12-1983

A Review Of Communication on Psychological Gender: Actors, Behaviors and Context

J. Indvik

Mary A. Fitzpatrick
University of South Carolina, fitzpatm@mailbox.sc.edu

A REVIEW OF COMMUNICATION RESEARCH ON PSYCHOLOGICAL GENDER:
ACTORS, BEHAVIORS AND CONTEXTS

Julie Indvik and Mary Anne Fitzpatrick*

In the past 10 years, the study of sex differences in communication has placed increasing emphasis on the psychological rather than the physiological gender of the communicators. From the psychological gender perspective, individuals, whether they are males or females, may exhibit predispositions to respond to others with aggression, dominance, and leadership or with gentleness, understanding, and warmth. Such predispositions, rather than the sex of the communicator, are believed to direct the individual's encoding and decoding of messages.

This conceptualization of psychological gender proposes that masculinity and femininity are orthogonal dimensions rather than mutually exclusive poles of a single continuum (Bem, 1974; Constantinople, 1973; cf. Freimuth & Hornstein, 1982). An individual can see him/herself as either masculine, feminine, or possessing a combination of masculine and feminine traits. The measurement developed to operationalize these dimensions draws trait items from the inter-personal domain (Wiggins & Holzmuller, 1978). The focus of the masculine or instrumental traits is to move toward achieving a goal or to complete a task while the feminine or expressive traits emphasize sharing one's inner nature and feelings in order to develop and maintain relationships (Bales & Slater, 1955; Poulakos, 1974). Psychological gender, conceived and measured thus, reflects "response repertoires" for obtaining desired social outcomes (Kelly & Worell, 1977). The orthogonality of the two dimensions implies that either, both, or neither instrumentality and expressivity may be exhibited by an indivi-dual, regardless of sex.

With the public attention devoted to changing sex roles in the last 10 years, the concept of psychological gender, with its emphasis on androgyny, filled both an ideological as well as a conceptual niche. Many researchers jumped on the bandwagon and broad claims were initially made for the concept's theoretical and practical utility. In the wake of numerous studies performed since Bem's (1974) seminal article, however, the time has come to eschew politics and closely examine the extant findings in order to assess which claims have empirical support. The purpose of this article, then, is to review the research that has employed psychological gender as a predictor of communication. As we can see in Table 1, this research can be fruitfully examined by looking at actors, behaviors, and contexts considered in psychological gender research.[1]

Communication Actors

The most basic distinction made in psychological gender research separates the sex-typed from the none-sex-typed. Sex-typed individuals are primarily instrumental (masculine) or primarily expressive (feminine). Non-sex-typed individuals endorse both domains of attributes (androgynous) or neither (undiffer-entiated).[2] Several issues have emerged as central in the study of actors' psychological gender including other self-perceptions, the relative importance of masculinity and femininity, sex differences, and information processing. Several problems have also arisen and each of these will be discussed in turn.

*Julie Indvik is a doctoral candidate in the Department of Communication Arts at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Mary Anne Fitzpatrick is Associate Professor in the Department of Communication Arts at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Self-Perceptions

Of all the personality research related to psychological gender, the most germane to communication research has been the study of interpersonal attributes including extraversion (Jones, Chernovetz, & Hansson, 1978) and traits represen-ting the eight vectors of an interpersonal circumplex (Wiggins & Holzmuller, 1978). Males in all psychological gender groups reported that they were extra-verted while among female respondents, masculine females were more extraverted than the androgynous who exceeded the feminine females (Jones et al., 1978). Of the 1,710 traits completed by their respondents, Wiggins & Holzmuller (1978) found that interpersonal traits most differentiated the psychological gender groups. Masculine males described themselves as dominant and cold in comparison with androgynous males who were warm and submissive. Feminine females reported meekness and submissiveness in contrast to androgynous females who endorsed dominance and extraversion. Androgynous females tended to be more extraverted, emotional, and aggressive while androgynous males rated themselves as shy, passive, and unemotional.

In addition to the above studies on personality characteristics, several studies have been concerned with self-perceptions of communication. Social self-esteem, measured by the Texas Social Behavior Inventory, reflects an individual's self-perceptions of confidence, dominance, and communication competence. Spence and her colleagues (1975) found the androgynous scored highest on this measure, followed by the masculine, feminine, and undifferen-tiated respondents, in that order. Bem's (1977) results were similar but differed somewhat by sex. Masculine males' scores were highest, followed by the androgynous, undifferentiated, and feminine males. Among females, the results replicated Spence et al.'s (1975) findings.

Androgynous individuals also perceived themselves as significantly more adaptive while the undifferentiated perceived themselves as least adaptive (Wheeless & Wheeless, 1981). Talley and Richmond (1980) found that the androgynous and masculine individuals viewed themselves as significantly more impression-leaving, relaxed, and dominant than did the undifferentiated and feminine individuals. Similarly, the feminine and undifferentiated respondents in Greenblatt, Hasenauer, and Freimuth's (1980) study reported the most communi-cation apprehension while masculine and androgynous subjects experienced the least.

Masculinity and Femininity

One question that has arisen on the personality as well as on the behavioral findings is whether the separate measurement of masculinity or femininity accounts for more variance than does the overall psychological gender score. Masculinity was more highly correlated with social self-esteem than femininity (Spence et al., 1975) especially for males (Bem, 1977). As an individual's self-perceived masculinity increased, so too did his/her flexibility and competence (Jones et al., 1978), visual decoding skill (Hall & Halberstadt, 1981), and communicative ease and sharing in both same- and mixed-sex close relationships (Narus & Fischer, 1982).

Although some studies have found that femininity was more related to self-reported adaptability (Brunner & Phelps, 1980, cited in Wheeless & Wheeless, 1931; Wheeless & Wheeless, 1981), empathy, and rewarding impressions (Wheeless & Curan, 1930, cited in Wheeless & Wheeless, 1981), the bulk of findings indicated that masculinity was primarily responsible for desirable personality and communi-cation patterns. In addition, respondents desired to increase their masculinity, although no one desired to increase their femininity (Jones et al., 1978).

Explanations for the preeminence of masculinity have posited that even in personal relationships a certain amount of assertiveness is required for disclosure, affiliation, and control (Bem, 1977; Narus & Fischer, 1982), that gathering too many nonverbal cues while listening may simply result in greater uncertainty rather than inaccuracy (Isenhart, 1980), or that feminine people, in the interests of politesse, are less likely to observe the uncontrolled cues exhibited by others (Rosenthal & DePaulo, 1979).

Sex Differences

One of the innovations of the psychological gender perspective has been the idea that masculinity and femininity do not inhere to members of one sex or the other. In other words, since all individuals may exhibit some combination of the two dimensions, researchers may no longer assume that males are psychologically masculine nor that females are psychologically feminine. While this idea led some researchers to discontinue using sex as an independent variable altogether, many studies have found an interaction between sex and psychological gender (e.g., Andersen & Bem, 1981; LaFrance & Carmen, 1980; Putnam & McCallister, 1980). In general, the adoption of feminine traits by males has negative impact while the adoption of masculine traits by females has a positive impact because instrumental behavior holds more value than expressive behavior for both sexes (Jones et al., 1978). Ironically, then, psychological gender research has demonstrated both that sex is necessary but not sufficient as an independent variable in communication research.[3]

Information Processing

One of the major goals of social science is to explain social behavior. To say that men and women differ, even in their orientations to masculinity and femininity, does not increase understanding of how and why humans behave, think, and feel as they do. To say that men and women behave differently because they process social information differently and thus perceive means and ends differently is an improvement. From there, of course, we can take the further step of pointing to nature (as sociobiologists would) or to nurture (as social learning theorists would) for the source of differences in cognitive structures. Leaving the search for the source of differences to developmentalists, an interest in how men and women differ communicatively has sparked investigation of the content of cognitive structures pertinent to psychological gender. Knowledge of these cognitive structures can eventually shed light on decoding and message interpretation in communication situations (Fitzpatrick & Indvik, 1979).

A schema is a cognitive structure that permits meaningful encoding of incoming information by providing a framework for selectively processing information in schema-relevant terms (e.g., Markus, 1977). Bem (1979, 1981) initially proposed the concept of a generalized gender schema which is organized around the concept of gender so that information is processed on the basis of sex-linked associations. In her formulation, sex-typed individuals' self-concept, encoding, and decoding are organized on the basis of male and female prototypes with the sex-congruency of attributes or behaviors as one of the more salient aspects of judgment. Several studies indicated that sex-typed individuals differentiated stimuli, both about themselves and others, along a gender-related dimension significantly more than did the androgynous (e.g., Bem 1981; Lippa, 1977).

For information about the self, Markus and her colleagues (1982) refined the gender schema ideas. Their series of studies indicated that masculine individuals had a self-schema relevant to masculinity, feminine individuals had a self-schema relevant to femininity, the androgynous had self-schemas relevant to both, and the undifferentiated were the only truly aschematic individuals

without knowledge of the attributes culturally linked to masculinity and femininity. In other words, the androgynous defined themselves in gender-relevant terms but responded equally to both domains of attributes while the undifferentiated did not use masculinity and femininity in thinking about themselves.

Summary

The findings on communication actors indicated that the four groups utilized different schemas to process information about themselves. The presence of a masculinity schema had the most impact on a variety of positive self-perceptions. Masculine and androgynous subjects often scored similarly as did the feminine and undifferentiated. The gender-related schemas differentially affected self-perceptions according to the individual's sex with androgynous females benefitting by the addition of masculinity more than did androgynous males by the addition of femininity.

Actor-related Problems

In order to establish the generality of psychological gender patterns, it is important to have a broad sampling of actors. The large majority of studies in Table 1 utilized samples from the same population: college students. Certainly this complaint is almost a cliche, and certainly there have been psychological gender studies that drew samples from other populations (e.g., Indvik & Fitzpatrick, 1982; see Spence & Helmreich, 1979). Communication researchers, nonetheless, need to be more attuned to this issue since there is good reason to believe that people's instrumentality-expressivity blends change over the course of relationships and the life span (e.g., Lowenthal, Thurnher, & Chiriboga, 1975).

With any sample used, however, the interaction between sex and psychological gender should be a standard test (Worell, 1978). As already noted, neither sex nor psychological gender appear to be sufficient as predictors in all cases. When interactions have been tested, they have usually been found. Further, all four psychological gender groups should be used routinely. There is a comparative dearth of information about the undifferentiated and sex-reversed individuals that needs to be corrected to understand more fully the implications of varying combinations of instrumentality and expressivity.

Finally, the scoring issue should be at least broached. How to score the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI; Bem, 1974) has been debated from the year following its introduction (Spence et al., 1975; Strahan, 1975) through the present (e.g., Marus & Fischer, 1982; Sedney, 1981; Wheeless & Wheeless, 1981). While no attempt will be made to settle the dispute here, suffice it to say that until a scoring procedure is uniformly adopted, the comparability of findings for psychological gender groups across studies is seriously weakened.

Each of the currently used procedures is problematic: the t-ratio method does not distinguish between the androgynous and the undifferentiated; the median-split procedure resulting in four categories loses information; and combining the two in order to include only the more extreme cases eliminates the bulk of respondents. An effort such as that begun by Wheeless and Wheeless (1981) to develop a formula that preserves the intervality of the masculinity and femininity subscores should be further validated.

Communication Behavior

The emphasis on instrumentality and expressivity as the dimensions of psychological gender has meant increased attention to sex roles as sets of social skills for obtaining desired outcomes (Kelly & Worell, 1977). Since the androgy-

nous used both masculine and feminine schemas to process information about
themselves (Markus et al., 1982), it was presumed that they would also decode
a broader range of situational cues and display a greater variety of behavior
than the sex-typed. Research concerned with the communication behavior of the
psychological gender groups has sought to establish differences in flexibility,
decoding, and encoding. Problems occurring in this research will also be
addressed.

Flexibility

Stemming from the finding that androgynous individuals combine instrumental
and expressive self-schemas, it seems reasonable that they would blend behavior
from both dimensions in order to remain consistent with their self-concepts
(Markus et al., 1982), while the sex-typed could be expected to draw on a more
limited range of behavior since they must maintain consistency with only one
gender-related schema. Further, since the androgynous process a larger range
of information about themselves, it was hypothesized that they would also perceive
sex-congruent and sex-incongruent situational cues. This sensitivity would permit
utilization of the androgynes' broader behavioral repertoire in order to meet
situational contingencies more effectively. The sex-typed were presumed to ignore
situational cues and to enact behavior consistent with their gender-related schema
regardless of contextual demands. The androgynes' perceptual acuity and behavioral
flexibility further suggested that they would be more communicatively competent.
Theoretical predictions have been less consistent for the undifferentiated and
for the sex-reversed.

Across a variety of studies, androgynous individuals have exhibited
intermediate levels of expressive (e.g., Bem, Martyna, & Watson, 1976),
independent (e.g., Montgomery & Burgoon, 1977), and controlling behavior
(e.g., Ellis & McCallister, 1980). Feminine individuals generally displayed
the highest level of expressive behavior while masculine individuals generally
displayed the highest level of instrumentality regardless of experimental demands.
All subjects, however, generally exhibited more expressive behavior in "feminine"
situations and more instrumental behavior in "masculine" situations (LaFrance &
Carmen, 1980; Putnam & McAllister, 1980). The greater "flexibility" of the
androgynous, then, may not mean more variability across situations, but rather,
different levels of instrumentality and expressivity across situations with more
use of cross-sex behavior to achieve communication goals (Putnam & McCallister,
1980) as well as less discomfort with cross-sex behavior (Bem & Lenney, 1976).

Decoding

None of the studies actually dealt with a direct interpretation of either
messages or nonverbal cues within the context of a particular conversation. A
number of perceptual differences, however, distinguished the four psychological
gender groups. Androgynous spouses were significantly more accurate about their
partners than were the undifferentiated but not significantly more accurate than
were the sex-typed (Indvik & Fitzpatrick, 1982). Androgynous and undifferentiated
perceivers utilized more dimensions than did the sex-typed perceivers when
depicting their partners (Fitzpatrick & Indvik, 1982c). Additionally, while most
spouses utilized the instrumentality dimension more than the expressivity dimen-
sion in assessing their partners, sex-reversed perceivers weighted more heavily
the dimension congruent with the partner's sex. In other words, masculine wives
used instrumentality in assessing their husbands while feminine husbands consi-
dered expressivity when characterizing their wives (Fitzpatrick & Indvik, 1982a).

When rating contrived protocols of ther individuals, androgynous respondents
perceived androgynous protocols as more attractive while sex-typed perceivers
evaluated sex-typed protocols more favorably (Pursell & Banikiotes, 1978). After
five minutes of conversation, sex-typed partners found each other less attractive

than did partners in dyads where at least one member was androgynous (Ickes & Barnes, 1978). All perceivers excepting androgynous females, saw allegedly physically attractive interactants as more likable than unattractive partners (Andersen & Bem, 1981). Finally, androgynous respondents perceived relational partners as more adaptable than the other three groups did. Feminine, masculine, and undifferentiated perceivers rated their partners as adaptable, in that order (Wheeless & Wheeless, 1981).[4]

Encoding

Findings on the four groups' communication behavior may be divided into results on expressivity and instrumentality. Please refer to Table 1 for a full listing of the behavioral measures obtained in each study. Beginning with self-reported expressivity, the androgynous males reported the most self-disclosure, followed by feminine, masculine, and undifferentiated males. Masculine females reported disclosing more than their androgynous, feminine, and undifferentiated counterparts (Greenblatt et al., 1980). Androgynous males did not vary in the amount of confidence-sharing done in close same- or mixed-sex relationships, but masculine males shared more with the opposite sex. Similarly, masculine males felt more at ease in mixed-sex relationships while androgynous males reported more communicative ease with other males, although neither difference was significant (Narus & Fischer, 1982). Eman, Dierks-Stewart, and Tucker (1978) asked subjects to indicate the likelihood that they would touch a sex-typed or sex-reversed male or female written target. Androgynous subjects reported higher likelihood of touching all targets, followed by the masculine, undifferentiated, and feminine subjects, respectively.

In an early experiment, Bem et al. (1976) developed a nurturance index from several verbal and nonverbal behaviors. Feminine and androgynous subjects both displayed significantly more nurturance than the masculine subjects but did not differ significantly from each other when talking to a "lonely" confederate. Dyads comprised of an androgynous male and a feminine female exhibited the most positive affect during initial interaction while dyads composed of a sex-typed male and female demonstrated the least (Ickes & Barnes, 1978). Dyads with one androgynous member also uttered more verbal reinforcers.

Bem (1981) proposed a heterosexuality subschema defined as "a generalized readiness to encode all cross-sex interactions in sexual terms and all members of the opposite sex in terms of sexual attractiveness" (p.361). Since an important element of sexual attractiveness is physical attractiveness, Andersen and Bem (1981) hypothesized sex-typed individuals would interact more responsively with physically attractive than with unattractive targets. Although responsiveness to physical attractiveness was not significantly greater in cross-sex than in same-sex interaction overall, the sex-typed communicated significantly more responsively to physically attractive targets with somewhat higher responsiveness with cross-sex partners, while the androgynous subjects' responsiveness did not differ significantly according to target attractiveness.

Feminine females ranked first in "feminine" behaviors whether the topic was instrumental or expressive; predictably, masculine males displayed these behaviors least during both conversations, with the one exception of the androgynous males smiling slightly less than masculine males during the instrumental interaction (LaFrance & Carmen, 1980). Of the five "warmth-attentiveness" behaviors coded by Putnam and McCallister (1980), masculine males smiled, androgynous males exhibited nods and eye gaze, androgynous females displayed head nods and mm-hmm back channels, and feminine females utilized laughter and mm-hmm back channels. Thus, each of the four groups displayed at least some warmth but utilized different behavioral configurations to do so.

In the instrumental domain, two studies have investigated independence in the face of influence attempts. The androgynous subjects did not conform

significantly more than masculine subjects when faced with falsely consensual
group judgements on humor in cartoons. Both groups conformed significantly less
than feminine and undifferentiated subjects (Bem, 1975). Montgomery and Burgoon
(1977) measured subjects' attitude change on a gender-neutral topic after reading
one persuasive message. Feminine females' attitudes changed significantly more
than did the androgynous females', while masculine males'attitudes changed sig-
nificantly less than the androgynous males' views. The feminine females, then,
proved most persuasible, the masculine males demonstrated resistance, while
androgynous subjects ranked intermediately.

Two studies coded the relational aspect of messages in task-oriented
triads in order to determine the control patterns encoded by the four psycholo-
gical gender groups. Patton, Jasnoski, and Skerchock's (1977) results indicated
that masculine triads exhibited the most dominance messages, mixed triads (with
one masculine male, one feminine female, and one androgynous individual)
demonstrated the fewest deference messages, while feminine and androgynous triads
displayed the most equivalent messages. In Ellis and McCallister's (1980) study,
masculine males were more likely to respond to any criterion behavior with a
dominant message while feminine females were more likely to exhibit deference
or equivalence regardless of the previous message. In contrast, the androgynous
tended to display dominance in response to a dominant or submissive message and
equivalence in response to a prior equivalence message.

LaFrance and Carmen (1980) coded two "masculine" behaviors during an
instrumental debate and an expressive discussion. Masculine males exhibited
both behaviors more during the instrumental debate while androgynous males
exhibited them more during the expressive conversation. Putnam and McCallister
(1980) coded five "dominance" behaviors during dyadic conversations. As with
the expressive behavior just discussed, each group tended to utilize somewhat
different behaviors to attain at least some degree of dominance. Masculine
males exhibited backward shifts, open posture, and frequent but not long turns.
Androgynous males also displayed backward shifts and open posture but tended to
take long rather than frequent turns. Androgynous females utilized long turns
on both topics while feminine females behaved least so as to attain dominance
except for talking more on the feminine topic. Finally, in Klein and Willerman's
(1979) all-female sample, masculine females displayed more assertive verbal
content and greater floor time, followed by the androgynous, undifferentiated,
and feminine females in that order. This ranking occurred in both a "typical"
interaction with no special instructions and in a "maximal" interaction where
each subject was encouraged to be as dominant as possible.

Summary

From the findings reviewed, incomplete portraits of the four groups have
begun to emerge. The androgynous were less extremely instrumental or expressive
and displayed intermediate levels of both domains across situations. The andro-
gynous were more accurate than the undifferentiated, utilized more dimensions
in assessing their spouses' behavior than the sex-typed, and perceived relational
partners as more adaptive. Androgynous subjects were highly nurturant with a
"lonely" confederate, displayed positive affect regardless of a sex-typed or
androgynous partner, and used different behavior configurations to convey warmth
than the sex-typed did. In the instrumental domain, androgynes neither
conformed nor resisted persuasion, varied their response to dominant/submissive
or equivalence messages, and again used somewhat different configurations to
achieve dominance than did the sex-typed.

While all subjects varied their behavior to some degree across situations,
masculine and feminine subjects generally displayed the most sex-congruent and
the least cross-sex behavior regardless of the context. Thus, these groups were
not less variable than the androgynous but were more extreme in the level of

sex-congruent behavior exhibited across situaitons. The sex-typed were as accurate as the androgynous but differentiated their perceptions on fewer dimensions. They viewed relational partners as moderately adaptive and sex-typed strangers as less attractive after talking for five minutes. Masculine males share more and experienced more ease with females than with males. Feminine females displayed high nurturance with a "lonely" confederate as well as conformity and persuasibility. Masculine males actually resisted a persuasive message and responded to any message with dominance while feminine females utilized primarily deference and equivalence messages and the least assertive verbal content.

Least is known about the undifferentiated. They perceive their spouses less accurately than the androgynous but used an equal number of perceptual dimensions. Undifferentiated subjects rated relational partners as least adaptive, reported the least self-disclosure, conformed to influence attempts, and displayed low levels of assertive verbal content and floor time.

Behavior-related Problems

The major problem for establishing both flexibility and decoding differences has been the lack of investigation of how the groups perceive situational dimensions and other interactants' messages and nonverbal cues within a particular conversation. There is not yet any evidence that the androgynous actually perceive communication situations differently or more accurately, or that the sex-typed ignore situational cues. The flexibility hypothesis, central to the psychological gender conceptualization, rests on these decoding hypotheses, but they have not yet been tested in a communication situation (cf., Bem & Lenney, 1976).

Little is known of how the four groups perceive others' message behavior. Studies like those by Sillars and Folger (1978) who sought to establish the representational validity of a coding scheme's interpretations or by Hawes (1972) who used stimulated recall after videotaping a conversation to obtain subjects' reactions to the other person's utterances could serve as models for learning more about how the four groups decode. Additionally, future research might address whether the four groups differ in their schemas about others as they do in their self-schemas. While the Andersen and Bem (1981) study provided some initial support for the concept of a heterosexuality subschema and the Fitzpatrick and Indvik (1982a, c) studies indicated somewhat differing dimensionality in spouses' perceptions of each other, future investigators need to broaden the available empirical base substantially before the four groups' views of others will be understood.

Problems with encoding research are somewhat more subtle. As mentioned earlier, establishing generality about communication actors requires adequate sampling; this also applies to establishing the generality of behavioral findings. The domain of instrumentality and expressivity need to be sampled more systematically, both for verbal content as well as for nonverbal cues. There has been more emphasis on noverbal cues than on verbal content in psychological gender research, and more attention needs to be given to message content.

Investigators employing nonverbal cues need to consider not only the function filled by particular cues but the multiple functions that a given cue may serve (e.g., Fitzpatrick, Fallis, & Vance, 1982). By sampling according to the function of behavior rather than according to its past association with males or females, researchers will be more likely to select a vector of behaviors that actually samples a domain of interest. Similarly, verbal content needs to be coded with validated schemes that sample the instrumental and expressive domains more systematically. Attention to the multi-functionality of verbal as well as nonverbal messages permits a more subtle assessment of how the four psychological

gender groups differ in how they blend the two domains. The blending, rather than the complete absence of either domain across situations, appears to be the present crux of the flexibility issue. As such, the study of configurations of cues and verbal messages across situations remains central but with more attention given to adequate sampling.

Communication Contexts

The work of Mischel (1968) and others suggests that individuals are far from consistent between different situations. In the first place, situations are important determinants of behavior, but in addition, different people are affected differently by different situations. In the oft-repeated phrase, behavior is a function of persons, situations, and person-situation interactions. A person brings certain behavioral tendencies to a situation while the situation prescribes and allows certain patterns of behavior. The way these two combine is complicated and extremely difficult to separate. Although the major theoretical claim of the psychological gender approach posits more variance attributable to the situation for the androgynous and less for the sex-typed, no direct test of such a claim has been made. Partial tests abound.

Within instrumental situations, androgynous and masculine participants were hypothesized to behave instrumentally, and feminine participants were expected to behave expressively. Within expressive situations, androgynous and feminine individuals were predicted to behave expressively, while masculine individuals were expected to behave instrumentally. The basic research paradigm for testing these predictions has been to develop either an instrumental or an expressive situation, code several instrumental and expressive behaviors, and then determine to what extent the groups engaged differentially in various behaviors. While this approach was not an unreasonable way to begin, it is clear that communication situations are assessed on more than one dimension (e.g., Forgas, 1979; Wish & Kaplan, 1977). This section will discuss two additional situational factors that have been included in psychological gender research, characteristics of the interlocutor(s) and the focus of the situation, as well as some suggestions for future research. Interlocutor characteristics refer to the other's sex and psychological gender and the type of relationship shared by the interactants. The focus of the situations includes the rewards available in the situation and the topic of conversation.

Interlocutor Sex

The sex of the other interactants was often treated as a control factor in the studies reviewed so that all dyads or triads were same- or mixed-sex units. In studies where mixed-sex triads were used, the proportions of the two sexes were not varied systematically (cf., Taylor & Fiske, 1976). Several studies, however, did vary the sex of subjects' interlocutors. In Klein and Willerman's (1979) study, female subjects were assigned to either same- or mixed-sex confederates and experimenter. Subjects were significantly less dominant with male confederates in problem-solving triads with no special instructions, but were equally dominant with male and female confederates when instructions encouraged dominance. Subjects also talked more with male confederates, particularly in the maximal discussion.

Masculine males shared more and felt more communicative ease in close relationships with females. Androgynous males did not vary their sharing according to the partner's sex but experienced more communicative ease with males (Narus & Fischer, 1982). Among Greenblatt et al.'s (1980) respondents, masculine females disclosed most with both same- and opposite-sex others. Feminine males disclosed most with males while androgynous males disclosed most with females. Pursell and Banikiotes' (1978) subjects evaluated contrived protocols of male and female sex-typed and androgynous targets. Female targets were generally perceived as more attractive, particularly by male perceivers.

In Anderson and Bem's (1981) study, subjects interacted by telephone with two targets of the same and two targets of the opposite sex, with one interlocutor of each sex allegedly attractive and the other allegedly unattractive. Sex-typed perceivers were somewhat more likely to communicate more responsively with attractive than with unattractive targets of the opposite sex, whereas androgynous perceivers were not more likely to differentiate according to attractiveness for either sex. Female perceivers communicated more responsively overall and did not vary in responsiveness according to their partner's sex, but males communicated significantly more responsively with opposite-sex targets. Female targets also communicated more responsively overall while male targets appeared more self-assured. Targets interacting with female perceivers interacted more responsively than did those with male perceivers. Female perceivers reported somewhat greater liking for targets, but all perceivers felt greater liking when the target was a member of the opposite sex.

Interlocutor Psychological Gender

The psychological gender of other interactants was often controlled such that dyads or triads were homogeneous in this respect, or it was not included as a variable. In Patton et al.'s (1977) study, triads contained masculine males, feminine females, androgynes of both sexes, or one masculine male, one feminine female and one androgyne. The mixed groups displayed low frequencies of submissive and equivalent messages, and androgynous triads ranked intermediately for all three message categories. Ellis and McCallister (1980) also utilized masculine, feminine, and androgynous triads but did not include mixed triads. Their results, already reported in this article, closely resembled Patton et al.'s.

When subjects evaluated contrived protocols, sex-typed targets were preferred by sex-typed and by male perceivers. Androgynous targets appeared more attractive to females and to other androgynes (Pursell & Baniklotes, 1978). Fran and her colleagues (1978) also utilized four written scenarios in which respondents were to imagine themselves interacting with sex-typed and sex-reversed males and females. Subjects were then asked to evaluate the desirability of touching each target. The feminine female, feminine male, and masculine female appeared more approachable to subjects than did the masculine male who displayed anger publicly in a restaurant scenario.

LaFrance and Carmen (1980) employed same-sex dyads who were comprised of two sex-typed, two androgynous, or one sex-typed and one androgynous partner. Results indicated feminine female dyads gazed most while speaking and masculine male dyads exhibited the most filled pauses. In Ickes and Barnes' (1978) study, all dyads were mixed-sex, and psychological gender was varied to obtain four dyad types: masculine male/feminine female, androgynous male/feminine female, masculine male/androgynous female, and androgynous male/androgynous female. The sex-typed dyad displayed lower levels of verbalization, directed gaze, expressive gestures, facial affect, and post-interaction liking than the other three dyad types. The androgynous male/feminine female dyad exhibited the most positive affect and high levels of verbal reinforcers as did the masculine male/androgynous female dyads. Dyads with at least one androgynous member were able to sustain topics while topics were initiated and then quickly terminated in the sex-typed dyads. Ickes and Barnes (1978) explained their findings by suggesting that extreme disparity in expressive control may have lead to the rocky interaction of the sex-typed dyads. The expressive female initiated topics but the highly controlled male did little to maintain them and the conversation foundered. This pattern was not found with the other dyad types since the "flexible" androgynous partner was better able to match the other interactant's level of expressive control so that reciprocity could be maintained and the conversation sustained.

Indvik and Fitzpatrick (1982) asked an urban sample of married couples to rate themselves and their partners using the BSRI. As already mentioned, androgynous spouses were significantly more accurate than the undifferentiated but not than the sex-typed spouses in perceiving the mate. Although the overall sample was only accurate about half the time regardless of length of marriage, the target's psychological gender affected the perceiver's accuracy about him/her. Not only were the undifferentiated least accurate as perceivers, they also engendered the most inaccuracy as targets. This may have occurred either because the perceiving spouses did not accept the undifferentiated target's negative self-perceptions or because the undifferentiated target did not communicate sufficiently for both mates to share a similar understanding of his/her self-assessment.

Relationship Type

Most studies utilized undergraduates who were previously strangers to each other. In several studies, respondents completed paper-and-pencil measures in reference to particular relational partners, but the data were not analyzed with relational type as a basis of comparison (Greenblatt et al., 1980; Narus & Fischer, 1982; Wheeless & Wheeless, 1981). Talley and Richmond's (1980) under-graduate respondents interacted for several weeks during regularly scheduled classroom exercises. Respondents then assessed their own and their partner's communication style. While respondents' psychological gender differentiated self-reports of communication style it did not differentiate perceptions of the partner's communication style. Respondents' self-assessment of shyness and communication apprehension accounted for more variance in perceptions of the partner's style, particularly for the dominant, open, dramatic, and contentious factors.

In a random sample of married couples, spouses completed the BSRI as they say themselves and as they perceived their partners. While these spouses' perceptions of each other were not compared with those of any other relational type, the context of an enduring relationship, as opposed to that of initial interaction, appeared to explain one set of findings. Bem's (1979, 1981) gender schema theory would suggest that sex-typed interactants in a heterosexual context would emphasize perceptual dimensions congruent with the sex of the partner while the non-sex-typed would use instrumental and expressive dimensions about equally in thinking about their partners. With the exception of the feminine husbands who emphasized the expressivity dimension, all other spouses weighted instrumentality at least somewhat more heavily in assessing the spouse (Fitzpatrick & Indvik, 1982a). While the heavier reliance on instrumentality may be explained by cultural preferences for instrumentality, two aspects of the marital context itself, i.e., the importance of instrumentality in family life (Kanter, 1977; Leik, 1963) and the communication of more "psychological" or personal information in an enduring relationship (Miller & Steinberg, 1975), provided more direct explanations. This study suggested, therefore, that one boundary condition of gender schema theory is the interactants' relationship. When a heterosexual relationship is non-intimate and serves a primarily expressive function (as in Andersen & Bem, 1981), gender schema theory should prove predictive about social information processing; when a heterosexual relationship is enduring and must serve instrumental, "survival" functions as well as emotional ones, gender schema theory will prove less predictive.

Situational Rewards

An individual's behavior is often shaped by the expectations held by attractive others since they are in a position to reward appropriate behavior (Rosenthal, 1974). To the extent that the expectations are stereotypically masculine or feminine, the self-fulfilling prophecy hypothesis predicts that the social actor will engage in stereotypic behavior to impress the other and obtain desirable social rewards. Thus do interpersonal situations evoke sex-role

behavior. In Zanna and Pack's (1975) study, female subjects altered their
self-presentation of sex-role attitudes and their performance on an intellectual
ability test to conform with a male's attitudes toward women when the male was
'desirable" (Princeton senior seeking a girlfriend) but not when he was "undesira-
ble" (non-Princeton freshman with a girlfriend). These subjects adapted their
self-presentation when the situation presented the potential reward of intimate
interaction with an available male. Predictions about responses to sex-role
linked rewards should be enhanced, however, when psychological gender is also
considered.

In one of the few repeated measures studies reviewed here, Klein and
Willerman (1979) assigned female subjects to same-sex of mixed-sex triads
containing two confederates. All subjects participated in two problem-solving
discussions: a "typical" discussion in which they received no special instruc-
tions about their behavior and which presumably reflected typical dominance
levels and a "maximal" discussion in which they were told to try to assume
leadership and be as assertive as possible in order to test their dominance
abilities. The maximal situation evoked significantly higher dominance ratings
for verbal content and for floor time from all four psychological gender groups.
In both situations, masculine and androgynous females displayed significantly
more dominance than did the undifferentiated and feminine females.

By differentially rewarding dominance, the two situations evoked different
perceptions of appropriate interpersonal behavior. Subjects displayed signifi-
cantly less dominant content with male than with female confederates in the
typical situation but did not vary according to confederates' sex in the maximal
situation. Similarly, subjects took more floor time with male confederates in
the maximal condition but did not vary according to confederates' sex in the
typical situation. This study, then, demonstrated not only that situational
demands had a large effect on women's dominance behavior but also that psycholo-
gical gender can hone predictions about which females will display more or less
dominance in response to particular situational demands.

Topic

One of the major ways in which situations were defined in psychological
gender research was through varying the topic. In telling subjects what to
discuss, researchers determined whether the context of the conversation was to
be interpreted as primarily instrumental (solving a problem) or expressive
(sharing personal information). This imposed situational definition was intended
to elicit the two domains of communication behavior presumably reflected in
psychological gender so that researchers could determine the range of these
behaviors, differences among the four groups, and each group's variability
between situations. Only two of the studies reviewed here utilized repeated
measures designs for these purposes.

In Putnam and McCallister's (1980) study, dyads discussed "an emotionally-
charged, moralistic situation" (the feminine topic) and a military rescue mission
(the masculine topic). Feminine and androgynous females and androgynous males
exhibited more conversational dominance during the masculine topic. Feminine
and androgynous females had lower levels of dominance during both topics and less
variability between topics than the androgynous males who differed widely between
the two topics and displayed a higher overall level of dominance. Rather
surprisingly, the masculine males displayed more dominance than any other group
with the feminine topic but less than the androgynous males during the masculine
topic. Putnam and McCallister (1980) suggested that the masculine males used
interruptions, long back channels, and postural shifts to compensate for the
females' longer floor time on the feminine topic.

As with conversational dominance, everyone except the masculine males
exhibited more warmth-attentiveness during the feminine topic. Feminine females

and androgynous males displayed higher levels and more variability in warmth
than did the androgynous females. Masculine males demonstrated the lowest level
of warmth during the feminine topic but increased it slightly during the masculine
task. Putnam and McCallister (1980) noted that the nonstereotypically high
frequency of smiles for this group may have functioned as a turn request buffer
rather than as an indication of warmth. The results of this study indicated that
the topic was a powerful situational factor as all psychological gender groups
varied behaviorally at least somewhat. The androgynous males, however, appeared
most responsive to this cue.

Lafrance and Carmen (1980) also asked dyads to discuss two topics: to
debate the legalization of marijuana (the instrumental topic) and to share
feelings about starting college (the expressive topic). In this study all
groups exhibited more "feminine" behavior during the expressive topic, with the
feminine females exhibiting the highest level followed by the androgynous females,
androgynous males, and masculine males, respectively. With the instrumental
topic, the androgynous males proved the exception to the rule of more "masculine"
behavior during this topic. Masculine males predictably displayed the highest
level and feminine females the lowest level of masculine behavior. Both groups
of females were less variable in their masculine behavior across topics than
were both groups of males. This study also demonstrated that the topic of
conversation evoked different behavioral configurations from all psychological
gender groups included. These results further suggested that sex-typed
individuals displayed sex-congruent behavior at higher levels during the
sex-congruent topic, while the androgynous tended to display more moderate
levels of both domains of behavior across topics.

Summary

Sex-typed individuals behaved in a more sex-congruent way with members
of the opposite sex than did the androgynous. The presence of a masculine male
in a dyad or triad decreased submissive and equivalent messages as well as
expressive cues. The relationship shared by two interactants emerged as a
boundary condition for Bem's gender schema theory. Gender schema theory should
be more predictive for nonintimate, primarily expressive heterosexual relation-
ships than for enduring, partially instrumental heterosexual relationships.
Contextually rewarded communication behavior, even if cross-sex, was displayed
by all females, but masculine and androgynous females were more dominant with
or without explicit encouragement. Behavior appropriate to a designated topic
was also displayed by all four psychological gender groups. The sex-typed
displayed more sex-congruent and less cross-sex behavior regardless of topic
while the androgynous exhibited intermediate levels of instrumental and expressive
behavior for all topics.

Context-related Problems

The problem of adequate sampling is most serious for contexts. Relatively
few situations have been employed and those factors included have not been varied
systematically. An example of the latter condition occurs with the sex and
psychological gender of other participants. Not only should the interaction
between sex and psychological gender be tested for an actor but also for his/her
interaction partner(s) and for the experimenter. Bem and Lenney (1976) found
that the tendency for subjects to engage in sex-congruent activities was higher
in the presence of an opposite-sex experimenter. Further, sex-typed subjects
felt less comfortable performing cross-sex activities in front of an opposite-sex
experimenter while androgynous subjects felt less comfortable doing so with a
same-sex experimenter. While these results suggest specifically that the sex
of the experimenter is important, findings on behavioral differences reported
throughout this paper suggested that the psychological gender of experimenters
ought to be measured and varied systematically as well.

Among the dyadic studies reviewed, very few used the dyad as the unit of analysis. More light will be shed on communication differences as a function of psychological gender if mutual influence processes in a dyad are examined, rather than cataloguing differences at the individual level. This also applies to units larger than dyads where, additionally, the proportion of members of either sex ought to be considered as a situational determinant of behavior (Taylor & Fiske, 1976).

Finally, a broader range of contextual demands in research situations could extend knowledge of the behavioral repertoires of the psychological gender groups. Conflict, negotiation, and most relational contexts have so far been untried. Message strategies used in contexts calling for interpersonal influence and relational termination might also illuminate the varying blends of instrumentality and expressivity used by the four groups. It practically goes without saying that to compare behavior across contexts, repeated measures designs should be employed. Only when the same individuals respond to different situations can valid comparisons be made of the variance attributable to the person, the situation, or person-situation interactions.

Conclusion

Based on the research reviewed in this article, psychological gender refers to the capacity to process information about the self that is related to instrumentality and expressivity. When an individual has a schema for one of these domains but not for both, she/he is more likely to emphasize sex-congruent behaviors and inhibit cross-sex behaviors across situations. When an individual has a schema for both domains, she/he displays intermediate levels of instrumental and expressive behavior across situations. Cross-situational variation occurs, however, in all psychological gender groups, and no group appears totally devoid of behavior from either domain.

These findings modify the initial flexibility hypothesis that predicted the sex-typed were essentially devoid of cross-sex behavior and would not vary at all according to situational demands while the androgynous would be highly variable across situations and behave primarily from one domain or the other depending on situational cues. What now appears central to the flexibility hypothesis is the androgynous blending of instrumentality and expressivity both within and across situations rather than simple differences in variability. The modification of the flexibility hypothesis is more consistent with the interactionist perspective in modern personality research which suggests that all individuals vary across different types of situations but behave more consistently in situations of the same type.

The major difficulty of the studies reviewed in this article is inadequate sampling of actors, behaviors, and contexts which prevents establishing psychological gender patterns as general. Apart from the specific suggestions already made about sampling, it is important to emphasize that psychological gender research is personality trait research. As such, the way in which this research can prove most beneficial for communication inquiry is to demonstrate how contextual differences interact with individual differences to produce communication patterns. Toward this end, future research needs to investigate how the psychological gender groups interpret situational dimensions and others' messages and how they respond verbally and nonverbally given their interpretations. Since the main theoretical linchpin of this approach has been situational flexibility, lack of attention to the person-by-situation interaction prevents a complete testing of the conceptualization.

TABLE 1

A SUMMARY OF COMMUNICATION RESEARCH ON PSYCHOLOGICAL GENDER

Study	Actors*	Behaviors	Context
Bem, 1975 (reanalyzed, 1977)	MM, FM, AM, UM MF, FF, AF, UF	Conformity to (false) judgments of humor in cartoons.	Ss in soundproof booths heard tapes of three voices rating how funny a series of cartoons was. Ss were always last to respond on the critical trials when a false consensus was presented in order to induce conformity.
Bem et al., 1976 (experiment 2)	MM, FM, AM, UM MF, FF, AF, UF	Behavioral nurturance: head nods, facial reactions, # of verbalizations, reaction to implicit request for further contact, other's perception of nurturance. Self-reported feelings of nurturance.	Ss interacted with one same-sex confederate. Ss were designated as listeners. Confederates disclosed general background information for 5 mins. and then described his/her current loneliness for 5 mins.
Montgomery & Burgoon, 1977	MM, AM FF, AF	Post-test attitude on a gender-neutral topic.	Ss read a written persuasive message advocating restricted enrollment of upper classmen.
Patton et al., 1977	MM, AM FF, AF	Relational control (Ellis): dominance, structuring, equivalence, deference, and submissiveness messages.	Ss participated in triadic, task-oriented discussions for 30 mins. Some triads were homogeneous for sex and psychological gender (MM and FF), for psychological gender only (androgynous), or for neither (mixed).
Pursell & Banikiotes, 1978	MM, AM FF, AF	Perceptions of attractiveness of written protocols.	Ss rated the task and social attractiveness of 4 contrived BSRI protocol forms. The protocols were randomly ordered and represented a MM, AM, FF, and AF.
Eman et al., 1978	MM, FM, AM, UM MF, FF, AF, UF	Perceptions of desirability of touching the target in a written scenario.	Ss rated the desirability of touching the target of 4 scenarios. The scenarios were designed to portray the typical behavior or a MM, FM, FF or MF and were randomly ordered.
Ickes & Barnes, 1978	MM, AM FF, AF	Who sat first, who talked first, interpersonal distance, body orientation, frequency and duration of verbalization, directed gazes, expressive gestures, facial	Ss spontaneously interacted in mixed-sex dyads for 5 mins. while "waiting" for the experiment to begin. There were 4 types of dyads: MM-FF, MM-AF, AM-FF, AM-AF.

TABLE 1 (continued)

Study	Actors	Behaviors	Context
		affect, questions, responses, comments, verbal reinforcers, silences, initiation/termination of conversational sequences and mutual gaze. Self reported attraction/liking.	
Klein & Willerman, 1979	MF, FF, AF, UF	Confederates' perceptions of Ss' dominant verbal content. Ss' floor time.	Ss participated twice in triads with 2 confederates in 10-min. problem-solving discussions. Ss were exposed to either a female experimenter & 4 confederates or to all males. For one discussion, Ss were given no special instructions on how to behave (typical). For the other discussion, Ss were told to be as dominant and assertive as possible for leader ability test purposes (maximal).
Ellis & McAllister, 1980	MM, AM FF, AF	Relational control: dominance, deference, and equivalence messages.	Ss interacted in triads on an unstructured, gender-neutral task. Triads were nomogeneous for psychological gender but were often mixed-sex.
Greenblatt et al., 1980	MM, FM, AM, UM MF, FF, AF, UF	Self-reported self-disclosure with same- and opposite-sex others; self-reported communication apprehension.	Ss completed self-report scales in the classroom.
Isenhart, 1980	MM, FM, AM MF, FF, AF	Nonverbal sensitivity.	Ss completed the PONS test. This consists of a 45-min. flim in which visual & paralinguistic cues are combined in different ways to produce 220 scenes that Ss label.
LaFrance & Carmen, 1980	MM, AM FF, AF	Masculinity: filled pauses, interruptive questions and comments. Femininity: gaze while speaking, smiling while listening.	Ss interacted in same-sex dyads for 7 mins. to debate an issue (instrumental) or to share feelings on starting college (expressive). Dyads were varied by psychological gender (2 sex-typed, 2 androgynous, or 1 of each).
Putnam & McAllister, 1980	MM, AM FF, AF	Dominance: interruptions, long back channels, turn time, postural shift and orientation, gesticulations. Warmth-attentiveness: "mm-hmm," eye gaze, head nods, smiling and laughing while listening	Ss interacted with the same partner on two tasks for a total of 20 mins. One task was moralistic and emotional (feminine) while the other involved a military mission (masculine). Sex was varied while psychological gender was homogeneous within dyads.

TABLE 1 (continued)

Study	Actors	Behaviors	Context
Talley & Richmond, 1980	MM, FM, AM, UM MF, FF, AF, UF	Self-report and perceptions of partner's communicator style.	Ss interacted on 5-10 dyadic exercises as part of normal instructional activity over several weeks. Ss then evaluated their partners.
Wheeless & Wheeless, 1981	MM, FM, AM, UM MF, FF, AF, UF	Self-report and perceptions of target's adaptability.	Ss selected one of 16 relational partner types (ranging from "disliked person" to "intimate friend") and rated his/her psychological gender and adaptability.
Andersen & Bem, 1981	MM, AM FF, AF	Perceiver's pre-interaction perceptions of targets' social attractiveness; judges' perceptions of perceivers' and targets' responsiveness & self-assurance during the conversation; perceivers' and targets' post-interaction self-report of liking for partner & own mood.	Perceivers and targets completed biographical questionnaires that served as the basis for an 8-min. conversation by telephone in the lab. Perceivers also received a photograph, ostensibly of the target, pretested as attractive of unattractive. Perceivers conversed with 2 same-sex and 2 opposite-sex targets.
Marus & Fischer, 1982	MM, AM, UM	Expressivity: self-reported ease of communication and confidence sharing.	Ss completed a questionnaire about the person to whom they felt closest.
Fitzpatrick & Indvik, 1982a	MM, FM, AM, UM MF, FF, AF, UF	Weights applied to instrumentality and expressivity in implicit theories of the spouse.	Ss were married couples who completed questionnaires in their homes without consulting the spouse.
Fitzpatrick & Indvik, 1982c	MM, FM, AM, UM MF, FF, AF, UF	Dimensionality of implicit theories of the spouse.	Ss were married couples who completed questionnaires in their homes without consulting the spouse.

*MM = masculine male, FM = feminine male, AM = androgynous male, UM = undifferentiated male, MF = masculine female, FF = feminine female, AF = androgynous female, UF = undifferentiated female

Notes

[1] While the studies summarized in Table 1 comprise a large proportion of communication research on psychological gender, they by no means constitute an exhaustive review of the literature. Convention papers cited were limited to those to which the present authors had access. Published articles were included in Table 1 only if they met several criteria.

First, the dependent variable concerned communication messages, perceptions, or outcomes. This requirement eliminated, for example, the frequently cited study by Bem and Lenney (1976) in which Ss were asked to choose sex (in) congruent activities, such as ironing a napkin or pounding a nail, to demonstrate their cross-sex behavioral flexibility. While these activities were sex-role-linked, they were not communicative.

Secondly, psychological gender was the predictor variable. Fitzpatrick and Indvik (1982b) used a marital typology to predict psychological gender and sex-role orientation, with primary emphasis on the couple types. Consequently, their study was not included here.

Thirdly, one of the four major instruments that measure feminity and masculinity as orthogonal (BSRI, PAQ, PRF, ANDRO, ACL) was used. Studies that investigated the integration of instrumentality and expressivity but did not use one of these scales were thus excluded (e.g., Albrecht & Cooley, 1980).

[2] The two most widely used scales for measuring psychological gender are the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI; Bem, 1974) and the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ; Spence et al., 1975). The BSRI asks individuals to rate themselves on 20 masculine and on 20 feminine traits that judges determined to be significantly more desirable for one sex or the other. There are now shorter versions of the BSRI available (Bem, 1979; Wheeless & Dierks-Stewart, 1981). The PAQ contains 23 "male-valued" and 18 "female-valued" traits judged as ideal for both sexes but as more typical of one or the other.

For both inventories, the psychological gender score is determined by classifying subjects above or below the median of masculinity and femininity scores. The method results in four groups: masculine (high masculinity/low femininity:, feminine (low masculinity/high femininity), androgynous (high masculinity/high femininity), undifferentiated (low masculinity/low femininity).

[3] The frequency of interaction effects for sex and psychological gender also implies, of course, that psychological gender is not sufficient to stand alone as a predictor. Indeed, several studies indicate that it may not be necassary. Andersen and Bem (1981) found that responsiveness to another interactant was related to sex but not to psychological gender, with females communicating more responsively than males. When Talley and Richmond (1980) covaried shyness and communication apprehension in predictions of communicator style (both self and other), psychological gender accounted for an average increase of only 1% of the variance. Finally, in Hall and Halberstadt's (1981) meta-analysis of nonverbal encoding and decoding studies, femininity and masculinity were partialled out before correlating sex with both decoding and encoding. Results indicated that the correlations with and without partialling out psychological gender differed very little. In other words, psychological gender was less important than sex in predicting nonverbal accuracy.

[4] In contrast to the above findings, Talley and Richmond (1980) reported that perceivers' psychological gender did not affect perceptions of targets' communicator style after interacting in classroom exercises for several weeks. Unfortunately, neither the Isenhart (1980) nonverbal decoding study nor the Hall and Halberstadt (1981) meta-analysis of nonverbal skill research compared the psychological gender groups to each other.

[5]Ickes and Barnes (1978) defined their research situation as unstructured Two subjects who had never met before were asked to wait together until the experimenter could find more questionnaires. Thus, for this five-minute interaction, there were neither clear contextual cues for appropriate behavior nor were there many conversational cues since this was initial interaction. Ickes and Barnes maintained that in the absence of situational cues, individual differences should account for more variance since subjects will behave congruently with their predispositions when they have no information about how to obtain social rewards. It could be argued, however, that in an initial interaction situation with no task to accomplish the researchers have implicitly defined the domain from which topics will be selected as expressive. Subjects without a goal to focus on would be most likely to share demographic information and/or discuss the context in which they found themselves (Berger, Gardner, Clatterbuck & Schulman, 1976). This research situation, then, can be defined as expressive rather than as a unique type of situation. Since the study did not employ a repeated measures design, it will not be discussed further in section.

REFERENCES

Albrecht, T. L., and Cooley, R. E. Androgyny and communication strategies for relational dominance: An empirical analysis. In D. Nimmo (ed.), Communication Yearbook 4. New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1980.

Andersen, S. M., and Bem, S. L. Sex-typing and androgyny in dyadic interaction: Individual differences in responsiveness to physical attractiveness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1981, 41, 74-86.

Bales, R. F., and Slater, P. Role differentiation. In T. Parsons and R. F. Bales (eds.), Family, socialization and interaction processes. Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1955.

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

Bem, S. L. Sex role adaptability: One consequence of psychological androgyny. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 634-643.

Bem, S. L. On the utility of alternative procedures for assessing psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1977, 45, 196-205.

Bem, S. L. Theory and measurement of androgyny: A reply to the Pedhazur-Tetenbaum and Locksley-Colten critiques. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1979, 37, 1047-1054.

Bem, S. L. Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex typing. Psychological Review, 1981, 88, 354-364.

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

Bem, S. L., Martyna, W., and Watson, C. Sex typing and androgyny: Further explorations of the expressive domain. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34, 1016-1023.

Berger, C. R., Gardner, R. R., Clatterbuck, G. W., and Schulman, L. S. Perceptions of information sequencing in relationship development. Human Communication Research, 1976, 3, 29-46.

Broverman, I. K., Vogel, S. R., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., and Rosen-
krantz, P. S. Sex-role stereotypes: A current appraisal. Journal of
Social Issues, 1972, 28, 59-78

Brunner, C. C., and Phelps, L. A. Interpersonal communication competence and
androgyny. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Communica-
tion Association, Acapulco, 1980.

Constantinople, A. Masculinity-feminity: An exception to a famous dictum?
Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 80, 389-407.

Ellis, D. G., and McCallister, L. Relational control sequences in sex-typed
and androgynous groups. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 1980,
44, 35-49.

Eman, V., Dierks-Stewart, K., and Tucker, R. K. Implications of sexual identity
and sexually identified situations on nonverbal touch. Paper presented
at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Minneapolis, 1978.

Fitzpatrick, M. A., Fallis, S., and Vance, L. Multifunctional coding of conflict
resolution strategies in marital dyads. Family Relations, 1982, 31, 61-70.

Fitzpatrick, M. A., and Indvik, J. The issue of competence: An alternative
approach to the study of sex differences in interpersonal communication.
Paper presented at the meeting of the Central States Speech Communication
Association, St. Louis, 1979.

Fitzpatrick, M. A., and Indvik, J. Implicit theories in enduring relationships:
Psychological gender differences in perceptions of one's mate. Western
Journal of Speech Communication, 1982, 46, 311-325. (a)

Fitzpatrick, M. A., and Indvik, J. The instrumental and expressive domains of
marital communication. Human Communication Research, 1982, 8, 195-213. (b)

Fitzpatrick, M. A., and Indvik, J. Me and my shadow: Projections of psychologi-
cal gender self-appraisals in marital implicit theories. Manuscript
submitted for publication, 1982. (c)

Forgas, J. P. Social episodes. New York: Academic Press, 1979.

Freimuth, M. J., and Hornstein, G. A. A critical examination of the concept of
gender. Sex Roles, 1982, 8, 515-531.

Greenblatt, L., Hasenauer, J. E., and Freimuth, V. S. Psychological sex types
and androgyny in the study of communication variables: Self-disclosure
and communication apprehension. Human Communication Research, 1980, 6,
117-129.

Hall, J. A., and Halberstadt, A. G. Sex roles and nonverbal communication
skills. Sex Roles, 1981, 7, 273-287.

Hawes, L. C. The effects of interviewer style on patterns of dyadic communica-
tion. Speech Monographs, 1972, 39, 114-123.

Heilbrun, A. G. Measurement of masculine and feminine sex role identities as
independent dimensions. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology,
1976, 44, 183-190.

Ickes, W., and Barnes, R. D. Boys and girls together--and alienated: On enacting
stereotyped sex roles in mixed-sex dyads. Journal of Personality and Social
Psychology, 1978, 36, 669-683.

Indvik, J., and Fitzpatrick, M. A. "If you could read my mind, love...:" Understanding and misunderstanding in the marital dyad. Family Relations, 1982, 31, 43-51.

Isenhart, M. W. An investigation of the relationship of sex and sex role to the ability to decode nonverbal cues. Human Communication Research, 1980, 6, 309-318.

Jones, W. H., Chernovetz, M. E., and Hansson, R. O. The enigma of androgyny: Differential implications for males and females. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1973, 46, 298-313.

Kanter, R. M. Men and women of the corporation. New York: Basic Books, 1977.

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

Klein, H. M., and Willerman, L. Psychological masculinity and femininity and typical and maximal dominance expression in women. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1979, 37, 2069-2070.

La France, M., and Carmen, B. The nonverbal display of psychological androgyny. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1980, 38, 36-49.

Leik, R. K. Instrumentality and emotionality in family interaction. Sociometry, 1963, 26, 131-145.

Lippa, R. Androgyny, sex typing, and the perception of masculinity-femininity in handwriting. Journal of Research in Personality, 1977, 11, 21-37.

Lowenthal, M. F., Thurnher, M., and Chiriboga, D. (eds.). Four Stages of Life. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Markus, H., Crane, M., Bernstein, S., and Siladi, M. Self-schemas and gender. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1982, 42, 38-50.

Markus, H., Self-schemata and processing information about the self. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1977, 35, 63-78.

Miller, G. R., and Steinberg, M. Between People. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1975.

Mischel, W. Personality and Assessment. New York: Wiley, 1968.

Montgomery, C. L., and Burgoon, M. An experimental study of the interactive effects of sex and androgyny on attitude change. Communication Monographs, 1977, 44, 130-135.

Narus, L. R., and Fischer, J. L. Strong but not silent: A reexamination of expressivity in the relationships of men. Sex Roles, 1982, 8, 159-168.

Patton, B. R., Jasnoski, M., Skerchock, L. Communication implications of androgyny. Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Washington, D. C., 1977.

Poulakos, J. The components of dialogue. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 1974, 38, 199-212.

Pursell, S. A., and Banikiotes, P. G. Androgyny and initial interpersonal attraction. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 1978, 4, 235-239.

Putnam, L. L., and McCallister, L. Situational effects of task and gender on nonverbal display. In D. Nimmo (ed.). Communication Yearbook 4. New Brunswick, N. J.: Transaction Books, 1980.

Rosenthal, R. On the social psychology of the self-fulfilling prophecy: Further evidence for Pygmalion effects and their mediating mechanisms. New York: MSS Modular Publications, 1974.

Rosenthal, R., and De Paulo, B. Expectancies, discrepancies, and courtesies in nonverbal communication. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 1979, 43, 76-95.

Sedney, M. A. Comments on median split procedures for scoring androgyny measures. Sex Roles, 1981, 7, 217-222.

Sillars, A. L., and Folger, J. P. A second look at relational coding assumptions. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Chicago, 1978.

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

Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., and Stapp, J. Ratings of self and peers on sex role attributes and their relation to self-esteem and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 32, 29-39.

Strahan, R. R. Remarks on Bem's measurement of psychological androgyny: Alternative methods and a supplementary analysis. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 43, 569-571.

Talley, M. A., and Richmond, V. P. The relationship between psychological gender orientation and communicator style. Human Communication Research, 1980, 6, 326-329.

Taylor, S. E., and Fiske, S. The token in the small group: Research findings and theoretical implications. In J. Sweeney (ed.), Psychology and politics. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976.

Wheeless, L. R., and Wheeless, V. E. Attribution, gender orientation, and reconceptualization, measurement, and research result. Communication Quarterly, 1981, 30, 56-66.

Wheeless, V. E., and Dierks-Stewart, K. The psychometric properties of the Bem Sex Role Inventory: Questions concerning reliability and validity. Communication Quarterly, 1981, 29, 173-186.

Wheeless, V. E., and Duran, R. L. Sexual identity and flexibility as correlates of communication competence. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Communication Association, Acapulco, 1980.

Wiggins, J. S., and Holzmuller, A. Psychological androgyny and interpersonal behavior. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 46, 40-52.

Wish, M., and Kaplan, S. J. Toward an implicit theory of interpersonal communication, Sociometry, 1977, 40, 234-246.

Worell, J. Sex roles and psychological well-being: Perspectives on methodology. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 46, 777-791.

Zanna, M. P., and Pack, S. J. On the self-fulfilling nature of apparent sex differences in behavior. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1975, 11, 583-591.