2005

Effects of gender role on the judgment of masculine signs

Joseph C. Mitchell
Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College

Recommended Citation

Mitchell, Joseph C., "Effects of gender role on the judgment of masculine signs" (2005). *LSU Doctoral Dissertations*. 538.
https://repository.lsu.edu/gradschool_dissertations/538

EFFECTS OF GENDER ROLE
ON THE JUDGMENT OF MASCULINE SIGNS

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in
The Department of Communication Studies

By
Joseph C Mitchell
B.S., Illinois State University, 1993
M.A., Indiana State University, 1997
May 2005

To my mother, who is with me even now.

Acknowledgments

Dad, step-mom, and family thank you all for providing such desperately needed support!

Joey and Jessie: you are the most wonderful, most bright, most perfectly perfect people I have ever met. I am so glad you are in my life.

Dr. Renee Edwards: without your expert guidance and never ending support this dissertation would not have been possible. For watching my back when the "bullets" were flying and for being a calming presence when things got seemingly out of control…thank you!

Dr. Loretta Pecchioni: your help was always available and was greatly appreciated when called upon. Your invitation to join the Communication Studies department changed my life. My "life-span" will never be the same. Thank you!

Dr. Trish Suchy: your expertise and enthusiasm inspired me more than you know! Your creative input energized me.

Dr. Denis Wu: thank you for your expert input on this dissertation. Your help and encouragement made this experience a lot easier than it could have been.

Dr. Rick Blackwood: thank you for taking the time to serve as my Dean's Representative. For the thankless job, thank you!

Dr. Bob Lafayette (our pinch hitter): Thanks for stepping in at the last minute and for giving such spirited input into the final product of this study.

To all of my good friends near and far, the tangled web we weave caught me when I fell! Thank God for good friends!

Table of Contents

Abstract

Masculinity is a multi-dimensional, fairly pliable construct that some scholars approach from a biological perspective, others approach from a social constructionist perspective, and others approach from a unifying perspective. Part of the environment that informs the meaning of masculinity to a given culture is the mass media. This study takes the constructivist theoretical perspective, which attempts to explain the activation of schemata. The schematic process for this study concerns how people perceive, process, and judge masculine signs. This study seeks to explain gender role orientation's influences on the development of schemata for masculinity as evidenced by differences in assessments of differing masculine images. Participants ($N = 747$) rated their own sex role orientation and then assessed the sex role orientation and evaluated the masculine imagery. The results of this experiment reveal that gender role has a limited effect on schematic development for masculinity. Though gender role affects how we perceive our world, the extent to which it influences that perception is smaller than expected. Directions for future research are also offered.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Masculinity is a multi-dimensional, fairly pliable construct that scholars study in a wide variety of fields and contexts. Some researchers approach the study of masculinity from a biological perspective whereas others claim masculinity to be a social construction taught and reinforced by significant others and external sources available in a given culture. Still other researchers approach gender and masculinity from a unifying perspective, that there are biological and cultural sources that constantly inform people about the nature and nurture of gendered behavior (Fagot & Leinbach, 1994).

The following study seeks to explain to what extent gender role orientation influences people's perceptions of masculine imagery. As evidenced through cognitive organizational processes (schemata), people are exposed to and are asked to assess traditional and nontraditional signs of masculinity. Through the constructivist theoretical perspective that attempts to explain the activation of masculine schemata, people perceive and process signs of masculinity and compare them to what they understand to be true about masculinity and the culture of gender that supports or challenges it. This study is concerned with the idea that gender role is a filter for perception. Instead of there being one general definition of masculinity, there may be several definitions. These definitions may differ in that people's perceptions of signs of masculinity are positive or negative and more or less masculine.

One source of influence on people's development of masculine schemata is the mass media. The mass media reinforce and expand upon what people learn and know about masculinity through its many channels. Advertising is a common area of influence in United States' culture since its presence is so pervasive in the mass media; people

encounter advertising almost every day. Because of advertising's role in reinforcing, or even challenging gender role information, it is appropriate to study schematic perceptions of masculinity through advertisements.

Throughout this study, there are several terms that are used often enough that it is important to define these terms here. A pair of such terms is traditional masculinity and nontraditional masculinity. Traditional masculinity refers to a masculinity that adheres to generally accepted notions of what masculine behavior should be. For example, traditionally masculine men should be strong, athletic, confident, etc. Nontraditional masculinity is a masculinity that in some way diverts from traditional masculinity. For example, nontraditionally masculine men might be nurturing, perhaps passive, and expressive. It is difficult to nail down definitions such as these as they are pliable concepts. Meanings reside in the domain of the receiver of messages, so what makes a man traditionally masculine or nontraditionally masculine must be left up to the perceptions of the receiver.

Another concept frequently discussed is gender role orientation. Sometimes interchangeably referred to as sex role orientation, gender role orientation describes behaviors exhibited by people that can be categorized into masculine, feminine, and androgynous regions. Bem (1974) conceptualized masculine gender role orientation to be a man or a woman who tends to behave practically, assertively, or even aggressively. Feminine gender role orientation is defined as a man or a woman who tends to behave with affection, compassion, and gentleness. A third category describes androgynous gender role orientation as a man or a woman who can be practical, assertive, and aggressive, while simultaneously behaving affectionately, compassionately, and gently.

Bem also conceptualizes androgynous gender role orientation as a successful, more flexible way of performing gender, whereas masculine and feminine gender role orientations tend to be limiting.

Other commonly used terms are judgment and assessment of androgyny. For the purposes of this study, judgment refers to attitudes one holds in reaction to masculine imagery. These attitudes are positive or negative and result from the schematic process when being exposed to masculine imagery. Assessment of androgyny refers to people's discernment of masculine imagery as being more masculine or more feminine in relation to androgyny, with androgyny being a sort of middle ground between masculine and feminine.

The following study presents a discussion of literature, rationales for hypotheses and research questions, a description of methods and procedures, an explanation of the statistical results of the methods and procedures, and a discussion of the results and their implications about the effects of gender role orientation on the judgment and assessment of androgyny of masculine signs and imagery.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

People live their lives within gendered cultures. The importance of gender and the roles applied to the performance of gender in a given culture influence how messages are perceived and, therefore, how one perceives those messages. The following chapter includes a discussion of definitions concerning masculinity, masculinity and gender, perceptions and judgments of masculinity, a discussion of schema theory, and masculinity as presented in the mass media.

Masculinity: Definitions and Explorations

Chesebro and Fuse (2001) defined masculinity within a communication framework stating that it is "the study of the discourses and the effects of the discourses generated by men, unifying men, and revealing the identity and characteristics men ascribe to themselves, others, and their environment" (p. 203). Women were not included in this definition and the researchers did not explain why. Later in their article, they defined masculinity again as "a social and symbolic concept, decisively shaped and affected by specific historical and cultural factors, that ultimately provides a framework and perspective by which men perceive and understand themselves, others and their environment" (p. 206). This additional definition of masculinity leaves room for women as part of the historical and cultural factors that help masculinity to evolve as it does over time. Looking at several arguments concerning the locus of the realm of masculinity, Chesebro and Fuse concluded that masculinity is a communication issue as a product of human interaction and not a product of "divinely inspired, innate, or biological" sources (p. 209). While these factors may provide some information about the nature of

masculinity, Chesebro and Fuse said, "at minimum, masculinity should be defined in a way that allows it to be researchable" (p. 209).

According to Craig (1992), masculinity is "what a culture expects of its men" (p. 3). In North American culture, masculinity typically means that men will support the patriarchy and participate in it, that men were taught and are reinforced for displaying traditional masculine characteristics, and that these characteristics are made to seem right; so right that the "domination and exploitation of women and other men [is] not only expected, but actually demanded" (p. 3). While less traditional forms of masculinity gain acceptance, it is still the norm that consistent violators of these expectations are often escorted to the fringes of "acceptable" society.

Kaufman (1987) agreed with Craig that masculinity is a system supported by the culture: "Centuries-old patriarchal orders will not be overturned by good public relations, boys playing with dolls, and women having access to bank directorships and military training. Domination by men is based on, and perpetuated by, a wide range of social structures, from the most intimate of sexual relations to the organization of economic and political life" (p. xiv).

Part of the domination process implies that there is something or someone to dominate, that there is an enemy. Kimmel (1987) suggested that extreme competitiveness, violence, and gnawing insecurity define compulsive masculinity, "a masculinity that must always prove itself and that is always in doubt" (p. 237). The enemy of the compulsively masculine man, more than anyone else, is himself. Perhaps it is due to this nagging self-doubt that Kimmel then asked, "is it any wonder that the United States leads all modern industrial democracies in rapes, aggravated assaults,

homicides, and robberies, and ranks among the highest in group violence and assassination?" (p. 237). Kimmel noted that compulsive masculinity might be a more common product of culture in the United States than in any other modern industrial democracy.

Strate (1992) described masculinity and femininity as cultural and social constructs. Much like language, what is masculine and feminine is often arbitrary. "Biology determines whether we are male or female; culture determines what it means to be male or female, and what sorts of behaviors and personality attributes are appropriate for each gender role" (Strate, 1992, p. 79).

Saco (1992) defined masculinity as a "symbolic sign system within which masculinity and femininity are coded oppositions…[the symbolic sign system] is what makes the constitution of masculine and feminine subjects possible" (p. 23). Gender is a symbolic category defined by culture to give meaning to human behavior. Masculinity and femininity are not anatomical features, but an aspect of what makes up one's social identity.

Badinter (1995) implied that being a man is not necessarily a natural occurrence: men are made. "Being a man implies a labor, an effort that does not seem to be demanded of a woman" (p. 1). She explained that boys must exorcise themselves of the feminine and are usually trained to carry the burden of adopting the new persona as the man. Some cultures are more formal about this process than others. Boys will be taken from their mothers and will not see women again until they are ritually declared men. Boys must prove to their culture and society that they are men through certain acts of duty and trials. Men must also continually convince themselves and others that they are still men.

Badinter (1995) noted that men have to carefully balance between two evils: "not being masculine enough and being too masculine" (p. 4). If one is too masculine, Badinter claimed that he is "the tough guy," meaning that he "never yields to the weakness and passivity that are always lying in wait for him…in a struggle that is never won" (p. 129). She suggested that men experience many of the same psychological and emotional needs and desires as women. As an example, all people need and desire to love and be loved, to communicate emotions and feelings, to be active and passive, etc. (p. 141). However, the tough guy must refuse those things so he does not reveal himself to be less than the societal ideal of manliness. As Badinter (1995) speculated, "The efforts demanded of men to conform to the masculine ideal cause anguish, emotional difficulties, fear of failure, and potentially dangerous and destructive compensatory behaviors" (p. 142). Badinter posited that when men began to believe in and take on the role of the "tough guy," the lifespan of men dropped below that of women; the psychic energy required to maintain the façade of idealized masculinity drains men of their very lives.

Another type of man Badinter (1995) introduced is "the soft man," who stands opposite from "the tough man." The soft man is gentle and feminine. He is so communal in his behavior that he loses touch with the part of him that is masculine; that natural, biological piece that guides men towards masculinity. Many women end up leading these men around, telling them what to do and think. As a result of this turn, Badinter called the soft man "the mutilated man." She denied that all gay men are mutilated men, though surely some are, just as there surely are some mutilated heterosexual men. She suggested that any man can and should evolve into a balanced form of masculinity: "the reconciled man" (p. 162). Badinter's recommendation was to strive for androgyny, which occurs

when people have the ability to choose appropriate instrumental or communal behaviors for various contexts. Depending on the situation, it is better for a person to display more agentic (masculine) or more nurturing (feminine) behaviors.

In all, these researchers agreed that masculinity is a deeply rooted construct supported by its social and cultural environment, and that while deviation from the norm is tolerated, too much deviation is punished. With these sociocultural definitions of masculinity in mind, this chapter turns next to studies about masculinity and gender in communication.

Masculinity and Gender in Communication

Communication scholars have focused on masculinity in a wide variety of communication contexts. Some topics in masculinity addressed by communication scholars include homophobia, same-sex touching behaviors, mass communication, message perception, verbal and nonverbal encoding, reactions to perceptual stimuli, communication in education, organizational communication, and health communication.

In order to facilitate this discussion of masculinity and scholarship, a few terms must be defined. Bem (1974) identified three sex-role orientations, which seek to describe not biological sex but an expression of gender: masculine, feminine and androgynous. Masculine sex-role orientation refers to instrumental, agentic, and pragmatic orientations. Feminine sex-role orientation is performed through communal, nurturing, and caring views and actions. Androgynous sex-role orientation describes one who has both masculine and feminine orientations and has the ability to discern which sex-role is appropriate for specific contexts. Some other terms used in the following sections are sex-typed and opposite sex-typed. Sex-typed persons are either masculine

men or feminine women. Sex-typed persons tend to maintain traditional sex-roles. Opposite sex-typed people are feminine men and masculine women. Situated in the center of these masculine and feminine sex-role orientations is androgyny. These key terms will be discussed further in the following review of literature.

Research in haptic nonverbal communication indicates that men, in general, are less comfortable with touching behaviors than women. Androgynous and feminine people are more comfortable with same-sex touch than are masculine people (Crawford, 1994). According to Crawford, women feel more comfortable than men do when presented with same-sex touching contexts. Biological sex is a greater predictor of comfort with same-sex touch in general, but for men, androgyny is the best predictor of increased comfort. For women, androgyny does not predict comfort with same-sex touch with much success. For men, this illustrates that reduced comfort level with same-sex touching behavior is a sign of traditional masculinity. Androgynous men are more comfortable with same-sex touch.

Roese, Olson, Borenstein, Martin, and Shores (1992) found that men hold more homophobic attitudes than women, and that men who are more homophobic are less comfortable with same-sex touch. Women engage in more same-sex touch than men and are more comfortable with it. The correlation between homophobic attitudes and comfort with same-sex touch provides evidence that same-sex touch avoidance is motivated by the fear of appearing to be homosexual. Based on this conclusion, there must be a consistent perception for men that being masculine means being heterosexual and that being feminine means being homosexual. Obviously, the man who wishes to hide his fears of appearing or being homosexual will rely on his masculine training.

To explore the role homophobia plays in the perception of same-sex touching acts, Floyd (2000) offered four theoretical statements. First, homophobia causes people to avoid behaviors that they believe are homosexual behaviors. Second, affectionate behavior can have sexual or non-sexual connotations. Third, the level of influence that homophobia has on behavior is proportional to the probability that the behavior is sexual. Fourth, a homophobic point of view impacts one's behavior and also serves to influence evaluations of others' behavior. These theoretical offerings further illustrate how some men, in their constant battle to appear masculine, will limit same-sex touch.

Floyd (2000) manipulated the context of same-sex touching behavior in staged photographs in three ways; one group of respondents was told that the people in the photographs had romantic interest in each other, a second group was told that the people in the photo were not romantically interested in each other, and the third group was told nothing about the relational context of the people in the photo. Respondents were asked to indicate their responses to the photos through scales that measured normalcy, evaluation of observed touch, and their experience of homophobia. Floyd found that homophobia has a strong negative relationship to normalcy and evaluation of touch when sexual attribution was suggested, a moderately negative relationship when no attribution was suggested, and a near-zero relationship when a non-sexual attribution was suggested. Homophobia has a stronger negative relationship to normalcy and evaluation when the same-sex touch is between men as opposed to women. Another finding provided evidence that men interpret male same-sex touch to be increasingly negative as the attribution moves from nonsexual to sexual. Similarly, men's interpretation of female same-sex touch is most positive when the touch is not attributed to any sexual context.

Women interpreted male same-sex touch more consistently across situations, but indicated that the no-attribution touching was most favorable. Meanwhile, women found nonsexual touch between women to be the most favorable and sexual touch to be least favorable, but even their lowest mean score for female sexual touch was higher than any form of male same-sex touch. Women also found affectionate same-sex touch to be more normal and more positive for women than men. In all, Floyd concluded that men wishing to maintain a masculine stance will disapprove of same-sex romantic and no-context signs of masculinity, perhaps as a genuine by-product of masculine indoctrination or as a way to deflect uncomfortable feelings about same-sex touching behaviors.

Kneidinger, Maple, and Tross (2001) assessed the function of tactile communication in team sports contexts. They found that women touch more frequently than men do. Women and men tend to touch differently in the sports context; women tend to exhibit more hand-to-hand, embrace, and group type touches, while men most often touch hand-to-another body part type touches (like the rear-end, head, and arm). Also, these intimate male touches are also made aggressive as they are delivered by a slap, shake, grab, or a rub. Here, another touching rule for masculine men tells us that if men touch, it should have a percussive, vigorous overtone. The reason for touch must also be in celebration of victories over their opponents or in support and encouragement to help other male teammates to obtain victory.

While same-sex touch studies reveal one method by which men manage their masculine identities, other studies explore different ways in which men manage masculine identity.

Men use a "masculine face" when presenting themselves to the world, hiding their "true selves" underneath. In a study by Shaw and Edwards (1997), male and female college students each identified 15 self-descriptive words from a list of 108 adjectives and then were tape recorded as each told a personal narrative that was well known to the subject's friends and family. Men and women both most often selected words such as "active, attractive, busy, capable, curious, faithful, friendly, generous, happy, independent, polite, and responsible to describe themselves" (p. 58). Words specific to men in this study were "able, funny, and smart" (p. 58), while women specifically chose "careful, sensible, and special" (p. 58). When men told their personal narratives, coders described those narratives with masculine descriptors like "brave, rough, and wild;" coders described women's narratives as "bright, funny, and warm" (p. 59). Men and women described themselves in very similar ways, but in a personal narrative, men performed as masculine. Meanwhile, women presented themselves as androgynous. Shaw and Edwards exposed how men must manage their images so they are perceived to be masculine, even though that may not be who they are or how they feel.

Even though men may present themselves as masculine, some men are androgynous or feminine. Men and women who are feminine in their gender identity were found to be better at person-centered comforting than those who identify as androgynous and masculine. Winters and Waltman (1997) assessed the gender identities of 104 study participants, 27 of whom were male, and elicited open-ended, free-response messages as the subjects responded to four different contexts in which they were to express comfort to another person. The results indicated that men and women who gender-identify as feminine are more successful at crafting person-centered comfort

messages. Due to the communal tendency of feminine gender identity, these successful

participants appear to be in-tune with the comforting needs of others. The method of

responding in writing to a context where comforting messages are encouraged may show

the inner nature of the men studied, but do these men reveal their communal abilities in

real encounters, thus sacrificing their masculine masks?

In times when the masculinity of a man is threatened, as in a job loss situation,

those around him help him save face by constructing and maintaining a façade. Buzzanell

and Turner (2003) studied the actions that resulted from a male head of household's job

loss. In an effort to deal with the job loss, families work together to create an atmosphere

of hope to replace anger. The men who lose their jobs tend to bury their anger and focus

on hope for new employment, which their families support. However, if the anger is

addressed, the man experiences and expresses his anger fully. Another construct that

families work to create is normalcy instead of chaos. The family makes the decision to

keep the family routine normal in order to make life as stable as possible for the children,

but also to help the man save face. For example, families pretend that the

husband/father/breadwinner still brings home a paycheck instead of acknowledging his

apparent weakness. A third method families use to deal with job loss is to restore

traditional masculinity to the man, even though this restoration is illusionary. To support

men's desire to provide for their family, wives who hold jobs do not consider themselves

or talk about themselves as "breadwinners," reserving that position for the husband by

pretending the job loss is a "hiccup" and that he will be employed again soon. When a

man loses his job, the family supports him by creating and maintaining the illusion that

he did not experience an emasculating event, but that he remains a masculine man, still in control, still the head of the family, but who happens to be in occupational transition.

This section explored communication studies that suggest various expectations for masculine men's behavior along with behaviors that allow men to appear masculine. The following section shifts to studies dealing with the perceptions individuals have of others' masculinity.

Perceptions and Judgments of Masculinity

Many studies have explored various topics within the realm of masculinity, some of which are reviewed below. A series of studies (Lobel, 1994; Lobel & Bar, 1997; and Lobel, Rothman, Abramovizt, & Maayan, 1999) explored adolescents' and preadolescents' perceptions and judgments of masculinity within the context of varied Israeli cultures. Other studies discussed in this section reveal how men and women perceive their own and others' gender role orientations.

Israeli adolescents perceive a man from a kibbutz community to be more masculine than a man in an urban setting based on age and residence alone, but perceive a man with the most traditionally masculine occupation more masculine regardless of residence (Lobel & Bar, 1997). Seventy-nine 16-18 year old adolescents read 6 descriptions of male targets. Half of the targets were born and raised kibbutz and the other half were born and raised in an urban environment. One description for the kibbutz and one description for the urban setting had only the place of residence and the age. Other descriptions contained traditionally masculine or feminine occupational information. After reading each description, respondents inferred the target's traits, roles, and physical appearance. When the target's occupational preference was altered to be

14

either more traditionally masculine (construction worker) or more traditionally feminine (an elementary school teacher), the effect of being part of a kibbutz or living in an urban setting dropped out. The targets were then rated as more masculine or feminine based on occupational preference.

Lobel (1994) found that Israeli preadolescent boys, no matter how they scored on the BSRI (Bem Sex Role Inventory), are equally able to identify and make judgments about masculine and feminine behavior in other preadolescent boys. Two hundred fifty-one preadolescent boys were shown videotapes, each depicting a preadolescent boy playing a masculine game (soccer) with other boys, a feminine game (jump rope) with girls, a neutral game (cards) with boys, or a neutral game (cards) with girls. After viewing the tapes, the subjects (of which there were groups of masculine, feminine, androgynous, and undifferentiated boys) made inferences about the boy in the videotape. Some of the inferences made were traits, interests, future occupation, popularity among peers, a choice of gift for the boy (masculine, feminine, or neutral), and to choose a name for the boy (masculine like John or a name both genders use like Chris). Beyond that, the subjects were asked to rate their liking and willingness to engage in activities with the boys they saw in the videos and how similar they felt the boys in the videos were to themselves.

Lobel (1994) found that all sex role orientations "attributed stereotypically feminine traits, activities, gifts, and occupations to the boy who played a feminine game with girls" (p. 384). This boy was also seen as the least likely to be popular. Subjects attributed stereotypically masculine traits, activities, and high popularity to the boy who played a masculine game with other boys. The boy who played a neutral game with girls

15

was rated as most popular. On an affective level, masculine, androgynous, and undifferentiated boys rated their probability of liking and being willing to engage in activities with the boy who played a feminine game with girls to be low and high for the boy who played a masculine game with boys. However, the feminine male subjects said they not only saw themselves in the boy who played a feminine game with girls, they said they would be most likely to want to engage in activities with him and would be least likely to do so with the boy who played a masculine game with boys. The feminine boys were aware of their feminine nature and could differentiate between masculine and feminine as separate constructs of behavior.

Lobel, Rothman, Abramovizt, and Maayan (1999) found that boys who score high on femininity and low on masculinity on the BSRI deceive more on feminine tasks than on masculine tasks compared to masculine, androgynous, and undifferentiated boys. One hundred fifty-four boys responded to three questionnaires. One dealt with traditionally masculine topics, the second with traditionally feminine topics, and the third with neutral topics. Most of the topics on the questionnaires were very difficult, so participants were given an opportunity to pretend they knew more about a topic than they really did.

Feminine boys deceived more often on the feminine topics because these boys wanted to appear more knowledgeable concerning feminine topics than they were concerned about wanting to appear more knowledgeable about masculine or even neutral topics. Lobel et al. (1999) reasoned that, "self-perception of gender-counter-stereotypic characteristics is indicative of a more pervasive sense of oneself as being feminine" (p. 578). Masculine, androgynous, and undifferentiated boys tended to deceive consistently

across all tasks. Lobel et al. reasoned that the motivation for the boys to appear knowledgeable was high and was the main reason for increased deception on all tasks.

While the studies just mentioned focused narrowly on preadolecsent and adolescent boys in the Israeli culture, the focus widens in the following studies to include men and women, their self-perceptions, and their beliefs about the ideal man and woman.

Scher (1984) found that men and women perceive themselves differently than they perceive the ideal man and the ideal woman. While men indicate traditional sex roles for themselves, they also indicate more androgynous views for themselves, but not as much as women do. Women indicate that they, ideal females, and men are androgynous, while men view ideal women as more sex-typed. When asked to rate the ideal man, men tend to respond with more sex-typed answers. But, because these men define themselves as more androgynous, it may indicate that men "have a personal dilemma in which they recognize sex-typed traits in themselves which they do not highly value" (p. 655). If this is so, it is evidence that the boundaries of acceptable masculine behavior may have shifted towards androgyny. Simultaneously, men remain conscious (and perhaps shameful) of their self-perceived differences from traditional masculinity.

Pennell and Ogilvie (1995) discovered that students perceive others' gender-related information differently than they perceive their own gender-related information and that gender-related meanings change based on who is perceived. When one perceives the self, it is a subjective process. When one perceives others, it is an intersubjective process. The difference between perceiving the self and the other reveals how the self and the other are assigned different evaluations based on different criteria. In other words, people tend to perceive the self more kindly than the other. For instance, gender-related

17

features congruent with the participants' biological sex are evaluated more positively than the same gender-related features when evaluating other people. Positive gender-related features define each participant's perception of self as sex-typed regardless of whether the features are considered to be masculine or feminine behaviors. When perceiving other people, men and women tend to agree on what it means to be masculine or feminine, but women seem to have a broader range of behaviors than men do. Pennel and Ogilvie found that individuals perceive women as having feminine and masculine traits, but consider those masculine traits to be feminine. Meanwhile, individuals define masculinity more narrowly as they label feminine traits ascribed to men as feminine. Pennell and Ogilvie concluded that part of the reason that women have more gender-related behavior latitude in the perceptions of college students is a result of having been exposed to textbooks that present women in less traditionally feminine roles. They also added that the women's movement might have had some influence on this group's perceptions.

When perceiving others, individuals tend to be harsher with men than with women. While allowing masculine behaviors to be considered feminine for women, fewer feminine behaviors are considered masculine for men. Similar conclusions can be made in the case of men and women who choose to hyphenate their last names upon marriage instead of the woman taking the man's last name.

College students perceive married men with hyphenated surnames as different from married men who keep their own surname in marriage (Forbes, Adams-Curtis, White, & Hamm, 2002). Married men with hyphenated surnames are perceived as having different views about what marriage means and acceptable gender roles. However, men

with hyphenated surnames are perceived as being highly committed to marriage, less anxious and worried, more outgoing, sociable, curious, and more open to new experiences. While these men are seen as androgynous, when tested through terminology such as "masculine" and "feminine," respondents report these men to be more feminine. "This may suggest that other men may see him as giving up some of his own sense of masculinity when he chooses to use a hyphenated surname" (p. 173). Men and women who perceive their gender identity as gender-consistent, but especially men, consider a married man with a hyphenated surname less positively than a married woman with a hyphenated surname since this behavior goes against traditional sex role expectations.

As men and women assess signs of masculinity originating from without, there is also an assessment within. Theodore and Basow (2000) found that college-aged men who compare and contrast themselves against society's definition of masculinity are likely to have homophobic attitudes of gay men. They also noted that college-aged male homophobia is a result of men's apparent need to make up for self-perceived discrepancies between the self and the ideal man; that is, if college-aged men perceive themselves as being less manly than what society demands, they are more likely to hold and express homophobic attitudes to cover for their self-perceived inadequacies. College-aged men who accept stereotypical, rigid gender roles and evaluate themselves negatively are most likely to hold homophobic attitudes in order to support beliefs that homosexuality is dangerous and that one must repress any behaviors or feelings that may be perceived by others as homosexual. Furthermore, these men fear being perceived as homosexual men and will most likely avoid behaviors and contexts that might lead others to question their heterosexual orientation (Theodore & Basow, 2000).

Taken together, gender role appears to influence perceptions of masculinity in that men tend to be harsh judges of their own and others' masculinity. Women in general tend to be kinder in their judgments of men's masculinity. This conclusion also affirms how men are trained to be men and, therefore, might be considered experts on masculinity. However, when men assess their own masculinity and compare it to what they believe to be the ideal man, often there is a conscious or unconscious sense of shame about any perceived discrepancies. The next section refers to the idea of expertise in masculinity in the form of the gender schema.

Schema and Schema Activation

Constructivism, conceived by Jean Piaget, is the larger theoretical perspective from which schema theory develops. Constructivism tries to explain how people know and come to know about their world (Fosnot, 1996). Constructivism also explains that learning is a self-regulatory process and that knowledge is "temporary, developmental, nonobjective, internally constructed, and socially and culturally regulated" (Fosnot, 1996, p. ix). Constructivism proposes that knowledge is acquired through human adaptation to stimuli. As a person exists within an environment, dynamic processes occur that enable the person to learn new things about the environment. Learning in constructivism is a struggle "with the conflict between existing and personal models of the world and discrepant new insights" (Fosnot, 1996, p. ix).

Markus, Smith, and Moreland (1985) defined schema as "a framework for the perception and organization of…life experiences. It is also broadly and systematically used as an interpretive framework for comprehending the thoughts, feelings, and behaviors of other people" (p. 1494). In any area of experience, a schema exists for the

organization of that experience. Those with little experience in a given area will have a simple schema for that experience. Those well versed in a particular experience will have developed a more complex schema for that given experience. Schema activation occurs when one encounters a stimulus that initiates a search in the mind to make sense of and recognize the stimulus. Schemata for masculinity would activate upon the presentation of stimuli, a sign of masculinity, such as a television commercial featuring a man, a man out at a restaurant with a date, or a man in a movie jumping out of a plane.

According to Markus et al. (1985), men who have highly developed masculine schemas organize and interpret another person's masculine behaviors by chunking behavior into large units or by noting several isolated behaviors related to meaningful masculine behavior. Those with less well-developed masculine schemas cannot chunk behaviors into larger units. Since those who have a well-developed self-schema for masculinity are experts in masculinity, they recognize masculine behavior in others and categorize it by comparing the behavior with their own self-schema for masculinity. Someone with a less developed self-schema for masculinity will not be as skilled at categorizing behaviors as masculine. Thus, a masculine expert will be better able to perceive masculine behaviors and label them as such, while someone with a simpler schema for masculinity may not consider the same behavior as masculine.

Schema activation may result in negative assessments of nontraditional masculinity to mask feelings of shame brought about by the self-recognition of a discrepancy between the self and the ideal image of masculine behavior. Altabe and Thompson (1996) discovered that body image functions as a schema because it is closely tied to emotional reaction and enhanced recall. Activation of the body image schema

results from events in the environment, which trigger an individual's perceived body deficiencies and produces negative emotional states and body image distress. This process may occur in a similar way for decoding masculine signs. Upon schema activation, a person will not only use the masculine schema to make sense of and interpret masculine signs, but men will compare the masculine sign with their beliefs about their own masculinity.

Dijksterhuis and Knippenberg (1995) found that schema activation increases one's ability to remember information inconsistent with that schema. When schemas are activated after the presentation of a schema inconsistent behavior, recall of the inconsistent behavior is low. When schemas are activated prior to the presentation of inconsistent behavior, recall of the inconsistent behavior is high. This shows that schema activation frames how behavior will be perceived. For example, if a teacher gives a lecture to a class and then the next day, the students are told that the teacher actually made up the information presented in the lecture, students' schemas for deception will be activated, but their ability to recall specific deceptive behaviors will be low. In the opposite condition, where the students are notified ahead of time that the lecture material is fictional, the students will have a much easier time recalling specific deceptive behaviors the teacher exhibits. In another example, if someone were to perceive a masculine sign that was inconsistent with her or his schematic definition of masculinity, then the inconsistencies within that masculine sign would be more salient to that person. She or he will remember the inconsistencies more than if she or he had seen a masculine sign that was consistent with her or his schematic definition of masculinity.

While the timing of schema activation affects recall of discrepant information, a person's ego-involvement with a given schema affects that person's schema activation and recall of self-serving information. Conway and Howell (1989) found that ego-involvement, how personally relevant a given task is, alters self-schema activation and the biased recall of favorable words. When subjects are ego-involved in a task, they are able to recall more positive words in relation to the self. When subjects are not ego-involved, subjects recall negative words, but those words are still more favorable to the self. Ego-involved subjects have greater positive self-schema activation as measured by the number of highly favorable words recalled.

Regarding schemas, Hummert, Shaner, and Garska (1995) explained the variety and scope of schema types as they examined elderly stereotypes. They mentioned that people might have multiple stereotypes for the elderly, some of which are positive and some negative. Another important issue they discussed concerned how life experience leads to schema complexity. They found that those with the most complex stereotype sets were older adults, while younger adults and youth have successively less complex stereotype sets. Over the lifespan, people integrate experiences into their schemata for the elderly, which provides evidence for the social construction of aging. We can make direct comparisons to stereotype schemas for the social construction of masculinity. If aging stereotype schemas become more complex through the lifespan, then the same might be true for masculine stereotype schemas. However, on television and in film, we usually see narrow representations of masculinity. Through cultural training, people learn what is and is not appropriate for each gender. It is possible that, as we gain life experience,

stereotypes for masculinity are merely reinforced and unchallenged as people work to avoid or dismiss information that challenges their masculine stereotypes.

Another example of how simple and complex schemas affect judgments of others lies in the complexity of how students' gender-schema influences affect the assessment of college faculty members (Bachen, McLoughlin, & Garcia, 1999). In this study, students responded to characteristics or practices that may be differentially perceived across male and female faculty. Students also shared their perceptions of male and female faculty members in writing. Sex-role expectations and evaluations guide students as they assessed male and female faculty. Female students rate female faculty the most favorably and male faculty the least, while male students are fairly even on their assessments of male and female faculty. Through qualitative responses, students say that female faculty members are best when they are approachable, interested in and supportive of students, and are enthusiastic. If the female faculty member does not possess these qualities (perhaps by appearing more instrumental), students comment that the female faculty member is self-important or has a "chip on her shoulder." Those with more complex gender schemas tend to be more negative towards the non-nurturing female faculty member, thus expressing a stronger expectation for the female faculty member to conform to feminine sex role standards. Male faculty members are held to a different standard. Students do not expect as much nurturing from the male faculty, but do expect encouragement. For the male faculty member, students expect more masculine behaviors to be displayed and do not expect the communal behaviors demanded of women. Students positively assess female and male faculty members who are seen to be competent, professional, and caring.

To summarize this section, schema activation and schemata concerning masculinity affects self- and other-attitudes and judgments. Some factors that influence the masculine schema are age, ego-involvement, and culture. Another influence to explore is the role of mass media as it communicates signs of masculinity.

Masculinity in the Mass Media

In advertising, men and women are portrayed most often in stereotypical sex roles (Fejes, 1992). Male characters appearing in advertisements tend to initiate action through logical reasoning and problem solving and thrive in high-paying jobs. Male characters appearing in advertisements are not found to be emotional nor are they found to be overly concerned with family and relationships.

As a further explanation of gender role stereotypes in commercials, Strate (1992) commented that in beer commercials, masculinity revolves around the theme of challenge. Beer commercials present mostly stereotypical, traditional images of men, and uphold the constructs of masculinity and femininity. When promoting beer, advertisers also promote signs of masculinity and femininity. While beer commercials highlight the obvious "lessons" of what is appropriate gendered behavior, it is not the only source of this information. Most commercial advertisements also contain instruction in gender appropriate behavior.

 "We use consumer goods to define and reinforce definitions of what is masculine and what is feminine" (Barthel, 1992, p. 138). Most people associate advertisements about beer, pizza, trucks, cars, and yard work with masculinity. When watching television programming, such as Monday Night Football, one does not expect to see advertisements for products traditionally associated with femininity, like dishwasher

soap, convenience foods, or clothes. "Much of the power of advertising is indirect…

What it often does do is to plant an image in our minds – an image of the good life, of

how the product can help facilitate its achievement, and an appealing, if flattering, picture

of the people we would like to be" (Barthel, 1992, p. 152). When we encounter

commercial messages through the mass media, our schemas for masculinity and

femininity are reinforced. But what happens when masculinity schemas are challenged by

inconsistent mass mediated information?

When traditionally masculine men are exposed to images of men in advertising,

the level of masculinity presented in the ad has less of an impact on their gender role

attitudes than for less traditionally masculine men (Garst & Bodenhausen, 1997). Short-

term attitude changes occur in less traditionally masculine men, while more traditionally

masculine men's attitudes are less susceptible to change in gender role attitudes. More

traditional men have narrower boundaries for what masculine behavior should be and,

when these men are confronted with contrary images, those images are rejected and

ignored. Since less traditional men have wider boundaries for what masculine behavior

includes (both traditional and nontraditional behaviors), they may be more likely to

experience a short-term change in their gender role attitudes.

Stereotypical images of men frequently appear in advertisements. However, with

the advent of women's liberation, advertisements were adapted. Now it is common for an

advertisement to offer ambiguous images of men and masculinity, allowing the perceiver

to see what he or she wishes to see. "Our adaptation to advertising has been aided, in any

case, by its adaptation to us" (Wernick, 1987, p. 277). Wernick suggested that this

adaptation displaces men in fixed family roles and ideologically fixed masculinity has

been "complemented, finally, by a parallel loosening of masculinity as a sexual construct" (p. 287). When advertisements include ambiguous gender-related imagery, they transform into "floating signifiers, free within any given promotional context to swirl around and substitute for one another at will," which re-presents men and women as equal (p. 294). Even though these transformed images challenge traditional masculinity, advertisers remain cautious to define the relationship between two vaguely presented male characters. In many ads containing only two male characters, their relationship is almost always explained, reassuring fragile and anxious audiences that the two men are not romantic partners. For example, in one commercial ad, two men converse about how a particular service aided their growing business. In the course of that conversation, it is mentioned that they are brothers. In another commercial ad, two men share a taxi. While one man gloats over his superior transaction with the business of interest in this ad, the other man looks defeated. During this power play of one man being more masculine than the other due to his successful "hunting and gathering of resources," it is clearly mentioned that each is married to women and both are shown wearing wedding bands. Both of these commercials have male characters that, if not for their disclosure of their non-homosexual orientations, could easily have been interpreted as romantic couples.

Conclusion

In this chapter, masculinity has been framed within a communicative context and explored through several avenues. Haptic behaviors and perceptions of haptic behaviors reveal how men are less comfortable with same sex touch than women and therefore tend to refrain from it unless it is aggressive touching (like a slap on the back or buttocks). Femininity or communal quality is a factor in how well men and women encode person-

centered comforting messages and how successful they are. Maintaining a masculine face is also an important feature of performing masculinity. Even though a man may feel less than ideal as a masculine creature, he works to create an external character that presents him as such. Families support this creation by rallying around wounded men at a time when masculinity is hotly challenged. A key function of masculine schemata is how they affect judgments of the self and others. In general, we tend to be kinder to ourselves than others, but men still judge themselves more harshly than women do. The complexity of one's schema for masculinity can also influence attitudes towards others' masculine presentations. Finally, this chapter explored the role of mass communication in teaching and reinforcing traditional as well as nontraditional masculinity. In the next chapter, rationales, hypotheses, and research questions are advanced.

Chapter 3: Rationale, Hypotheses and Research Questions

Gender role orientation, schemata for masculinity, and many other variables influence how people perceive and judge masculine signs. Highly masculine men and highly feminine men and women have a narrow view of what masculinity is and will identify the traditional signs of masculinity narrowly (Markus, Smith, & Moreland, 1985). Feminine men and women may perceive masculine signs more traditionally because they see themselves in opposition to traditional masculinity (see Lobel, 1994). Those who are androgynous will interpret a broader scope of behaviors as masculine than same- or opposite sex-typed individuals (see Garst & Bodenhausen, 1997; Pennel & Ogilvie, 1995; Theodore & Basow, 2000). Androgynous individuals may have a broader definition of and have more flexible constructs for what it means to be masculine or feminine and whether or not those masculine signs are judged positively or negatively. Therefore it is expected that…

> H1: Sex-typed and opposite sex-typed men and women judge traditionally masculine imagery as more masculine than androgynous typed men and women.
>
> H2: Sex-typed and opposite sex-typed men and women judge traditionally masculine imagery as more positive than androgynous typed men and women.

Each gender role orientation reflects differing expectations for human behavior (see Crawford, 1994; Floyd, 2000; Garst & Bodenhausen, 1997; Kimmel, 1987; Lobel, 1994; Pennel & Ogilvie, 1995; Roese, Olson, Borenstein, Martin, & Shores, 1992; Theodore & Basow, 2000). Traditionally masculine men tend to be homophobic and tend

29

to fear feminine behavior in men and wish not to be associated with it (Kimmel, 1987; Lobel, 1994). Feminine women, because they have similar gender role orientations to traditionally masculine men, are also likely to express discomfort with nontraditional signs of masculinity (Pennel & Ogilvie, 1995). Opposite sex-typed men and women and androgynous individuals conceptualize male behavior expectations differently and therefore have a less negative reaction to information counter to schemata for traditionally masculine behavior (see Crawford, 1994; Floyd, 2000; Garst & Bodenhausen, 1997; Lobel, 1994; Roese, et al, 1992; Theodore & Basow, 2000). Thus, I predict that…

> H3: When an individual expects a traditionally masculine image, but that expectation is violated, sex-typed individuals will evaluate the nontraditional image as less masculine than opposite sex-typed and androgynous individuals.
>
> H4: When an individual expects a traditionally masculine image, but that expectation is violated, sex-typed individuals will evaluate the nontraditional image more negatively than opposite sex-typed and androgynous individuals.
>
> H5: If an individual expects a nontraditionally masculine image and that expectation is upheld, sex-typed individuals will perceive the nontraditionally masculine image as less masculine than androgynous individuals.

H6: If an individual expects a nontraditionally masculine

image and that expectation is upheld, sex-typed individuals

will perceive the nontraditionally masculine image more

negatively than opposite sex-typed men and androgynous

individuals.

When information counter to developed schemata occurs, schemas are called into

question. When schemas are challenged, the individual must attempt to resolve the

conflicting information with the available schematic information. When an individual

expects nontraditionally masculine behavior, the individual's schema for masculinity is

activated. When the behavior of the target differs from these expectations by showing

signs of traditional masculinity, the individual's schema for masculinity is challenged.

This challenge may have multiple effects depending on the individual. The individual

might perceive feminine behavior despite the masculine behavior displayed due to

conflicting information, become frustrated, and judge the masculine sign negatively. The

individual might otherwise perceive traditionally masculine behavior and disregard the

conflicting information. Because same-sex typed and opposite sex-typed individuals'

have less flexible schemas for masculine behavior than androgynous individuals (Altabe

& Thompson, 1996; Bachen, McLoughlin, & Garcia, 1999; Dijksterhuis & Knippenberg,

1995; Markus, Smith, & Moreland, 1985), the following is expected:

H7: When an individual expects a nontraditionally

masculine image and that expectation is violated (i.e. the

individual sees a traditionally masculine sign), sex-typed

and opposite sex-typed individuals will judge that

masculine image more negatively than androgynous individuals.

H8: When an individual expects a nontraditionally masculine image and that expectation is violated (the individual sees a traditionally masculine sign), sex-typed and opposite sex-typed individuals will judge masculine imagery as more feminine than androgynous individuals.

Opposite-sex typed women may respond negatively to a nontraditionally masculine image of a man because they see the femininity they lack. They may see the nontraditional or even feminine man as a reminder that they are more masculine than culture expects them to be. However, it might also be true that opposite-sex typed women may be unaffected by images of nontraditionally masculine men or feminine men because they may not be interested in or concerned with male imagery. As a result, their schemas for masculine signs may not be as well developed and they will therefore judge the signs positively. For the same reason, they will also not consider them to be masculine. Because the literature does not address these issues, they are addressed here in the form of research questions.

RQ1: When an opposite sex-typed woman expects a nontraditionally masculine image, and that expectation is upheld, will the opposite sex-typed woman evaluate the masculine image as more negative than all other individuals?

RQ2: If an opposite sex-typed woman expects a nontraditionally masculine image and that expectation is upheld, will opposite sex-typed women perceive the nontraditionally masculine image as more feminine than all other individuals?

RQ3: Do opposite sex-typed women judge nontraditional masculine imagery more negatively than sex-typed men and women, opposite sex-typed men, and androgynous men and women?

RQ4: Do opposite sex-typed women judge nontraditionally masculine imagery as more feminine than sex-typed men and women, opposite sex-typed men, and androgynous men and women?

The following chapter explains the procedures for testing these hypotheses and for answering these research questions.

Chapter 4: Methods and Procedures

Masculine signs reflect what a culture expects of its men (Craig, 1992; Saco, 1992). Men perform masculinity based on lessons learned about whom they should not be (Badinter, 1995; Kimmel, 1987; Strate, 1992). Because of this, the male experience can be quite stressful (Badinter, 1995). For instance, men are less comfortable with touch than women (Crawford, 1994), men tend to be more homophobic than women (Floyd, 2000; Roese, Olson, Borenstein, Martin, & Shores, 1992), and some men experience shame for not living up to ideal notions of what is masculine (Altabe & Thompson, 1996; Scher, 1984; Theodore & Basow, 2000). Perceptions and judgments of masculine signs stem from culture bound experiences that teach masculinity (Chesebro & Fuse, 2001; Lobel, 1994; Lobel & Bar, 1997; Pennell & Ogilvie, 1995; Scher, 1984; Theodore & Basow, 2000; and others). From a schematic point of view, people who are experts on masculinity are able to chunk behaviors into large units while those who have more simple schemata for masculine behavior cannot do so (Markus, Smith, & Moreland, 1985). Based on this information, several hypotheses and research questions concerning gender role orientation's effect on the development of schemata for masculine signs were posited. The following is a discussion of the methods and procedures used to explore the proposed hypotheses and research questions.

<u>Participants</u>

Participants were recruited from Communication Studies classes at Louisiana State University (N=747). According to data analyzed through the "G*Power" computer program (Erdfelder, Faul, & Buchner, 1996), 500 participants would be enough power to have a medium effect at the .05 alpha level after throwing out non-United States citizens

and other miscellaneous respondent errors. The participants were asked to take class time

to respond to the instrument and masculine imagery to be explained in detail below.

"Undifferentiated" people score low on the masculine and the feminine portions of the

modified self-report BSRI. None of this study's participants was undifferentiated. Also,

because there is a lack of sufficient literature about the undifferentiated, this group was

not a concern for this study. Non-United States citizens were thrown out since people

from different cultures, far removed from southern United States cultures, might have

obscured the data (n = 32). Some respondents were thrown out because they did not

indicate their sex (n = 4), did not fill out a portion of the instrument (n = 19), were

underage (n = 1), or reported questionable ages for a college aged group (n = 14). A

questionable age was, for example, 92 years old. While it is not unheard of for someone

of any age to be enrolled in a university, extremes such as this may have indicated either

a less than serious mindset when responding to the instrument or a simple error in

entering age. Three hundred eighty-five participants (51.5%) were women and 362

(48.5%) were men. Since participants' sex was crucial to the outcomes of this study,

those that did not indicate their sex were dropped. Participants' ages ranged from 18 to 51

years old (M=21.17, SD = 3.64). Ninety-two participants (12.3%) were African

American, 18 (2.4%) were Asian, 614 (82.2%) were Caucasian, 12 (1.6%) were

Hispanic, and 11 (1.5%) indicated "other" for race. Seventy-six (10.2%) participants

were freshman, 237 (31.7%) were sophomores, 219 (29.3%) were juniors, 207 (27.7%)

were seniors, and eight (1.1%) either did not enter a response for class or were non-

matriculating students. Placing respondents in testable categories for sex role,

participants' androgyny scores were separated into three fairly even groups. 250

participants (33.5%) were assigned to the masculine group, 239 (32%) were assigned to the androgynous group, and 257 (34.4%) were assigned to the feminine group. Based on the sex of the participant, each individual was assigned to one of six categories of gender role orientation: Masculine men (n = 170), masculine women (n = 80), androgynous men (n = 123), androgynous women (n = 116), feminine men (n = 68), and feminine women (n = 189).

<u>Masculinity Scales</u>

Before entering into the discussion of variables and measurements, it must be mentioned that there are several instruments that claim to measure the construct of masculinity. A discussion of various scales follows featuring assessments by Thompson, Pleck, and Ferrera (1992), who reviewed 11 masculinity ideology measures, which attempt to discern populations' attitudes towards men, and 6 scales measuring other masculinity-related constructs. Their review evaluated the reliability and validity of these scales and offered conclusions about the limitations of the reviewed scales with suggestions for the development of newer, more focused scales. Several of the scales they reviewed will be briefly explained and evaluated. After this review, a new scale by Chesebro and Fuse (2001) will be explored. Finally, an explanation of and justification for the use of the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) will be discussed as the choice for measuring gender role orientation and the judgment of masculine imagery as masculine or feminine in the current study.

Thompson, Pleck, and Ferrera (1992) reviewed several scales that measure masculinity constructs. The following recapitulates their review for some of these scales. *The Macho Scale* (Villemez & Touhey, 1977) is a 28-item self-report instrument that

Thompson, Pleck, and Ferrera (1992) believed measures "antifemininity and patriarchal ideology and is not strictly a masculinity ideology measure tapping only attitudes toward men and masculinity standards" (p. 580). *The Attitudes Towards the Male Role Scale* (Doyle & Moore, 1978) attempts to measure people's attitudes towards appropriate male behavior in the following dimensions: male dominance, vocational pursuits, sexuality, emotionality, and relations with women and other men. Thompson, Pleck, and Ferrera claimed that this scale actually measures attitudes towards men in comparison to women and therefore makes it difficult to determine if the scale measures this interpretation or the original, intended construct. The *Attitude Toward Masculinity Transcendence Scale* (as cited in Thompson, Pleck, and Ferrera, 1992) measures dominance transcendence, homophobia transcendence, nontraditional activities, and the acceptance of the "new woman" (which reflects a mid-1970's, feminist point of view). It is intended to measure "attitudes toward the changing societal norms and values defining masculinities" (p. 584). Thompson, Pleck, and Ferrera concluded that this scale has evidence to support its validity and reliability and is a notable scale. Another *Macho Scale* (Bunting & Reeves, 1983) appeared in the early 1980's and attempted to operationalize hypermasculinity, which refers to extremely rigid traditional masculinity taken to pathological levels. While this scale is intended for male respondents only, it has also been used incorrectly to measure other constructs like masculinity beliefs, gender attitudes, and attitudes towards women. Thompson, Pleck, and Ferrara found this scale to be quite limited in its usefulness. The *Gender-Role Conflict Scale* (O'Neil, Helms, Gable, David, & Wrightsman, 1986) attempts to measure masculinity by measuring responses to "contradictory and unrealistic messages within and across the standards of masculinity"

(p. 597) and men's reactions to the gender-based expectations they face with great frequency. Thompson, Pleck, and Ferrera concluded that this scale "provides an important link between societal norms scripting traditional masculinities and individuals' adaptation" (p. 598). The *Masculine Gender Role Stress Scale* (Eisler & Skidmore, 1987) looks at the weight of cognitive stress that men tend to feel more than women do in the following areas: situations that demonstrate physical inadequacy, expression of "tender" emotions, situations where men are subordinate to women, threats to men's intellectual control, and performance failures in work and sex. Thompson, Pleck, and Ferrara evaluated this scale as a strong measure that focuses well on gender role stress.

Taken together, Thompson, Pleck, and Ferrara (1992) concluded that masculinity ideology standards for men are different from women; that attitudes toward men and attitudes toward women are conceptually independent, and by including both in the same scale, they dilute the chances of a clear interpretation of the data; newer scales that reach beyond traditional measures (like the GRCS, where respondents report their stress level in violating traditional norms) look promising but remain largely uncharted; and that too many scales direct attention to a masculinity script that is too narrow to be realistic (presumption of conventional division of labor between sexes, contrasts to the female role, and continual heteronormativity). They also noted that other aspects of masculinity might have been ignored. Age, generation, sexual orientation, class, race, ethnicity, and other factors that may affect perceptions of masculinity have not yet been studied to a sufficient degree to make any solid conclusions about other possible cultural masculinities.

Perceived Masculinity Questionnaire

Chesebro and Fuse (2001) constructed the Perceived Masculinity Questionnaire 50 (PMQ50) that measures perceived masculinity based on multiple dimensions. This scale may be used for self and other report. While it successfully measures one's (or another's) perceived masculinity, it does not assess masculine, feminine, and androgynous gender orientations as the BSRI (Bem Sex-Role Inventory) does.

Initially, Chesebro and Fuse considered eight factors. Physiological energy compares androgen/testosterone levels to estrogen/progestin levels. This dimension deals with the impact of hormonal differences reflected through history and culture by asking "how desirable it is to be aggressive, assertive, competitive, dominant, or forceful in society" (p. 226). Physical characteristics explore gender-related physical characteristics like being physically larger than women and having deeper voices. Gender-related sociocultural roles look at the social performance of masculinity as a reflection of culture. It explores what roles men are expected to perform in order to be perceived as masculine within a given culture and society. Gender preference assesses sexual orientation, the gender and gender characteristics of one's sexual partner, and the effects of an orientation on self- and other-perceptions of an individual's ability to be masculine. Subjective gender-identity measures self- and other-perceptions of the self's masculinity. This refers to how masculine one sees one's self and how one believes others see one's self. Gender-related age identity refers to "the social, symbolic construction of sexuality relative to one's age" (p. 227). For instance, prepubescent boys and elderly men are often perceived as asexual, even though it is a misnomer that elderly men are less physically able to have sex when it is usually a psychological factor (Chesebro & Fuse, 2001). Gender-related

39

racial and national identities deal with the stereotypes people use to define and characterize what is and is not masculine for a particular race or national identity. Lust is a measure of intense sexual desire, which seems to be related to masculinity. Higher levels of lusty intentions and behavior were predicted to positively correlate with higher levels of masculinity.

With further revisions, Chesebro and Fuse (2001) added additional categories. Male eroticism was added to "underscore the sensuous, hedonistic, suggestive, passionate, and amorous set of characteristics that have become associated with masculinity…in marketing and advertising" (p. 239). The dimension of Gender preference contained two specific sets of attitudes and reactions, which are now the new dimensions of Idealized masculinity and Sexual preference. All together, what is now dubbed the PMQ47 (due to revisions) is a scale that measures ten dimensions of masculinity.

Bem Sex Role Inventory

The Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) has received both praise and criticism over the decades since it was introduced. Bem's article, "The Measurement of Psychological Androgyny" has been cited over 190 times (EBSCO, 2004) and the use of the BSRI remains commonly accepted (see Edwards & Hamilton, 2005; Washburn-Ormachea, Hillman, & Sawilowsky, 2004; Reeder, 2003; Rubinstein, 2003; Grinnell, 2002; and many more) despite criticism.

Bem (1974) developed the BSRI, which describes a person as masculine, feminine, or androgynous regardless of biological sex. Those who tend to identify themselves as instrumental, agentic, or assertive indicate masculine orientations.

40

Feminine orientations are indicative of communal, nurturing, and expressive traits. Androgynous individuals indicate high rates of masculinity and femininity, which means that their masculinity score subtracted by their femininity score would result in a low difference. Bem suggested that the androgyny score can be calculated by using a *t-ratio* on a statistical software package, but explains that an adjusted difference between masculine and feminine scores will produce very similar outcomes. Bem also described how androgynous people are at an advantage over sex-typed individuals (those scoring as male and masculine, female and feminine) as they are able to respond to various contexts more appropriately. Considering that androgynous people identify themselves as having both masculine and feminine traits, they have a wider range of communicative tools to deal with various situations. A masculine person would have trouble dealing with a context that calls for feminine behaviors, but an androgynous person would have more success.

Critics of the BSRI described limitations to the scale suggesting that the constructs of masculinity and femininity are not unidimensional constructs, but would function better as differently labeled constructs. Choi and Namok (2003) found that masculinity and femininity might not have been operationalized well enough in the BSRI. In a review of 25 articles, Choi and Namok examined the BSRI through various factor analytic methods, sample characteristics, extraction and rotation methods, etc. The results of their review revealed that the BSRI might not capture the complex nature of masculinity and femininity. Hoffman and Borders (1999) argued that classification of people into Bem's sex roles is not consistent depending on the method used to collect and calculate data. They encourage researchers to measure expressiveness and instrumentality

and not to consider these outcomes as exclusively congruent to masculine or feminine

categories. While Brems and Johnson (1990) found internal consistency and validity for

the BSRI's scales measuring masculinity and femininity, they found it to have a four-

factor result when applying principal axis factor analysis with varimax rotation. Through

this, they concluded that both the masculinity scale and the femininity scale are not

unidimensional. They suggested that the BSRI's main scale labels, masculinity and

femininity, should be altered to become, respectively, Interpersonal Potency and

Interpersonal Sensitivity.

Since it's creation, the BSRI has been praised and criticized by many scholars in

the social sciences. While some argued that the BSRI is not as useful as Bem suggested,

others continued to use it (in abbreviated form) to measure psychological androgyny. For

the purposes of the present study, the use of the BSRI allows for the separation of

individuals into meaningful categories, which will facilitate the analysis of hypotheses

and research questions. Masculine men and feminine women, androgynous men and

women, and feminine men and women are categories that would not be possible using

other scales mentioned in this section.

Independent Variables

Gender Orientation

Gender orientation was measured using a modified version of the Bem Sex Role

Inventory (BSRI) (Bem, 1974). The BSRI (see Appendix 1) included a scale for

masculinity (Cronbach's alpha = .839), a scale for femininity (Cronbach's alpha = .811),

and a social desirability scale. For the purposes of this study, the social desirability scale

and the terms "masculine" and "feminine" were eliminated. Social desirability, though an

important construct in interpersonal communication, does not directly address the issues to be studied here. In a previous study, (Edwards & Hamilton, 2004) the scale was administered without the terms "masculine" and "feminine" due to concerns that they would bias the responses. The terms "masculine" and "feminine" tend to be polarizing words that may not correlate with the overall scales of masculinity and femininity. Participants' responses to the BSRI were here and elsewhere separated into two lists, masculinity and femininity. The responses were added and averaged for each list. These averages comprise the participants' masculinity and femininity scores. To calculate the androgyny score, the feminine average was subtracted from the masculine average. The closer the resulting score is to zero, the more androgynous the individual is. If the androgyny score is negative, it indicates that the individual has a masculine gender role orientation. If the androgyny score is positive, it indicates that the individual is more feminine.

Expectation for the Masculine Sign

Two conditions framed the context of the advertisement. The first condition operationalized the expectation for traditionally masculine imagery as respondents were told that an ad came from a magazine with a universally accepted reputation for representations of traditional masculinity (such as *Sports Illustrated*). The second condition operationalized expectations for nontraditionally masculine imagery as respondents were told that the ad came from a source that does not necessarily follow traditional masculinity (such as *The Advocate: The National Gay and Lesbian Newsmagazine*). By altering the source of the advertisement, activated masculine

43

schemas were either supported or contradicted by the ad itself, depending on the

perceptions of the respondents.

The Stimulus

The stimulus was one of two magazine advertisements featuring a male figure.

The traditionally masculine advertisement pictured a Nike athletic shoe featuring a

traditionally masculine male image, which was baseball player Jason Giambi. The text on

the ad included "made to move" next to Nike's trademark "swoosh" and some small

lettering in the lower right hand corner that read, "Jason Giambi, Nike Sphere Thermal

Top, flexibility to go." The text in the lower right hand corner was virtually invisible

when projected with a document camera or with a transparency projector. It must be

noted that these data were collected before a steroid scandal including Jason Giambi

occurred in 2005. The second advertisement featured a nontraditionally masculine image,

an androgynous or even feminine male subject in an Echo by Davidoff cologne ad. The

model lay on his side, looking through the cologne bottle at the camera. The text in this

advertisement read, "Echo Davidoff: The New Fragrance for Men." In both

advertisements, the male target was the only person featured in the advertisement to

avoid distraction concerning the focus of the respondents' perceptions and judgments of

masculine imagery.

Dependent Variables

Perception of Masculinity

To measure respondents' judgments of the male figure's masculinity ($M = 3.55$,

$SD = .73$, Cronbach's alpha = .923) and femininity ($M = 3.09$, $SD = .62$, Cronbach's

alpha = .889), an adapted version of the BSRI was administered. This adapted scale was

the same version that respondents filled out for themselves, except they used this scale to assess an "other" (see Appendix 2). Participants' assessments of the masculine image, just as it was done for the self-report version, were separated into two lists, masculinity and femininity. The responses were added and averaged for each list. These averages comprised the participants' assessment of the masculine image's masculinity and femininity. To calculate the androgyny score, the feminine average was subtracted from the masculine average ($M = -0.46$, $SD = 1.10$). The closer the resulting score was to zero, the more androgynous the individual was. If the androgyny score was negative, it indicates that the individual perceived the masculine image as having a masculine gender role orientation. If the androgyny score was positive, it indicates that the individual perceived the masculine image as having a more feminine gender role orientation.

Attitude towards Masculine Sign

To measure respondents' attitudes towards the male figure, five prompts measured positive and negative judgments about the male figure (see Appendix 4) ($M = 11.84$, $SD = 3.76$). Participants were asked to rate the male figure on a five-point scale based on a series of opposites: Good person-Bad Person, Abnormal-Normal, Honest-Dishonest, Friendly-Unfriendly, and Acceptable-Unacceptable. Each pairing had a positive and negative counterpart. If the participant rated the male figure as "abnormal," then that rating would indicate a negative judgment. These were recoded so that, when added together, a low score indicated positive judgments and a high score indicated negative judgments. Because the scale ranged from 1 to 5, the lowest score possible was 5 and the highest score possible was 25. The attitude scale's reliability score indicated lower than desired reliability (Cronbach's alpha = .717). The reliability of this scale

would not have improved significantly if one or more items were removed. This lower reliability score may have occurred because some participants indicated distress about assigning attitudes towards a male figure they did not know. During administration of the instrument, two or three respondents revealed this concern to the proctor without prompting. It may have indicated some confusion over instructions that asked the respondent to "indicate the impressions created by the character in the advertisement, which might appear in such magazines as…along the following criteria."

Procedure

Respondents participated on a voluntary basis, but any student wishing to refrain from participating may have done so without penalty. The data were collected in classroom settings. Over the course of months, 14 professors, instructors, and graduate assistants administered the instrument to their classes, which were of varying size from 15 to over 100 students. Approximately thirty classrooms were involved in data collection.

First, respondents indicated demographic data such as their age, race, and sex. Secondly, the questionnaire asked the respondents to give their impressions of their own sex role orientation through a modified version of the BSRI (Bem Sex Role Inventory). Third, when all respondents completed the modified version of the BSRI, one of the two images discussed earlier were displayed via document projector or via color transparency. Though the selection of which class would see which image was random, care was taken to expose as equal an amount of participants as possible. Upon viewing the selected advertisement participants were instructed to read in the questionnaire that they were to imagine they have found this advertisement either in the pages of *Sports Illustrated* or

The Advocate: The National Gay and Lesbian Newsmagazine. A few other magazines were listed to ensure that the respondent understood the assumed primary audience for that advertisement. To ensure that participants understood that *Sports Illustrated* was the traditionally masculine source, *Men's Journal* and *Maxim* were also listed. To ensure that participants understood that *The Advocate: The National Gay and Lesbian Newsmagazine* was the nontraditionally masculine source, *Out* and *Instinct* were also listed. Care was taken to ensure an equal number of each questionnaire type was distributed to each classroom participating in this study. To react to the advertisement and the source, respondents indicated their impressions of the male subject's masculinity and femininity using the modified version of the BSRI and indicated their attitudes towards the male subject through the five polar opposite word prompts. One final question assessed the participants' usage of the magazines listed in their version of the instrument.

The preceeding explicated the procedures and methods used to conduct an experiment designed to confirm or disconfirm the study's hypotheses and research questions concerning gender role orientation's influence on the development of schemata for masculine signs. Several alternative instruments designed to measure some aspect of masculinity were discussed and a justification was provided for the use of the BSRI in this present study. The following chapter discusses the results of this experiment.

Chapter 5: Results

To facilitate a clear discussion of the results of this study, results are reported in two parts. The first part describes the results of t-tests on eight hypotheses and four research questions and the second part describes interesting findings from two exploratory ANVOAs. The first ANOVA analyzed the perception of androgyny of the masculine imagery in both advertisements as the dependent variable and participants' gender role, the sources of the advertisements, the advertisements themselves, and the sex of the participants as independent variables. The second ANOVA analyzed participants' positive or negative judgments of the masculine imagery presented to them using participants' gender role, the source, the advertisement, and the sex as independent variables. On the following page a table lists an overview of the results of the hypotheses and research questions.

Hypothesis number one stated that sex-typed and opposite sex-typed men and women judge traditionally masculine imagery as more masculine than androgynous typed men and women. Though the means were in the predicted direction, the t-test comparing androgynous participants to sex-typed and opposite sex-typed individuals was not significant, t (416) = -1.114, p = .13. There is no significant difference in the perception of androgyny in a traditionally masculine image that is affected by gender orientation (M for sex-typed and opposite sex-typed participants = -1.04, SD = .93; M for androgynous participants = -0.94, SD = .88).

Hypothesis number two stated that sex-typed and opposite sex-typed men and women judge traditionally masculine imagery as more positive than androgynous typed men and women. The t-test was not significant, t (416) = -.530, p = .30. Additionally,

Table One

Overview of hypotheses and research questions

H1	Sex-typed and opposite sex-typed men and women judge traditionally masculine imagery as more masculine than androgynous typed men and women.	Not supported
H2	Sex-typed and opposite sex-typed men and women judge traditionally masculine imagery as more positive than androgynous typed men and women.	Not supported; Means in wrong direction
H3	When an individual expects a traditionally masculine image, but that expectation is violated, sex-typed individuals will evaluate the nontraditional image as less masculine than opposite sex-typed and androgynous individuals.	Not supported
H4	When an individual expects a traditionally masculine image, but that expectation is violated, sex-typed individuals will evaluate the nontraditional image more negatively than opposite sex-typed and androgynous individuals.	Not supported; Means in wrong direction
H5	If an individual expects a nontraditionally masculine image and that expectation is upheld, sex-typed individuals will perceive the nontraditionally masculine image as less masculine than androgynous individuals.	Not supported
H6	If an individual expects a nontraditionally masculine image and that expectation is upheld, sex-typed individuals will perceive the nontraditionally masculine image more negatively than opposite sex-typed men and androgynous individuals.	Not supported; Means in wrong direction
H7	When an individual expects a nontraditionally masculine image and that expectation is violated, sex-typed and opposite-sex typed individuals will judge that masculine image more negatively than androgynous individuals.	Not supported
H8	When an individual expects a nontraditionally masculine sign and that expectation is violated, same-sex and opposite-sex typed individuals will judge masculine signs as more feminine than androgynous individuals.	Not supported; Means in wrong direction

Table One continues on the next page.

49

RQ1	If an opposite sex-typed woman expects a nontraditionally masculine image, and that expectation is upheld, will the opposite sex-typed woman evaluate the masculine image as more negative than all other individuals?	Not supported;
RQ2	If an opposite sex-typed woman expects a nontraditionally masculine image and that expectation is upheld, will opposite sex-typed women perceive the nontraditionally masculine image as more feminine than all other individuals?	Not supported
RQ3	Do opposite sex-typed women judge nontraditionally masculine imagery more negatively than sex-typed men and women, opposite sex-typed men, and androgynous men and women?	Not supported;
RQ4	Do opposite sex-typed women judge nontraditionally masculine imagery as more feminine than sex-typed men and women, opposite sex-typed men, and androgynous men and women?	Supported

the means were not in the predicted direction (*M* for sex-typed and opposite sex-typed participants = 11.56, *SD* = 3.78; *M* for androgynous participants = 11.36, *SD* = 3.48). There is no significant difference in the positive or negative judgment of traditionally masculine imagery that is affected by gender orientation.

Hypothesis number three stated that when an individual expects a traditionally masculine image, but that expectation is violated, sex-typed individuals will evaluate the nontraditional image as less masculine than opposite sex-typed and androgynous individuals. Although the means were in the predicted direction, this hypothesis was not significant, $t(166) = .620$, $p = .27$. Gender orientation is not a significant factor in the perception of androgyny for nontraditionally masculine imagery appearing in traditionally masculine contexts (*M* for sex-typed participants = 0.12, *SD* = .11; *M* for androgynous and opposite sex-typed participants = 0.03, *SD* = .10).

Hypothesis number four stated that when an individual expects a traditionally masculine image, but that expectation is violated, sex-typed individuals will evaluate the nontraditional image more negatively than opposite sex-typed and androgynous

individuals. This hypothesis was not supported, t (166) = -1.74, p = .04. Additionally, the means were not in the predicted direction (M for sex-typed participants = 11.73, SD = 3.49; M for androgynous and opposite sex-typed participants = 12.74, SD = 3.97). Sex-typed individuals may evaluate traditional imagery of masculinity within a nontraditionally masculine context more positively than opposite sex-typed and androgynous individuals.

Hypothesis number five stated that if an individual expects a nontraditionally masculine image and that expectation is upheld, sex-typed individuals will perceive the nontraditionally masculine image as less masculine than androgynous individuals. This hypothesis was not significant at conventional levels of alpha, t (132) = 1.53, p = .065. Because the means were in the predicted direction, there may be some effect for gender orientation's role in affecting the perceptions of masculinity of nontraditionally masculine imagery appearing in nontraditionally masculine contexts (M for sex-typed participants = 0.42, SD = .10; M for androgynous participants = 0.18, SD = .11).

Hypothesis number six stated that if an individual expects a nontraditionally masculine image and that expectation is upheld, sex-typed individuals will perceive the nontraditionally masculine image more negatively than opposite sex-typed men and androgynous individuals. This hypothesis was not significant, t (164) = -1.11, p = .14. Additionally, the means were not in the predicted direction (M for sex-typed participants = 11.95, SD = 3.92; M for androgynous and opposite sex-typed participants = 12.62, SD = 3.86). Gender orientation is not a significant factor in the positive or negative judgments of nontraditionally masculine imagery appearing in nontraditionally masculine contexts.

Hypothesis number seven stated that when an individual expects a

nontraditionally masculine image and that expectation is violated (i.e. the individual sees

a traditionally masculine image), sex-typed and opposite-sex typed individuals will judge

that masculine image more negatively than androgynous individuals. Though the means

were in the predicted direction, this hypothesis was not supported, t (212) = .090, p = .46.

When an individual expects to see a nontraditionally masculine image, and that

expectation is violated, there is very little difference between all gender orientation types

(M for sex-typed and opposite sex-typed participants = 11.84, SD = 4.12; M for

androgynous participants = 11.79, SD = 3.63).

Hypothesis number eight stated that when an individual expects a nontraditionally

masculine image and that expectation is violated (the individual sees a traditionally

masculine image), same-sex and opposite-sex typed individuals will judge masculine

imagery as more feminine than androgynous individuals. This hypothesis was not

significant, t (212) = -1.429, p = .08. Additionally, the means were not in the predicted

direction (M for sex-typed and opposite sex-typed participants = -0.748, SD = .96; M for

androgynous participants = -0.554, SD = .10). When an individual expects a

nontraditionally masculine image and that expectation is violated, sex-typed and opposite

sex-typed individuals may perceive the image as more masculine than do androgynous

individuals.

Research question number one asked if an opposite sex-typed woman expects a

nontraditionally masculine image, and that expectation is upheld, will the opposite sex-

typed woman evaluate the masculine image as more negative than all other individuals?

Evidence for this question does not support that masculine women dislike

nontraditionally masculine imagery with nontraditionally masculine sources, t (164) = 1.689, p = .09. Though the means were not significantly different, it appears that masculine women may judge this type of masculine image more positively (M = 10.83, SD = 3.31) than all other gender orientation types (M = 12.46, SD = 3.93).

Research question number two asked if an opposite sex-typed woman expects a nontraditionally masculine image and that expectation is upheld, will opposite sex-typed women perceive the nontraditionally masculine image as more feminine than all other individuals? This was not the case, t (164) = -1.53, p = .13. Masculine women (M = 0.67, SD = .96) are similar to other gender orientation groups (M = 0.35, SD = .84) when judging the masculinity/femininity of a nontraditional masculine image in a nontraditionally masculine source context.

Research question number three asked if opposite sex-typed women judge nontraditionally masculine imagery more negatively than sex-typed men and women, opposite sex-typed men, and androgynous men and women. The data showed that masculine women (M = 10.83, SD = 3.51) have more favorable attitudes towards nontraditionally masculine imagery than all other groups (M = 12.48, SD = 3.83), t (330) = 2.58, p = .01.

Research question number four asked if opposite sex-typed women judge nontraditionally masculine imagery as more feminine than sex-typed men and women, opposite sex-typed men, and androgynous men and women? The data supported a positive answer to this research question, t (330) = -1.96, p = .05. Masculine women (M = 0.49, SD = .98) perceive nontraditionally masculine imagery as more feminine than all other gender orientation groups (M = 0.19, SD = .90).

Now that the results for this study's hypotheses and research questions have been presented, the following presents the results of two ANOVAs. These two ANOVAs were conducted on the following dependent variables: the judgment of the masculine image's androgyny and the respondents' attitudes toward the masculine image.

A four-way ANOVA was conducted to test respondents' judgments of the level of androgyny of masculine imagery through the gender role of the respondents, the source of the advertisements, the advertisements themselves, and the sex of the respondents. Significant results included the following: respondent's gender role, advertisement source, advertisement, sex, the interaction of respondent's gender role and the advertisement, the interaction of the advertisement and its source, and the interaction of the advertisement and the sex of the respondent.

A univariate ANOVA that tested the respondents' gender role and their perceptions of the androgyny of the masculine imagery was significant, F (2, 722) = 3.93, p = .02, η^2 = .01. Though the analysis was significant, the effect was trivial. An analysis of confidence intervals revealed that masculine participants (M = -0.28, SE = .059) perceived masculine imagery to be more feminine than androgynous (M = -0.44, SE = .056) and feminine participants (M = -0.51, SE = .061).

A univariate ANOVA that tested the source of the advertisement and participants' perceptions of the androgyny of the masculine image was significant, F (1, 722) = 44.16, p = .00, η^2 = .06. Participants found the traditionally masculine source (Sports Illustrated) (M = -0.64, SE = .047) to be more masculine than the nontraditionally masculine source (the Advocate: The National Gay and Lesbian Newsmagazine) (M = -0.18, SE = .049).

A univariate ANOVA that tested the advertisement and participants' perceptions of the masculine image's androgyny was significant, $F(1, 722) = 371.93$, $p = .00$, $\eta^2 = .34$. The Nike advertisement was determined to be more masculine ($M = -1.07$, $SE = .046$) than the Echo advertisement ($M = .25$, $SE = .050$). The effect size shows that the advertisements greatly affected percieved androgyny of masculine imagery.

A univariate ANOVA that tested the sex of the participant and participants' perceptions of the masculine image's androgyny was significant, $F(1, 722) = 9.50$, $p = .002$, $\eta^2 = .01$. Though the effect was trivial, women perceived the masculine imagery to be more masculine ($M = -0.51$, $SE = .047$) than men ($M = -0.30$, $SE = .049$).

A two-way interaction between participants' gender role, the advertisement, and participants' perceptions of the androgyny of the masculine image was significant, $F(2, 722) = 6.43$, $p = .002$, $\eta^2 = .02$. The advertisements had the highest impact on this result. Though the effect was trivial, all respondents found the traditionally masculine advertisement to be much more masculine than the nontraditionally masculine advertisement (see Table Two). The only group that was markedly different from others was the masculine group who perceived the nontraditionally masculine advertisement as most feminine ($M = 0.53$, $SE = .088$). The result of this interaction effect does not change the interpretation of the main effects.

A two-way interaction between the source of the ads and the advertisements on the participants' perceptions of the androgyny of the masculine image was significant, $F(1, 722) = 4.31$, $p = .04$, $\eta^2 = .006$. Though this is a remarkably trivial effect, the most masculine advertisement was the Nike ad when it was suggested to have appeared in the traditional source (Sports Illustrated) ($M = -1.36$, $SE = .064$). The Nike ad in the

Table Two

Means and standard errors for the interaction effect of gender role and advertisements on perceptions of androgyny

	Traditional Ad	Nontraditional Ad
Masculine participants	-1.08/.079	0.53/.088
Androgynous participants	-0.95/.072	0.08/.086
Feminine participants	-1.16/.085	0.14/.087

nontraditional source (*the Advocate: The National Gay and Lesbian Newsmagazine*) was considered to be less masculine than the same ad in the traditional source (*M* = -0.77, *SE* = .065). The Echo cologne ad was judged to be less masculine than the Nike advertisement in either source when appearing in the traditional source (*M* = 0.09, *SE* = .070). The most feminine advertisement was the Echo cologne ad when respondents were asked to imagine the ad appearing in the nontraditional source (*M* = 0.40, *SE* = .072) (see Table Three).

A two-way interaction between the advertisements and the sex of the respondents on perceptions of androgyny of masculine imagery was significant, *F* (1, 722) = 8.34, *p* = .004, η^2 = .01. Though the effect was trivial, women found the Nike ad to be the most masculine (*M* = -1.27, *SE* = .065) while men found the Nike ad to be less masculine (*M* = -0.86, *SE* = .065). Women and men were evenly matched in their judgment of the Echo cologne advertisement, considering it to be androgynous, leaning toward the feminine (*M* = 0.24, *SE* = .067 for the women and *M* = 0.25, *SE* = .075 for men). The preceding results described the significant findings for the ANOVA of the

Table Three

Means and standard errors for the effect of the advertisements and the ads on perceptions
of androgyny

Traditional Ad and Source	-1.36/.064
Nontraditional Source and Traditional Ad	-0.77/.065
Traditional Source and Nontraditional Ad	0.09/.070
Nontraditional Source and Ad	0.40/.072

assessment of masculinity. The following describe the results of the ANOVA for positive

and negative judgments of masculine imagery.

A second ANOVA tested participants' judgments for masculine imagery.

Significant areas of the ANOVA test include the following: the advertisements,

participants' sex, and the interaction of the participants' gender role, the advertisement,

and sex of the participants.

A univariate ANOVA that tested the advertisements and the positive or negative

judgments of the masculine imagery was significant, $F(1, 722) = 17.34$, $p = .000$, $\eta^2 =$

.023. The traditionally masculine image in the Nike advertisement was judged more

positively by all participants ($M = 11.27$, $SE = .195$) than the nontraditionally masculine

image in the Echo advertisement ($M = 12.48$, $SE = .214$).

A univariate ANOVA that tested the participants' sex and the positive or negative

judgments of the masculine imagery were significant, $F(1, 722) = 31.21$, $p = .000$, $n^2 =$

.041. Women judged the masculine imagery to be more positive ($M = 11.07$, $SE = .199$)

than men did ($M = 12.68$, $SE = .211$).

A three-way interaction between participants' gender role, the advertisement, the sex of participants, and the positive or negative judgments of the masculine imagery was significant, $F(2, 722) = 3.35$, $p = .035$, $\eta^2 = .009$. Masculine men ($M = 12.55$, $SE = .350$) judged the masculine image in the Nike less positively than feminine men ($M = 11.48$, $SE = .616$) regardless of the source presented. Androgynous men ($M = 12.06$, $SE = .421$) also judged the masculine image as more negative than feminine men. When men viewed the Echo cologne advertisement masculine men ($M = 12.36$, $SE = .480$) judged the masculine image to be more negative, but were more positive than androgynous men ($M = 13.25$, $SE = .526$) and feminine men ($M = 14.39$, $SE = .641$). A significant difference exists between the mean scores of masculine men and feminine men. Androgynous men again scored at an intermediate level between masculine and feminine men. Women judging the Nike advertisement judged more positively, but with little difference between masculine ($M = 10.10$, $SE = .579$), androgynous ($M = 10.51$, $SE = .449$), and feminine gender role orientations ($M = 10.93$, $SE = .384$). When women judged the masculine image in the Echo advertisement, androgynous women expressed more negative attitudes ($M = 12.54$, $SE = .515$) than masculine ($M = 10.83$, $SE = .579$) and feminine ($M = 11.49$, $SE = .367$) women did (see Table Four).

The results of this study were largely not significant. There was no strong, consistent relationship between gender role and the assessment of androgyny in masculine imagery, nor was there a strong, consistent relationship between gender role and the judgment of masculine imagery. Exploratory ANOVA tests on perceptions of the androgyny of masculine imagery reveal a stronger relationship between respondent's

Table Four

Means and standard errors for the effects of participants' gender role, the advertisement, and paticipants' sex on the positive or negative judgments of the masculine imagery

Men	Nike advertisement	Echo advertisement
Masculine	12.55/.350	12.36/.480
Androgynous	12.06/.421	13.25/.526
Feminine	11.48/.616	14.39/.641
Women		
Masculine	10.10/.579	10.83/.579
Androgynous	10.51/.449	12.54/.515
Feminine	10.93/.384	11.49/.367

gender role, advertisement source, advertisement, sex, the interaction of respondent's gender role and the advertisement, the interaction of the advertisement and its source, and the interaction of the advertisement and the sex of the respondent. Of these tests, the advertisement explained the most variance in the perceptions of androgyny in masculine imagery. Exploratory ANOVA tests on participants' judgments of masculine imagery reveal a stronger relationship between the advertisements, participants' biological sex, and the interaction of gender role, the advertisement, and the biological sex of the participants. The advertisements explained much of how participants judge masculine imagery positively or negatively. In the next chapter, these results and their implications will be discussed.

Chapter 6: Discussion

The purpose of this study was to discover the effect of gender role on the perceptions and judgments of masculine imagery. Gender, a learned cultural phenomenon, is a filter through which people perceive and make sense of their reality. One way people learn about gender is through advertising. The imagery in advertising supports or challenges notions of what it means to be masculine or feminine. In the present study, masculine imagery in advertisements was used to activate participants' schemata for masculinity. Participants' evaluations of the androgyny of the masculine imagery and their attitudes towards the masculine imagery were tested to see to what extent gender role influences these perceptions.

Participants ($N = 747$) responded to a modified version of the Bem Sex Role Inventory, which assessed the participants' masculinity, femininity, and androgyny. They then were exposed to an image of one of two advertisements. One advertisement featured an active, athletic, traditionally masculine male in an athletic shoe magazine ad, while the second advertisement featured a passive, nontraditionally masculine male in a cologne ad. Participants were then directed to read instructions that asked them to imagine that the displayed ad appeared in one of two magazines. The first magazine was *Sports Illustrated*, a traditionally masculine source, and the second magazine was *The Advocate: The National Gay and Lesbian Newsmagazine*, a nontraditionally masculine source. The participants rated the masculine image's masculinity, femininity, and androgyny using a modified version of the Bem Sex Role Inventory. Lastly, the participants responded to five semantic differentials that measured positive or negative judgments of the masculine image.

The results revealed that the effect of gender role on the judgments and perceptions of masculine imagery is mostly insignificant and trivial. There appear to be only small differences between how masculine, feminine, and androgynous men and women perceive and judge masculine signs. One difference was found in sex-typed individuals as they evaluate nontraditionally masculine imagery appearing in nontraditionally masculine sources as more positive than opposite and androgynous sex-typed individuals. A research question revealed, though at non-conventional levels ($p = .09$), that masculine women might judge nontraditionally masculine imagery in nontraditionally masculine sources as more positive than any other gender role group. A second research question showed that masculine women perceive nontraditionally masculine imagery appearing in nontraditionally masculine sources as more feminine than any other group. Other research questions revealed that masculine women judge nontraditionally masculine imagery in general as more positive and as more feminine than any other group.

Though the results of the hypotheses and research questions show gender role's effect on the perceptions and judgments of masculine signs to be dubious, other factors explained more of what caused differences in perception and judgment. Concerning perceptions of androgyny in masculine imagery, participants' gender role, advertisement sources, advertisements, the sex of the participants, the interaction effect of the advertisement and it's source, and the interaction effect of the advertisement and the sex of the participant explain more of what affects these perceptions than does gender role alone. According to a univariate ANOVA, the factor that explained the most about what influenced participants in this study was the advertisement, which accounted for 34% of

the variance. All other factors explained only one per cent or less of the variance for assessment of androgyny in masculine imagery.

Concerning positive or negative judgments of masculine imagery, the advertisements, participants' sex, and the interaction effect of participants' gender role, participants' sex, and the advertisement itself help explain more of what affects these judgments than does gender role alone. Participants' sex explained 4% of the variance, the most of any other factor in this ANOVA. The advertisements explained only 2% of what influenced positive or negative judgments of masculine imagery.

Gender role makes a significant difference when expectations for a traditionally masculine image are violated, especially in sex-typed individuals. Sex-typed individuals find traditionally masculine imagery more masculine than androgynous-typed and opposite sex-typed individuals, even when the expectation is set up to be a nontraditionally masculine image. Sex-typed individuals also judge the traditionally masculine image in the nontraditionally masculine source more positively than all other groups as well. This may be so because even though sex-typed individuals are well able to spot differences in masculinity in others, those differences may not lead to negative judgments. Another possibility for positive judgments is that the traditionally masculine image was softened by the nontraditional source. When individuals expect to see a nontraditionally masculine image, but then see an image that is traditionally masculine, the reaction is positive.

While these two cases suggest that gender role orientation influences some positive or negative judgments and perceptions of androgyny in masculine imagery, it is apparent that gender role orientation's influence is small. Six of eight hypotheses show

that gender role orientation is not a significant influence on positive or negative judgments or on perceptions of androgyny in masculine imagery, while the significant results in the exploratory ANOVA tests tended to have very small effect sizes for gender role, meaning that gender role explains very little of what happens when people encounter masculine signs, or at least when people encounter masculine imagery in advertising.

Masculine participants saw more femininity in the masculine imagery than did feminine and androgynous participants. Since men often compare themselves to their impressions of what the ideal man should be (Badinter, 1995; Scher, 1984; Theodore & Basow, 2000), masculine men may see or simply report more femininity in masculine imagery because they compare themselves through the image and what they believe men should be. Masculine women may see androgyny for similar reasons, but perhaps sense the masculine image is less masculine than they are.

Men perceive more femininity in masculine imagery than women regardless of the advertisement or the source. However, all individuals consider a traditionally masculine source, like Sports Illustrated, to be more masculine than a nontraditionally masculine source, such as the Advocate: The National Gay and Lesbian Newsmagazine. Also, individuals find the Nike advertisement to be more masculine than the Echo advertisement. The differences between men and women on perceptions of androgyny in masculine imagery must be informed by norms existing within the culture (Badinter, 1995; Craig, 1992; Kaufman, 1987), as are judgments of the level of the androgyny of imagery.

When an interaction effect occurs between sources and advertisements, the traditionally masculine advertisement in the traditionally masculine source is perceived as most masculine, followed by the traditional advertisement in the nontraditionally masculine source, then the nontraditionally masculine ad in the traditionally masculine source, and finally, as the most feminine, the nontraditional ad in the nontraditional source. So, appropriately, individuals seem to agree on the androgyny they perceive in masculine imagery and their sources. Culturally, masculinity is learned and seems to have a fairly common definition across the culture (Badinter, 1995; Craig, 1992; Strate, 1992). This finding also supports how the source influenced perceptions just as how advertising in television and magazines (Barthel, 1992; Fejes, 1992; Wernick, 1987) or how non-advertising sources of masculine stimuli such as videotapes or simple descriptions of occupation (Lobel, 1994; Lobel & Bar, 1997) influences definitions of masculinity.

Women perceive the traditionally masculine advertisement to be masculine whereas men find it to be less so. This agrees with the finding that men find more femininity in masculine imagery in general than women do. Again, we find that respondents react to their cultural training in masculinity.

Men and women agree in their perception that the nontraditionally masculine advertisement is more feminine than the traditionally masculine advertisement. However, women find the traditionally masculine image to be more masculine than men do, but they agree more often on androgyny in a nontraditionally masculine image. This may also be due to cultural training.

Participants' positive or negative judgments of masculine imagery are influenced by the advertisements themselves, the participants' sex, and an interaction effect of

64

participants' gender role, the advertisement, and the sex of the participants. Women tend to judge masculine imagery more positively than men and the traditional image was judged more positively than the nontraditional image. Men's more negative judgments of masculine imagery may reflect either disinterest in masculine signs or, perhaps, a certain level of homophobia that seeks to separate those who wish not to be viewed as less traditionally masculine (Badinter, 1995; Crawford, 1994; Roese, Olson, Borenstein, Martin, & Shores, 1992; Floyd, 2000; Theodore & Basow, 2000).

Masculine men judge traditionally masculine imagery more negatively than androgynous men, while feminine men and all women judge traditionally masculine imagery most positively. This finding is interesting because the literature notes that traditionally masculine signs are positively judged by audiences (Altabe & Thompson, 1996; Barthel, 1992; Lobel, 1994; Lobel & Bar, 1997; Scher, 1984). To see that masculine men judge the Nike advertisement more negatively than all other groups suggests again that masculine men are either disinterested or are intimidated by traditionally masculine signs (Badinter, 1995; Crawford, 1994; Roese, Olson, Borenstein, Martin, & Shores, 1992; Floyd, 2000; Theodore & Basow, 2000).

Masculine men negatively judge nontraditional imagery, but androgynous men judge them more negatively, while feminine men judge them most negatively. In Lobel (1994), feminine boys tended to dislike the traditionally masculine boy and tended to like the nontraditionally masculine boy. To find such negative reactions in this present study may indicate that feminine men's attitudes change over time or that the cultural training is different in the United States than in Israel, where the Lobel (1994) study was conducted.

Androgynous women judge nontraditionally masculine imagery negatively, while feminine women are more positive towards them. Masculine women like nontraditional imagery the most. It was expected that androgynous women would judge nontraditionally masculine imagery most positively, so this result is perplexing. Being able to behave in masculine and feminine modes does not mean that their attitudes toward nontraditional masculinities will become more positive. Despite gender role orientations, androgynous women perceive masculine signs through their cultural training. The reasons behind this result are in need of further investigation.

As the results of the research questions regarding masculine women indicate, gender role seems to affect masculine women's positive judgments of nontraditionally masculine imagery. They tend to be more positive toward them than all other gender role orientations. This may be because they might perceive their own opposition to femininity just as feminine men perceive their own opposition to masculinity (Lobel, 1994; Pennell & Ogilvie, 1995; Scher, 1984; Theodore & Basow, 2000). So, masculine women may feel more positively toward nontraditionally masculine signs because they personally understand them. Even though masculine women judge nontraditionally masculine signs positively, they perceive these signs as more feminine than any other group. This may happen because their unique gender role orientation stands in opposition to traditional gender roles.

Developing schemata for masculinity and judgments of masculine signs seems to be influenced little by gender role, but it is apparent that schemata for masculinity are influenced by the cultures surrounding the individual. People learn about masculinity through significant others and through other means such as the media and peer groups

66

(Badinter, 1995; Craig, 1992). Individuals receive similar messages about what masculinity is regardless of an individual's gender role (Scher, 1984; Pennell & Ogilvie, 1995; Altabe & Thompson, 1996; Theodore & Basow, 2000). Identifying a nontraditionally masculine sign does not also mean that individuals will always hold negative attitudes towards the nontraditionally masculine.

This study has several strengths that include the reliability of the instruments used, the clarity of the advertisements and sources as traditionally masculine and nontraditionally masculine, and the sufficient number of participants. The Bem Sex Role Inventory was reliable as a self- and other-report instrument. The scale created to measure positive or negative judgments of a masculine image also had acceptable reliability. The advertisements were also clear as one being a traditionally masculine image and the other being a nontraditionally masculine image. The sources of the advertisements were also very clear. Experts on the researcher's committee verified the clarity of the advertisement and the sources, as did the results of the two exploratory ANOVAs. Consistently, participants identified the traditionally masculine ad and source as more masculine than the nontraditionally masculine ad and source. Having 747 participants strengthened the meaningfulness of the data, clearly having enough participants to detect more of the effects of gender role on perceptions of masculinity and on positive or negative judgments. While this study had many strengths, it also had weaknesses.

The questionnaire used for this study had close to ninety questions, which increased the possibility of respondent fatigue. There may have been other problems with the instrument. A few participants spontaneously remarked during the instrument's

administration that they did not think they were able to judge the masculine imagery nor report their perceptions because they "did not know him." This reaction may have had a more dramatic effect on the participants' responses than is apparent if the desire to not judge another without having personal knowledge was more widespread than detected. Making the BSRI a self- and other-report mechanism may have encouraged this problem. While one can assess one's self, it is more difficult to assess someone unknown with descriptive words like "loyal" or "willing to take a stand." These issues may be evidence that the use of the BSRI as an other-report may have been a weakness for this study. For future study, the development of a new instrument designed to assess the masculinity of an other is recommended.

In another participant/instrument issue, one man recorded on his response sheet that he did not want to participate because he thought the researcher was trying to compare him to a "gay man." Perhaps this is an extreme example of how the procedure may have disturbed some of the more sensitive participants, but this could also be an indication of a more widespread, though not communicated, discomfort with the experiment. Additionally, this reaction was due to the source, *the Advocate: The National Gay and Lesbian Newsmagazine*. It is quite possible that the sources for the advertisements, intended to activate masculine schemata, might have activated other schemata as well. For instance, the nontraditionally masculine source might have activated religious schemata. The traditionally masculine source might have activated sports schemata or simply mass media schemata.

Other possible issues that may have weakened this study include the participants' age, the geographical region participants came from, difficulties with the subject of the

advertisement, and the construction of desire that advertisements attempt to create. The mean age for this population was 21 years old. This young age may not be representative of all people. Due to the disparate experiences of different cohorts of people there will inevitably be differing opinions of what masculinity is and what it is not. Another concern is that most of the participants came from a similar cultural background. If this study were replicated in other regions of the United States, there would be differences in the outcome. Another potential weakness dealt with apparent confusion about who the masculine image was. During a pilot study, respondents admitted they did not know who they were supposed to be looking at. Was the male figure supposed to be the model, the character the model was "playing," or was the model to be associated with the product being sold. The instructions for the participants were altered to refer to the male figure as a "character" though that does not guarantee clarity for this issue. Another issue might arise from the advertisement as a tool to create desire for a product. Advertising hopes to create desire in the consumer so that their products will be purchased (Barthel, 1992). How much the construction of desire overlaped with the masculine imagery is unknown, however it is possible that this was also a factor in diluting the results.

Because the differences in perceptions and judgments between gender role groups were often very small or nonexistent, the effect of gender role on perceptions of masculinity and on positive or negative judgments was less than expected. With 747 participants, a large number of respondents, there was enough power to deliver a meaningful result (it was reported that 500 participants would have been sufficient). Obtaining one thousand participants may not have increased the ability to see the effect.

While the effect of gender role on the schemata for masculinity exists, the extremely small effect sizes found in the results show that gender role orientation is just a tiny portion of all the factors involved in developing cultural attitudes towards masculinity. For example, the respondents' gender role indicated differing reactions to the androgyny of the masculine image in the advertisements, $F(2, 722) = 3.93$, $p = .02$, $\eta^2 = .01$. However the effect size reveals that this explains only one per cent of the variance. Another result revealed that when the source of the ads and the advertisement are combined, a significant difference exists, $F(1, 722) = 4.31$, $p = .04$, $\eta^2 = .006$, but again we see a very low variance of 0.6%. A third, very extreme example was the significant interaction for participants' gender role, the advertisement, and sex of participants, $F(2, 722) = 3.35$, $p = .035$, $\eta^2 = .009$. This interaction effect explained a paltry 0.9% of the variance. While these and other results of the ANOVAS conducted had significant findings, there is a limitation in the effect size, being that it is so small, much of these data explain very little about the issues of perceptions of masculine signs and in positive or negative judgments of masculine signs.

Since the results of this research are unclear, they provide many new avenues for future research.

Masculine women's positive judgments of nontraditionally masculine signs are interesting. Why do masculine women so positively judge nontraditionally masculine signs? Why do masculine women also see more femininity in nontraditionally masculine signs than any other gender role group?

This study shows that the advertisements and sex are the more significant determinants of the perceptions of androgyny and of positive or negative judgments of

masculine imagery. In addition, since the present study shows that gender role plays such a small role in the perceptions and judgments of masculine signs, does that mean that those who study these concepts are constructing falsely? If gender role is not a large determinant and the advertisements accounted for 34% of the variance, how is it then that we come to understand anything about masculinity or gender roles? Certainly gender is culture bound, but what is the major influence that reveals to us the way to understand gender? What other factors influence judgments and perceptions of masculine signs? What is it about current advertising and media sources that influence the judgments and perceptions of masculine signs within them? What content tells people that a masculine sign is traditionally masculine, nontraditionally masculine, or somewhere in between? To what extent does the reputation of the source (or perhaps the source's intended audience) influence perceptions and judgments of masculine imagery found within?

Of equal interest would be to study similar effects with traditionally feminine and nontraditionally feminine signs. Would attitudes and perceptions of femininity align with studies of attitudes and perceptions of masculine signs?

Other areas of study are to look at how masculinity, femininity, and androgyny evolve over the lifespan. Since it seems that attitudes towards nontraditionally masculine signs were positive for feminine boys (Lobel, 1994) and then as most negative among feminine men in the current study, are these attitudes similar or different among other age groups? Measuring attitudinal change by following a cohort of feminine men might provide insight into the development of schemata, changes in perceptions of gender roles, judgments of gender roles, and might uncover long-term influences and effects of this gender role. Lastly, looking at these topics from a multicultural perspective would also be

comparatively interesting. Different cultures have differing definitions of masculinity and would therefore have different attitudes and perceptions towards masculine signs. It may also be in the multicultural area that further effects of gender role on schema development may garner additional useful information.

To improve on the methods of this present study, qualitative interviews with randomly selected participants would help to clarify issues concerning the assessment of androgyny and the positive and negative judgments of masculine imagery. In addition, these interviews could reveal further problems with the quantitative method discussed above.

This discussion explored the results of the study, strengths and potential weaknesses of the study, and recommendations for future research. Though it seems that gender role plays just a small role in perceiving masculine signs, it would be presumptuous to stop there. This issue must be explored in different ways to verify or contradict the results of this present study. Though this study indicates that gender role is not a major driver of how we perceive masculinity, it certainly is not the final word on this issue.

Chapter 7: Conclusion

Masculinity is a multi-dimensional, fairly pliable construct that some scholars approach from a biological perspective, others approach from a social constructionist perspective, and others approach from a unifying perspective. Part of the environment that informs the meaning of masculinity to a given culture is the mass media.

This study took the constructivist theoretical perspective, which attempted to explain the activation of schemata. This perspective describes the schematic process as people perceiving and processing signs of masculinity and comparing them to what they understand to be true about masculinity.

This study sought to explain gender role orientation's influences on the development of schemata, which would be evidenced by clear differences in assessments of differing masculine signs. This study ($N = 747$) asked participants to rate their own sex role and then asked them to assess what they imagined to be the sex role of and how well they liked the masculine image to which they were exposed. The two masculine images used in this experiment were also imagined to have been taken from different sources. Each source, combined with the masculine image provided four categories of masculinity ranging from traditionally masculine to nontraditionally masculine. The results of this experiment show that while gender role affects how people interpret masculine signs, the effect is much smaller than the literature suggests. Larger effects in interpretation were due to the sex of the participant, and the sources those advertisements were to be imagined to come from. To further understand gender role's influence on perceptions of masculinity and gender, further study is required.

References

Altabe, M. & Thompson, J. K. (1996). Body image: A cognitive self-schema construct? *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 20*, 171-193.

Bachen, C. M., McLoughlin, M. M., & Garcia, S. S. (1999). Assessing the role of gender in college students' evaluations of faculty. *Communication Education, 48*, 193-210.

Badinter, E. (1995). *XY: On Masculine Identity*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Barthel, D. (1992). When men put on appearances: Advertising and the social construction of masculinity. In S. Craig (Ed.), *Men, Masculinity, and the Media* (p. 137-153). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

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

Brems, C. & Johnson, M. E. (1990). Reexamination of the Bem sex-role inventory: The interpersonal BSRI. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 55*, 484-498.

Bunting, A. B., & Reeves, J. B. (1983). Perceived male sex orientation and beliefs about rape. *Deviant Behavior, 4,* 281-295.

Buzzanell, P. M. & Turner, L. H. (2003). Emotion work revealed by job loss disclosure: Backgrounding-Foregrounding of feelings, construction of normalcy, and (re)instituting of traditional masculinities. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 31*, 27-57.

Chesebro, J. W. & Fuse, K. (2001). The development of a perceived masculinity scale. *Communication Quarterly, 49*, 203-278.

Choi, N. & Fuqua, D. R. (2003). The structure of the Bem sex role inventory: A summary report of 23 validation studies. *Educational & Psychological Measurement, 63*, 872-888.

Conway, M. & Howell, A. (1989). Ego-involvement leads to positive self-schema activation and to a positivity bias in information processing. *Motivation and Emotion, 13,* 159-177.

Craig, S. (1992). Considering men and the media. In S. Craig (Ed.), *Men, Masculinity, and the Media* (p. 1-7). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Crawford, C. B. (1994). Effects of sex and sex roles on same-sex touch. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 78, 391-394.

Dijksterhuis, A. P. & Knippenberg, A. D. (1995). Timing of schema activation and memory: Inhibited access to inconsistent information. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 25*, 383-390.

Doyle, J. A. & Moore, R. J. (1978). Attitudes toward the male role scale: An objective instrument to measure attitudes towards the male's sex role in contemporary society. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 8,* 35-36.

EBSCOhost search using PSYCHinfo. (2004, March 2).

Edwards, R. & Hamilton, M. A. (2004). You need to understand my gender role: An empirical test of Tannen's model of gender and communication. *Sex Roles, 50,* 491-504.

Eisler, R. M. & Skidmore, J. R. (1987). Masculine gender role stress: Scale development and component factors in the appraisal of stressful situations. *Behavior Modification, 11,* 123-136.

Erdfelder, E., Faul, F., & Buchner, A. (1996). GPower: A general power analysis program. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers, 28*, 1-11.

Fagot, B. I. & Leinbach, M. D. (1994). Gender-role development in young children. In M. R. Stevenson (Ed.), *Gender Roles: Through the Life Span* (p. 3-24). Muncie, IN: Ball State University Press.

Fejes, F. J. (1992). Masculinity as fact: A review of empirical mass communication research on masculinity. In S. Craig (Ed.), *Men, Masculinity, and the Media* (p. 9-22). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Floyd, K. (2000). Affectionate same-sex touch: The influence of homophobia on observers' perceptions. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 140*, 774-788.

Forbes, G. B., Adams-Curtis, L. E., White, K. B., & Hamm, N. R. (2002). Perceptions of married women and married men with hyphenated surnames. *Sex Roles, 46,* 167-175.

Fosnot, C. T. (1996.) Preface. In C. T. Fostnot (Ed.), *Constructivism: Theory, Perspectives, and Pactice* (p. ix-xi). New York: Teachers College Press.

Garst, J. & Bodenhausen. (1997). Advertising's effects on men's gender role attitudes. *Sex Roles, 36*, 551-572.

Grinnell, J. P. (2002). Effects of leaders' and evaluators' sex on sex-role stereotyping of charismatic leaders. *Psychological Reports, 91*, 1247-1252.

Hoffmann, R. M., & Borders, L. D. (1999). Twenty-five years after the Bem sex-role inventory: A reassessment and new issues regarding classification variability. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 34*, 39-55.

Hummert, M. L., Shaner, J. L., & Garska, T. A. (1995). Cognitive processes affecting communication with older adults: The case for stereotypes, attitudes, and beliefs about communication. In J. F. Nussbaum & J. Coupland (Eds.), *Handbook of Communication and Aging Research* (p. 105-131). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Kaufman, M. (1987). Introduction. In M. Kaufman (Ed.), *Beyond Patriarchy: Essays by Men on Pleasure, Power, and Change* (p. xiii-xix). Toronto, Canada: Oxford University Press.

Kimmel, M. S. (1987). The cult of masculinity: American social character and the legacy of the cowboy. In M. Kaufman (Ed.), *Beyond Patriarchy: Essays by Men on Pleasure, Power, and Change* (p. 235-249). Toronto, Canada: Oxford University Press.

Kinsman, G. (1987). Men loving men: The challenge of Gay Liberation. In M. Kaufman (Ed.), *Beyond Patriarchy: Essays by Men on Pleasure, Power, and Change* (p. 103-119). Toronto, Canada: Oxford University Press.

Kneidinger, L. M., Maple, T. L., & Tross, S. A. (2001). Touching behavior in sport: Functional components, analysis of sex differences, and ethological considerations. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 25*, (1), 43-62.

Lobel, T. E. (1994). Sex typing and the social perception of gender stereotypic and nonstereotypic behavior: The uniqueness of feminine males. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66,* 379-385.

Lobel, T. E. & Bar, E. (1997). Perception of masculinity and femininity of kibbutz and urban adolescents. *Sex Roles, 37,* 283-293.

Lobel, T. E., Rothman, G., Abramovizt, E., & Maayan, E. (1999). Self-perception and deceptive behavior: The uniquness of feminine males. *Sex Roles, 41*, 577-587.

Markus, H., Smith, J., & Moreland, R. L. (1985). Role of the self-concept in the perception of others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49*, 1494-1512.

O'Neil, J. M., Helms, B. J., Gable, R. K., David, L., & Wrightsman, L. S. (1986). Gender-role conflict scale: College men's fear of femininity. *Sex Roles, 14,* 335-350.

Pennell, G. E. & Ogilvie, D. M. (1995). You and me as she and he: The meaning of gender-related concepts in other- and self-perception. *Sex Roles, 33,* 29-57.

Reeder, H. M. (2003). The effect of gender role orientation on same- and cross-sex friendship formation. *Sex Roles, 49*, 143-152.

Roese, N. J., Olson, J. M., Borenstein, M. N., Martin, A., & Shores, A. L. (1992). Same-sex touching behavior: The moderating role of homophobic attitudes. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 16*, 249-259.

Rubinstein, G. (2003). Macho man: Narcissism, homophobia, agency, communion, and authoritarianism - a comparative study among Israeli bodybuilders and a control group. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 4*, 100-110.

Saco, D. (1992). Masculinity as signs: Postsrtucturalist feminist approaches to the study of gender. In S. Craig (Ed.), *Men, Masculinity, and the Media* (p. 23-39). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Scher, D. (1984). Sex-role contradictions: Self-perceptions and ideal perceptions. *Sex Roles, 10,* 651-656.

Shaw, C. M. & Edwards, R. (1997). Self-concepts and self-presentations of males and females: Similarities and differences. *Communication Reports, 10,* 55-62.

Stevenson, M. R., Paludi, M. A., Black, K. N., & Whitley, B. E. (1994). Gender roles: A multidisciplinary life-span perspective. In M. R. Stevenson (Ed.), *Gender Roles: Through the Life Span* (p. ix-xxxi). Muncie, IN: Ball State University Press.

Strate, L. (1992). Beer commercials: A manual on masculinity. In S. Craig (Ed.), *Men, Masculinity, and the Media* (p. 78-92). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Theodore, P. S. & Basow, S. A. (2000). Heterosexual masculinity and homophobia: A reaction to the self? *Journal of Homosexuality, 40,* 31-48.

Thompson, E. H., Pleck, J. H., & Ferrera, D. L. (1992). Men and masculinities: Scales for masculinity ideology and masculinity-related constructs. *Sex Roles, 27*, 573-607.

Villemez, W. J. & Touhey, J. C. (1977). A measure of individual differences in sex stereotyping and sex discrimination: The "macho" scale. *Psychological Reports, 41,* 411-415.

Washburn-Ormachea, J. M., Hillman, S. B., & Sawilowsky, S. S. 2004. Gender and gender-role orientation differences on adolescents' coping with peer stressors. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence, 33*, 31-40.

Wernick, A. (1987). From voyeur to narcissist: Imaging men in contemporary advertising. In M. Kaufman (Ed.), *Beyond Patriarchy: Essays by Men on Pleasure, Power, and Change* (p. 277-297). Toronto, Canada: Oxford University Press.

Winters, M. & Waltman, M. S. (1997). Feminine gender identity and interpersonal cognitive differentiation as correlates of person-centered comforting. *Communication Reports, 10,* 123-132.

Appendix 1: Scale for Demographic Information and Self-Report Modified BSRI

All responses are voluntary, confidential, and anonymous. Your responses will not be traceable to you. Mark all answers on the attached answer sheet. **Do no*t*** mark or write on the questionnaire in any way. **Do no*t*** mark or write on the answer sheet except responses to the following questions.

Please record your **sex** at the top of the box in the lower left hand corner of the back of the form.

Please record your **year of birth** under "Birth Date" and "Yr." on the back of the form in the lower left hand corner box. For example, if you were born on January 3rd of 1986, then you would fill in 0 and 1 under "Birth Date" and "Yr." Under "Mo.", you would fill in the numbers 8 and 6.

Please turn over your form to the front page and begin responding to the following starting at number 1.

1. Classification:

    A. Freshman   B. Sophomore C. Junior   D. Senior   E. Other

2. Ethnicity:

    A. African-American/Black   B. Asian/Pacific-Islander

    C. Caucasian/White   D. Latino-Latina/Hispanic

    E. Other

3. Are you a United States citizen?

  A. yes   B. no

For each prompt, give your first, best answer. Some prompts may seem similar to previous prompts. This is necessary for statistical purposes. Please indicate the extent to which the following descriptive words describe you:

A. almost never B. very little C. at times D. usually E. almost always.

    4. Self-reliant

    5. Yielding (to give way to something or someone else)

    6. Defends own beliefs

    7. Cheerful

    8. Independent

    9. Shy

    10. Athletic

    11. Affectionate

    12. Assertive (self-confident)

    13. Flatterable (gives in to excessive compliments)

    14. Strong personality

    15. Loyal

    16. Forceful

    17. Analytical (able to separate a concept or thing into elemental parts)

    18. Sympathetic (showing favorable agreement or approval)

    19. Has leadership abilities

20. Sensitive to the needs of others

21. Willing to take risks

22. Understanding

23. Makes decisions easily

24. Compassionate

25. Self-sufficient

26. Eager to soothe hurt feelings

27. Dominant

28. Soft spoken

29. Warm

30. Willing to take a stand

31. Tender

32. Aggressive

33. Gullible

34. Acts as a leader

35. Childlike

36. Individualistic

37. Does not use harsh language

38. Competitive

39. Loves children

40. Ambitious

41. Gentle

Stop! When you complete this section, please wait until everyone is finished before completing the next section of this questionnaire. Thank you.

Appendix 2: Scale for Other-Report Modified BSRI

Imagine the advertisement on the overhead projector has appeared in magazines such as Sports Illustrated, Men's Journal, and Maxim (For the nontraditional masculine version: The Advocate: The National Gay and Lesbian Newsmagazine, Out, and Instinct). For each of the following characteristics, indicate to what extent each word describes the man in the advertisement.

Not at all A   B   C   D   E Very much

42. Self-reliant

43. Yielding

44. Defends own beliefs

45. Cheerful

46. Independent

47. Shy

48. Athletic

49. Affectionate

50. Assertive

51. Flatterable

52. Strong personality

53. Loyal

54. Forceful

55. Analytical

56. Sympathetic

57. Has leadership abilities

58. Sensitive to the needs of others

59. Willing to take risks

60. Understanding

61. Makes decisions easily

62. Compassionate

63. Self-sufficient

64. Eager to soothe hurt feelings

65. Dominant

66. Soft spoken

67. Warm

68. Willing to take a stand

69. Tender

70. Aggressive

71. Gullible

72. Acts as a leader

73. Childlike

74. Individualistic

75. Does not use harsh language

76. Competitive

77. Loves children

78. Ambitious

79. Gentle

Appendix 3: Scale for Judgments of Masculine Sign

Referring to the image on the overhead projector, indicate how you would assess the

personality of the male character in the image along the following criteria:

80. Friendly   A   B   C   D   E   Unfriendly

81. Honest   A   B   C   D   E   Dishonest

82. Strange   A   B   C   D   E   Normal

83. Bad   A   B   C   D   E   Good

84. Moral   A   B   C   D   E   Immoral

Thank you for participating in this experiment. If you would like to either know more

about the nature of the experiment, or would like to find out the overall results of the

experiment, please contact Joe Mitchell via e-mail at jmitc13@lsu.edu.

Vita

Joseph C Mitchell teaches communication studies at Louisiana State University and has taught at such colleges and universities as Baton Rouge Community College, Delgado Community College, Indiana State University, and Ivy Tech State College. Aside from teaching, Joseph's research interests include researching communication phenomena as experienced by understudied populations. Other areas of interest lie in screenwriting, songwriting, the performance of song, and a good game of Scrabble. Joseph currently resides in Baton Rouge, Louisiana.