where I get to help people, you know. You've seen those rape hotlines they have downtown, or suicide hotlines...that would be interesting. Or...what else could I do? Oh, I could work as a nurse's aide, or, you know, even help out at a daycare center.

(confederate B): Well, let's see...what would I like to do? Uh, you know, I'd like to probably be a part of something where I could help people. Uh, maybe answering phones at a crisis hotline, or let's see...one of those rape or suicide hotlines. You know, something like that where you can spend time helping people. Or, you know, even maybe as a nurse's aide..or in a hospital. Or, you know, I guess I'd maybe like to help out at a daycare center or something.
Question 4: 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 (confederate A): Gosh, five hundred dollars! What the heck happened? Um, I don't have much faith in those gas station mechanics, and I'm pretty good with cars anyway...so I would just tell him to forget it and I'd take it home and go to the junkyard and maybe buy the parts there...and save some money.

(confederate B): Oh, five hundred dollars, huh? Oh, something must have happened to that poor old car. Uh, fortunately, you know, I'm pretty good with cars and I've got a whole garage full of tools, so...you know, that's really not that big of a problem for me. Um...I'd tell the mechanic just to forget it and just fix it myself, and uh, I could go to the junkyard and get some of the parts and save some money.

Speaker 2 (confederate A): Oh, you know, I really don't know anything about cars and I'm always afraid this is going to happen and some mechanic is just going to really take advantage of me. Uh...you know, in the end I'd just have to let him go ahead and fix it. I really feel pretty helpless, you know. I can't fix it myself...I just hope he wouldn't take me for every penny I had.

(confederate B): Well, you know, I have a pretty old car so I'm always afraid that's going to happen and
some mechanic is really going to take advantage of me. Uh...I just don't know anything about cars and I guess I'd just have to go ahead and fix it and, you know, I'd have no other choice, I guess. Uh, sometimes I feel pretty helpless 'cuz I don't - because I can't fix it myself. I just hope that he wouldn't take me for every penny that I have.

Question 5: You have the opportunity to use a VCR. What programs would you tape for later viewing?

Speaker 1 (confederate A): Oh, this is an easy one to answer, 'cuz I just got one for Christmas last year. Uh...and what I do with it is, just tape all the football games and boxing matches. And, it makes it kinda neat, 'cuz when my buddies come over and you have a few beers, you always have something to watch.

(confederate B): That's an easy question. I got one for Christmas. Now I tape all the sports on T.V., and when my buddies come over we have something to watch now.

Speaker 2 (confederate A): Oh, you know, having a VCR...oh, that'd really be great, you know. Then I could...I could tape the soaps I miss, you know, 'cuz I'm in school all day. And as it stands right now I have to call my mom and, you know, ask her what's happening to Marlena on "Days of Our Lives"...and that's really a pain. So, you know, having a VCR would really be a big help. I only wish I had the money to buy one.
(confederate B): Uh, use a VCR? Yeah, that'd be great. Um, then we could, you know, tape the soaps that I miss while I'm in class. Since school started I usually have to call my mom to find out what's happened to Marlena on "Days of Our Lives." Hey, that's a really good idea. I wish I had the money to buy one.

Question 6: You have a Saturday afternoon free from all commitments. How would you spend this time?

Speaker 1 (confederate A): Well, let's see...free-time...I've almost really forgotten what that is. Oh, no not really, just joking. Uh, let's see. if I had the afternoon to myself, I'd probably call up a couple of my friends and see if they'd want to go out motorcycle riding, or maybe even play a game of football.

Speaker 2 (confederate B): Hmmmm...free time. Well, I'm taking an overload this quarter and I just don't have any free time anymore. Um...if I had an afternoon free, though...you know, I'd call up some of my buddies and ask them if they want to go dirt bike riding, or something like that. Or, see if they wanted to go play a football game.

Speaker 2 (confederate A): Oh, let's see, you know, I'm taking so many classes this quarter I really don't have any time at all. Man, I am so busy! But, you know what I really miss doin'? It sounds kinda silly, but I'd like to curl up next to a fireplace and just read a good book. Or, let's
see...what else could I do? You know, if the weather's nice, I don't get a chance to see my mom much anymore, so I'd probably ask her out to lunch, or to go shopping, or maybe take her to a movie.

(confederate B): Well, let's see, you know, being a student I really don't have a whole lot of free time. Uh, well I guess what I'd really probably like to do is curl up by the fireplace and just read a good book. Or you know, if the weather was nice I'd probably call up my mom and see if she'd like to, you know, go out to lunch. We could go shopping or even go to a movie.

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

Speaker 1 (confederate A): Well, I...I don't know what I'd do. The first thing, I don't think my sister would even ask me to babysit 'cuz, uh, she knows how I - knows how I am. Ah...I'm not that good around the kids anyway. Uh...I just, I guess I'd just have to tell my sister I couldn't do it. But I guess if I absolutely had to... I'd probably have someone come over and babysit. I just, you know, find myself being too busy on the weekends and I couldn't get much done with a three-year old under my feet.

(confederate B): Oh, babysitting a three-year old kid, huh? Um, I'm not sure I could handle that, uh, besides
my sister wouldn't even ask me. I mean, she knows how I am and she knows I'm not very good around the kids. Um, if she did ask I'd just tell her that I couldn't do it. Or, you know, I mean if I absolutely had to, I'd find someone to come over and babysit. Uh, afterall, I'm busy on the week-ends and I don't think I could get a whole lot done with a kid under my feet.

Speaker 2 (confederate A): Ooh...babysitting a three year old kid, huh? Well, you know, that wouldn't be too bad. As a matter of fact, I have a nephew who's three and, man, he's a real pistol. And I get along real well with him so...You know, to tell the truth, I'd like to have kids of my own, so I'm really sure we could find plenty of things to do together. I mean, you know, we could go to the park or to the playground. And, you know, I can push him on the swings - he loves the swings - and, you know, if it was raining or something we could stay home, and we could sing songs and play games like ring-around-the-rosie. And he even likes to help me make cookies.

(confederate B): Uh, well, I guess that wouldn't be too bad. Uh, as a matter of fact I do enjoy spending time with my nieces and nephews. You know, I really can't wait 'til I have my own kids. Uh, I'm sure we could find plenty of things to do together. You know, we could go to the park, or to the playground. Um, we could play on the swings over there. We could stay at home and sing songs or
play games, you know, like ring-around-the-rosie, or we could even bake cookies.

Question 8: You have just found out that your girlfriend is cheating on you. What would you do in this situation?

Speaker 1 (confederate A): Oh, you know, I'd really be mad and I'd confront her with it because nobody's gonna make a fool out of me. You know, I would...I don't know...I'd demand to know who she was seeing and then I'd talk to that guy about it later. And then I'd dump her for good, 'cuz I don't stand for that kind of stuff. And anyway, there's plenty of other girls out there.

(confederate B): Oh...girlfriend's cheating on me, huh? I'd really be mad. And, I'd confront her with it because nobody makes a fool out of me. I'd demand to know who she was seeing, and I'd deal with that later. Um...then I'd dump her for good 'cuz I just don't stand for that kind of stuff, and you know, there are plenty of other girls out there anyways.

Speaker 2 (confederate A): Oh, these questions are getting tough, you know? Ah, heck...girlfriend's cheating on me. Well, yeah, I really hate to admit it, but, you know, I...I'd really be hurt. You know, I...I'd be hurt so much I'd probably even cry and uh, uh...really get depressed. Uh, you know...oh, what could I do? Oh, I'd probably, you know, try to talk to her and work things out, but you know, in the end I'd probably just forgive her.
(confederate B): Oh, shoot...these are getting tough. Um, I don't know. I guess...um...I might have to...uh...I'd probably - definitely be hurt. I hate to admit it, but I'd probably...I'd probably just end up crying and be depressed. I'd probably, uh...try to talk to her and work things out and maybe in the end I'd find a way to forgive her.

Question 9: If you had unlimited time and money, what career would you pursue?

Speaker 1 (confederate A): Well, let's see...what career would I pursue? Well, right now I'm working on a business degree with a special emphasis on international banking. But, uh, in the future I think I'd like to be the head of a large...a large corporation that has offices abroad. Or, possibly the Chief Executive of Wall Street.

(confederate B): Oh, unlimited time and money, huh? That'd really be great. Right now I'm an undergraduate and I'm working on a business degree. You know, I really get a kick out of international banking and financing. So, uh, in the future, I'd like to be the head of a large corporation that has offices abroad. Oh, ah, possibly even the Chief Executive on Wall Street.

Speaker 2 (confederate A): Hmmm...unlimited time and money...oh, that's a favorite fantasy of mine. Right now, I...I'm just an undergraduate and I take mostly art courses
so...uh, you know, what I really think about doing is working in the fashion industry, but you know with my personality and everything, I...I'd stick to the creative end of the business and I'd have to find someone who could handle the business side of it. You know, I could even open up a...uh, you know, a fashion shop.

(confederate B): Well, let's see...Uh, well right now I'm just an undergraduate taking mostly art courses. Uh, so I'd really like to work in the fashion industry. I'd probably have to find a partner who could handle the business end of the deal while I handle the creative end. You know, maybe...shoot, maybe even...uh, I'd like to open up a small fashion shop.

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

Speaker 1 (confederate A): Well, I guess I'd go home if they asked me to...uh, but of course, you know, I couldn't take mom's place 'cuz I just don't know how to do those sorts of things. Uh, I'd probably end up calling my sisters to come over and do the cooking and the cleaning. You know, those type of things that moms do. Uh, but, you know, one thing I could do...I could take care of the yard or, you know, fix the car, pay the bills, or, you know, fix anything that was broken. You know, the kind of things that
my father usually does.

(confederate B): Oh, what would I do? Well if they asked me, I'd go home. But of course, you know, I could never take mom's place because I don't know how to do those sorts of things. I mean, you know, I'd have to call my sisters and have them come over to do the cooking and the cleaning - I am a terrible cook! Um...you know, but I'm good at some things...I can take care of the yard and fix the car and make sure it's O.K. And, you know, pay the bills and maybe fix something that got broken. Uh, you know, the things that my dad usually does.

Speaker 2 (confederate A): Oh, what would I do...huh? Well...well, I'd go home and, you know, help out, you know, if I could. Uh, well...what could I do? Um, you know, I could do the cooking and the cleaning up after my little brothers. You know, basically the kind of stuff my mom does when she's feeling better. Um, you know, it really wouldn't bother me because, you know, I used to do that stuff when I lived at home anyways.

(confederate B): Uh...let's see...mom's ill and dad's out of town...uh, sure I'd go home and help. Uh...I could do the cooking. I could clean up, you know, after my little brothers...and basically just do the stuff that Mom does. And I don't mind because, uh, when I lived at home I used to do it all the time...just to help mom out.
APPENDIX B

Bem Sex Role Inventory (Short Form)

Below you will find listed a number of personality characteristics. We would like you to use those characteristics to describe yourself, that is, we would like you to indicate, on a scale from 1 to 7, how true of you each of these characteristics is. Please do not leave any characteristic unmarked.

Example: sly

Write a 1 if it is never or almost never true that you are sly

Write a 2 if it is usually not true that you are sly

Write a 3 if it is sometimes but infrequently true that you are sly

Write a 4 if it is occasionally true that you are sly

Write a 5 if it is often true that you are sly

Write a 6 if it is usually true that you are sly

Write a 7 if it is always or almost always true that you are sly

Thus, if you feel it is sometimes but infrequently
true that you are "sly", never or almost never true
that you are "malicious", always or almost always
true that you are "irresponsible", and often true
that you are "carefree", then you would rate these
characteristics as follows:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Irresponsible</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malicious</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Carefree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B (continued)

1 = Never or almost never true  
5 = Often true  
2 = Usually not true  
6 = Usually true  
3 = Sometimes but infrequently true  
7 = Always or almost always true  
4 = Occasionally true

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Coding</th>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defend my own beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Affectionate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conscientious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have leadership abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassionate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Truthful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to take a stand</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to take risks</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conceited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Personality</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tactful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eager to soothe hurt feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gentle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive to needs of others</td>
<td></td>
<td>Warm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptable</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moody</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tender</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love children</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jealous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Secretive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td></td>
<td>Forceful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Post-Conversation Questionnaire

Listener, since you have had the opportunity to hear Speaker 1 and Speaker 2 comment, 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:

   very unclear traditionally masculine
   very not traditionally masculine
   very inappropriate appropriate
   very dishonest traditionally
   very feminine feminine
2. After listening to Speaker #1 (#2), I found Speaker #1 (#2) to be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very</th>
<th>not very</th>
<th>likeable</th>
<th>very</th>
<th>not very</th>
<th>likeable</th>
<th>very</th>
<th>not very</th>
<th>likeable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>likeable</td>
<td>__</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td></td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not very</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td></td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masculine</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td></td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td></td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intelligent</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td></td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not very</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td></td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immoral</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td></td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td></td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feminine</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td></td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not very mentally</td>
<td></td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td></td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>healthy</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td></td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| heterosexual              | ___  | ___      | ___      | ___  | ___      | ___      |      | ___      | ___      | homosexual_
APPENDIX D

Post-Experiment Questionnaire

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

Not at all-Somewhat-Quite-Very Much

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 D (continued)

As a result of participating in this experiment I am:

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

5. Trusting in authorities
   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

6. Positive about my evaluation of experimental research
   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

7. Should this research be permitted to continue?
   ___ Yes ___ no

8. Is this research justified?
   ___ Yes ___ No

9. Did the explanations about the purpose of the experiment satisfy you?
   ___ Yes ___ No

10. Do you regret having participated in the experiment?
    ___ Yes ___ No

11. Are you resentful about having been deceived?
    ___ Yes ___ No
APPENDIX E

Demographic Questionnaire

1. How old are you?

2. Education

A. Level (please check one)
   - freshman ____
   - sophomore ____
   - junior ____
   - senior ____
   - graduate ____

B. Major (please check one)
   - Administration/Business ____
   - Education ____
   - Humanities ____
   - Natural Sciences ____
   - Social & Behavioral Sciences ____

C. Highest degree you plan to obtain (please check one)
   - B.A./B.S. ____
   - M.A./M.S. ____
   - Ph.D./M.D. ____
   - Other ____
APPENDIX F

Consent Form

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

Name__________________________

SIGNATURE__________________________

DATE__________________________
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