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Peter R. Stevenson
The purpose of this study is to assess public and private differences in gender role identity presentation. It was hypothesized that in both public and private, males should generally present themselves as more masculine (instrumental) and females should present themselves as more feminine (expressive) as traditional gender norms would suggest. Also, public and private situational differences in gender identity presentation are hypothesized. Males and females who are high in public self-consciousness should design their gender related presentations to meet the normative expectations of public situations because these individuals are highly aware of social expectations.

The results of the study supported the first hypothesis in that men and women did portray themselves in a manner constant with normative gender standards. Women high in public self-consciousness were found not to present themselves in more feminine ways in public than in private settings. It was unclear whether this finding indicated a lack of relationship between self-consciousness and public identity presentation or a failure of the independent variable manipulation.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Description of the Problem

General Expectations for Behavior

What guides our behavior when we are alone or with others? Do we use our own expectations, the expectations others have for us, or a combination of the two? One line of thought suggests that the ways individuals interact in a group is dependant upon the approval or disapproval of those around them in a social setting (Arkin, 1981). Individuals are motivated by winning the approval of others and will alter their presentation of self toward others' expectations to gain approval, because approval promises other forms of reward, either immediate or potential. This would then suggest individuals have a transient conception of self that may vary from setting to setting as their presentations of self change depending on the situational requirements.

A contrasting view suggests that individuals are motivated to create a role identity that meets their own expectations within particular normatively defined situations (McCall & Simmons, 1981). According to this view individuals tend to create stable self-conceptions; when their presentations of self are not receiving support for their created role identity they may distort their views of
others' reactions or leave the situation rather than changing their self-conceptions. This suggests that individuals' presentations of self may be stable from setting to setting even when their presentations may conflict with the expectations of those around them.

Back to the original question of what guides behavior: the answer may be that each view applies to different types of people depending on how aware they are of others' expectations and whether other people are present. Individuals who are highly aware of others' expectations may change their presentations of self when others are present. Those who are less aware of social expectations may tend to base their presentations on their own expectations, not those that others around them may have.

What happens when individuals are not in the presence of others? In this instance people will use their own or ideal conception of self to guide their behavior (McCall & Simmons, 1994). This may come primarily from their own expectations which may have been shaped by the expectations of others they have encountered in the past.

**Gender Related Expectations for Behavior**

One aspect of our overall self-conception is our gender role identity. Much of our behavior may be shaped to fit traits considered to be masculine or feminine (Spence, 1984). The expectations individuals have for themselves and others concern the portrayal of masculine and feminine identities. Many of the expectations individuals have are based on the appropriateness of enacting those traits
that are defined as appropriate in relationship to their biological sex. At various levels of consciousness men and women are aware of their own and others' expectations (remember, these expectations are weighted differentially depending on a person's awareness of other individuals' expectations) as to how masculine or feminine they should portray themselves depending on their sex. The way individuals present these masculine and feminine traits may differ depending upon their awareness of expectations concerning what behaviors are appropriate for their sex. This seems to suggest that for those individuals who are aware of what others expect from them, in terms of appropriate presentation of their gender identity, may alter their presentation when others are present. For people who are less aware of other individuals' expectations, their presentation of gender role identity may not change when they are in the presence of others or alone.

Purpose of the Study

Research that has been done previously shows that individuals vary their gender related behaviors when alone and in the presence of others (Kidder, 1977). What has not been determined is if an individual's gender role identity, the way a person conceives of him or herself as a male or female, differs depending on the setting one may find him or herself. As an individual finds him or herself alone or in the presence of others, differences in gender identity may be seen for people who are aware of the normative gender role expecta-
This research project will first attempt to determine if males and females present themselves inline with traditional gender expectations; men portraying themselves as more masculine (instrumental) and women as more feminine (expressive). Next, in a public and private experimental settings, this research project will try to determine if gender role identity is portrayed differentially in public settings, as opposed to a more static presentation in private, for two distinct types of individuals; those who are highly aware of others' expectations and those who are not. For individuals who are aware of others' expectations, their gender role identity presentation is more likely to be linked to the perceived social expectations for masculinity or femininity associated with the situation, while for those who are not as aware, their definition of self as a male or female is shaped by personal expectations for sex-linked behaviors regardless of the setting.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND THEORY

Presentation of Self

Self-Presentation Theory: Goffman

In *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, Erving Goffman asserts that individuals seek out information from others in order to behave appropriately and successfully when they find themselves in social situations (1959). This information allows performers to infer the characteristics, attitudes, and self-conceptions of the other interactants, and is useful in predicting their behavior when interacting in face-to-face situations. These inferences are used by the actors to shape their interaction strategies. Based on their knowledge of others, actors will adjust their performances in order to bring about the responses they desire.

Since the information that performers glean from others is important in choosing appropriate interaction strategies, actors must pay attention to the way they present themselves so that others will respond in ways that produce desired interactional consequences. Goffman describes three forms of desired consequences that can be gained from the presentation of self in a social setting; the interaction can be facilitated by reaching a common definition of the situation, the definition of the situation can be controlled to
get others to act voluntarily in accordance with one’s own plans (goals), and the actor can obtain approval and/or material benefit (1959).

The information that actors provide about themselves defines their identity in that social situation. An actor’s self-presentation represents who they claim they are in that situation. Goffman suggests that there are certain moral obligations attached to self-presentation that set normative parameters that govern self-presentations and curb false presentations of self. The first obligation is that others will value and treat actors in a manner that is consistent with the identities presented. Secondly, the actor must keep his presentation in line with the qualities contained within their own identity (1959, p. 13).

Goffman’s theoretical framework contains both moral and hedonistic aspects. He points to the moral imperatives that guides a person’s development of performance strategies that follow those normative guidelines which enhance the communicative interactions between social actors. However, in the same section of his writings he also focuses on implementing performance strategies that bring with them some form of material benefit or approval. This can be problematic in that some people devise non-normative performance strategies that are not in line with who they claim they are so they can reap the benefits of a favorable presentation (impression management). Current self-presentation theorists have chosen to ignore the moral implications and communicative aspects of Goffman’s theory.
and emphasize the more instrumental aspects of presenting one's self in such a way that always produces some sort of benefit, regardless of the moral imperative to be true to one's real identity (Chriss, 1995). This current view of self-presentation theory will be discussed in more detail in the next section.

Over time, the actor may utilize the same performance strategy again and again in similar situations and for similar interactants. Such repeated performances, which have been validated by others, represent the actor's social role in that situation (Goffman, 1959). The various roles performed by an actor serve to identify the correct performance to fit the social situations the actor encounters. According to Goffman, situations are defined in terms of roles enacted by the participants. Roles become an important part of the identity claims that actors make in adapting their performances to particular situations. This discussion concerning self-presentation theory will consider role and identity as synonymous. The enacted role represents a person's identity in a social situation which in turn shapes his or her plans of action and self-presentation. In conclusion, according to Goffman, an actor's identity is the role they claim and perform at that moment in time (1959).

Self-Presentation Theory: Arkin

Robert Arkin has adopted the general analytical framework offered by Goffman, adding ideas about social reinforcement drawn from the work of B.F. Skinner to develop a theory of self-presentation
Self-presentation theory, according to Arkin, suggests that the way individuals interact in a group is dependent upon the approval or disapproval of others in the group (Arkin, 1981). Winning the approval of others by meeting their expectations supplies the motivation for an individual to maintain an interaction that promises either an immediate direct reward or the potential of a future reward. In Arkin's perspective, individuals engage in role performance primarily to receive some type of benefit, and will readily change their self presentations to maximize rewards. This view suggests that the individual's primary motivation is not to express some form of ideal role-identity they have created, but to maximize their rewards, and that they will alter their identities to conform to others' expectations in order to do so. Rewards will motivate actors to perform or simulate whatever behavior is expected by others.

Arkin's narrow view of self-presentation theory is based on Goffman's view but differs significantly from his actual writings (Chriss, 1995). Arkin focuses on only one of several possible motivations governing the presentation of self. In suggesting that we present ourselves only in ways that maximize potential rewards, Arkin emphasizes the instrumental and self-serving aspects of self-presentation and neglects the normative and communicative dimensions of role performance. These latter aspects of self-presentation are factors addressed by role-identity theory.
Comparing the Two Views of Self-Presentation Theory

What is left is to take elements of Goffman's and Arkin's interpretations to create a useful set of tools to explain why people may alter their role performances when engaged in any social interaction. First, individuals may shape their identities to engage in a role performance that is socially expected or demanded. This will occur when the actor defines the situation as requiring a particular role because the other interactants expect or require that a certain performance be enacted. For example, when there is an emergency, men are usually expected to go and offer help (an instrumental gender role) while women are expected to offer comfort to the victims and their families (an expressive gender role). If the men and women in this example do not present themselves by exhibiting the proper behavior some form of social sanction may be levied against them.

The second explanation for changes in one's role presentation has to do with situations where a particular role has not been socially defined. When individuals encounter a situation where there are no preset social expectations or sanctions, they then present themselves in a way that will best maintain or control the interaction or facilitate their goals or plans. Self-presentation strategies involve behaving in a manner that meets others' expectations in order to fulfill individual goals and creates a common definition of the situation in order to maintain the interaction. For example, two strangers sit next to each other on an airplane. There may not be any preset rules as to how one is to behave but they present them-
selves in a way best to enhance the interaction and perhaps develop a social relationship. In maintaining the interaction, the individual does not reap any great reward or escape a sanction, but does achieve desired support for the role created. In this example, the individuals are creating an identity that reflects their goals and there is no reward achieved beyond that of gaining support for one's identity in the form of social acceptance for one's identity is reflected by their performance.

By comparing Arkin's and Goffman's view of self-presentation theory it becomes clear that social interactions do not always require the adoption of a particular role presentation to meet established expectations as Arkin suggests. Roles may not be so tightly defined. Instead, the roles that individuals create may be so loosely defined that they will allow for presentation of their identity that may serve to validate one's self views (which will be explained more completely in a forthcoming section) (Chriss, 1995).

Role-Identity Theory: McCall and Simmons

In contrast to self-presentation theory, which emphasizes the impact of external consequences on one's performance, role-identity has a more internal focus, emphasizing how individuals create identities that meet their expectations. Role-identity theory shares the moral and normative focuses of Goffman's work, although the two theories developed independently. McCall and Simmons define a role-identity as the character or image people create for themselves as
occupants of a social position (1981). Every social position has certain associated behavioral rights and duties and role-identities must include the performance of these rights and duties because they are demanded by the larger social structure. According to role-identity theorists, people may modify their role-identities to suit their own tastes and needs but the created role-identity must include those behaviors that are deemed as role appropriate. It becomes the moral duty of the individual to construct a role identity that includes elements demanded by society. On this point, role identity theory is consistent with the normative aspects of Goffman's self-presentation theory.

Role-identity is how actors think of themselves as being and acting as occupants of a particular position; in essence it becomes a part of the person's self-conception. The role-identities we develop become our primary plans of action. They become templates for how we would like to behave in certain situations (McCall & Simmons, 1981). Role-identities also provide actors with the criteria used to judge their role performances. Created identities serve as important referents to appraise actors' thoughts and actions. McCall and Simmons feel that our role identities are important in determining the meanings of the objects and events in our environment.

Individuals behave in line with their created role-identities to gain support from themselves and from others for those role-identities. Such support legitimizes the role-identities. Legitimation, knowing that one's created role-identity is acceptable be-
cause it is fulfilling your plans, goals, and image of self in relationship to the particular role, can be either extrinsically or intrinsically satisfying to the individual (McCall & Simmons, 1981). Role identities can be intrinsically satisfying when the actor interprets his or her role performance as being in line with the created role-identity. This can be seen as a form of self-verification in that people search for information that confirms the identity they have created and come to believe in (Swann, 1987) For example, one of a boy's role identities may be that he is a tough guy around his friends. In his mind's eye he replays his role performance. He perceives that his behavior intimidates and causes others to fear or respect him (no matter what the actual results were); he sees that the results of his behavior are in line with his created identity thus verifying the identity.

Role performance can also be extrinsically rewarding if others provide the actor with feedback that their behavior is deemed as socially appropriate from their position in the interaction. This can be seen as a source of self-enhancement, in that people desire positive feedback in order to help legitimize their identity (Swann, 1987). Using the previous example, they young boy finds others around who give him approval or behave in a manner that connotes approval of his tough guy behavior.

This suggests that individuals create role performances to both verify and enhance salient role identities that they are exhibiting. Performances are motivated and guided by the verifying and
enhancing feedback that they receive. Individuals can call on a particular identity which is appropriate for a setting to guide their behavior. McCall and Simmons suggest that, for the most part, that people carry with them and utilize this same identity as they go from one situation to the next (1981). McCall and Simmons also contend that when presentation of their role-identity is not meeting social expectations and thus not being validated, people will distort their definition of the situation to achieve validation or they will move on to another situation where others do see them meeting the requisite social expectations.

**Role-Identity and Self-Presentation Theories**

Role-identity theory, like self-presentation theory, suggests that a person's interaction in a social situation is dependent on the anticipated reactions of others in the situation (Arkin, 1981; Chriss, 1995; McCall & Simmons, 1981). However, it is the motivation behind the action that distinguishes role-identity theory from Arkin's version of self-presentation theory. For self-presentation theorists such as Arkin winning the approval of others in a social setting is the main interactional goal (Arkin, 1981).

While role-identity theorists also identify social rewards as motivators, they would consider them only as of secondary concern (McCall & Simmons, 1981). They would see positive affirmation of one's role performance as leading to self-enhancement in so far as other interactants legitimate a created role-identity by giving some
sort of approval. But unlike Arkin's self-presentation theory, actors are seen as altering performance to meet the expectations of others only if the legitimacy of the identity is questioned or challenged by others. Role-identity theory and Goffman's self-presentation theory have a much more intrinsic and moral quality in that the actors are seen as presenting identities to others for validation in relation to legitimate and expected roles. However McCall and Simmons differ from Goffman and Arkin when one encounters problematic situations where one's behavior is not achieving the desired results. McCall and Simmons felt when people encounter a situation where others are not validating their role-identity rather than changing their presentation of self, which for self-presentation theorists would mean a change in identity, the person chooses two strategies to resolve the discrepancy between performance and others not legitimating their identity. The person can respond by altering or distorting their definition of the situation so it would then become a self-enhancing experience or they would leave the situation to find alternatives where their role-identity is legitimated in order to maintain their created role-identity (McCall & Simmons, 1981).

Role-identity theorists see self-verification as the primary motivation for the enactment of roles (McCall & Simmons, 1981; Swann, 1987). Individuals attempt to gain role support from others to legitimate their created role-identity. People bring a role-identity to a particular situation, which they seek to validate through others' reflected approval. If they feel that their performance is
achieving desired results and that others approve of their performance then the individual can feel that they created a valid role for themselves.

Public and Private Behavior

The utility of including role-identity theory in a discussion of self-presentation theory becomes evident when one wants to examine differences in role behavior when individuals find themselves in the presence of others (public interaction) or alone (private activity). According to role-identity theorists, people construct identities in connection with particular roles. This identity will be the framework that a they use to think about themselves in private, where they will seek validation in their own thoughts and private acts. This validation comes from their own perceptions of self. In public, actors will attempt to exhibit this identity to others in ways that are consistent with their own views and to get others to agree and provide legitimation. As a result, public role performances are internally defined before they are presented to the world, and are likely to be consistent with private acts.

Self-presentation theorists following Arkin's tradition would be clear in seeing that public performance is guided and constructed based on an actor's assessment of others' expectations. In different situations actors will vary behavior in relation to the expectations they assess in others. Self-presentation theorists are less clear as to what guides private behavior. It would be logical to
suggest that people may recall how their identity was presented in the past when in private. This means that the actor would recall past public identities from relevant situations when they are in a private situation. Both of these theories have very different views on explaining behavior in public settings. McCall and Simmons would suggest that people base their public behavior on role identities that they have created and which have been legitimized primarily by themselves and to a lesser extent those around them. Arkin would see public behavior as based solely on the expectations of others. One's identity is shaped by the expectations of others and these expectations guide behavior regardless of the actor's conception of his or her legitimate identity. Arkin would hold that a person's conception of self is solely comprised of others' expectations for him or her (1980). In private, self-presentation theory would predict that a person's behavior would be based upon an identity that is comprised of perceptions of behaviors that have worked in the past for them and produced desired results. However, role-identity theorists would see behavior as based on identity constructed to meet the expectations of socially defined role.

**Public Self-Consciousness**

Despite dissimilar views on public presentations of self, both theories become particularly applicable in explaining public and private differences in behavior when public self-consciousness is considered. The differences between the two theories may be reconciled
if one were to consider that each theory might apply best to a different type of actor. People differ in their degree of public self-consciousness.

Public self-consciousness is a personality construct designed to distinguish between people who are highly aware of their social environment and those who are not (Carver & Scheier, 1981; Tice, 1992). Individuals who are high on this dimension are extremely aware of other people's expectations and conform to these expectations. Individuals who have low public self-consciousness are less aware of, and less motivated to conform to the expectations and the demands others in a social setting place on them.

Based on this previous statement, self-presentation theory seems particularly applicable to those individuals who are high in public self-consciousness. These people may have a more transient identity because they are aware of others' expectations and tend to base their behavior, in public, on these expectations. This suggests that the publically self-conscious would alter their identity from one public setting to the next and may also portray themselves in a very different manner than they would when alone. In private, they will tend to base their behavior on a previous identity that has worked for them in a similar situation. As a result the actor would have different presentations of self in public than they would in private.

At the other end of this spectrum, those low in public self-consciousness are less aware of these expectations and would be more
likely to keep their presentations of self inline with their own self-conception. As a result, their identity would be less likely change from private to public settings. Based on the above discussion it becomes clear that self-presentation theory would be applicable in explaining the public and private behavior of those individuals who are publically self-conscious while role-identity theory would be useful in explaining the behavior of those who are not publically self-conscious.

Gender Role-Identity Performance

People create many different role identities corresponding to the variety of roles they play in different social situations. These identities are then organized into a coherent personality structure which McCall and Simmons identify as the ideal self-conception or global self-conception (1981). One of the identities that all people create is that of gender role-identity. This is defined by Janet Spence as a person's conception of self as a man or woman, defined in terms of traits considered to be masculine and feminine (1984). A person's gender role-identity becomes the plan by which the individual organizes and processes gender relevant information so they can enact gender specific behavior. This conception is common to both role-identity theory (e.g., McCall & Simmons, 1981) and gender role theories (e.g., Bem, 1984; Spence, 1984) The gender role identity of the actor shapes interaction strategies with others which, in turn, will directly affect how behaviors are performed by
the individual. Social expectations concerning appropriate gender behavior must be included into a person's construction of his or her gender role identity. The demands of the larger social structure may impose limitations as to how an individual can construct gender role identity.

Gender role-identity has been measured by observing the actor's behaviors or through the use of questionnaires (Bem, 1984; Spence, 1984). Gender role-identities will be measured in this research project by means of a questionnaire developed by Janet Spence (1978). The Spence Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ), independently assesses two dimensions of gender identity; masculine (instrumental) qualities and the feminine (expressive) qualities (1978). Using this instrument, it is possible to classify the degree to which a person conceptualizes his or her gender role-identity in terms of both instrumental and expressive characteristics.

If an individual is to use gender role-identity to guide actions in a certain situation, the gender role-identity must be salient, consciously or unconsciously, to that person in that given moment in time. McCall and Simmons identify several factors that determine if a role-identity will be salient: its prominence, its need for support, the intrinsic or extrinsic gratification received through its performance, and/or the perceived degree of opportunity for its profitable enactment (1981). Gender role-identity is likely to be one of the more salient role identities individuals enact because others attend to our gender in all social situations, and make in-
terpretations of behavior in relation to its gender-appropriateness. People place high importance the adequacy and appropriateness of an actor's gender presentation.

**Public and Private Settings.**

Public behavior is behavior that is known to others and is thus subject to their evaluation (Tice, 1992). When an individual is aware that his or her behavior is observable by others, and their reactions trigger awareness of the social expectations operating in the situation (Carver & Scheier, 1981). Private behavior, on the other hand, is anonymous, and individuals may believe that no one else will know of this behavior; they will not be concerned about the expectations or potential reactions of others as they perceive themselves to be alone.

Self-presentation theory would predict that once individuals believe that others will evaluate their gender presentation, they alter their performances to fit the gender expectancies of others. The individual determines what the others' expectancies are and develops the best strategy to meet these expectations. Once a course of action has be decided upon by the person they then enact their presentation of self, which would be considered their situated identity.

On the other-hand, role-identity theorists would suggest that public expectations would increase the salience of the person's gender role-identity as an internal construct. The person will follow
his or her internal model of gendered performance, altering it in some cases to fit the particular expectations of others. Typically, the individual's performance would be based on the gender identity that has worked well for them in the past in a similar situation and this identity would guide their behavior. As a result, the created gender role identity reflects a combination of both a person's own self-views as well as the expectations of others. Both role-identity theory and self-presentation theory imply that social expectations have an impact upon actual performances. For self-presentation theory it is others' expectations for performance, rather than internalized identity, that constitutes the major determinant of behavior. Arkin would suggest that one's presentation need not match any ideal representation of how one feels as a male of female; rather, a presentation will be chosen on the basis of its promise of desirable results. Self-presentation requires that the individual be aware of the expectations of others.

However some individuals are not necessarily attuned to the expectations of others in a public situation (low public self-consciousness). These individuals would use their a previously constructed gender identity as the basis of their performance which would tend to be stable across situations.

In private, gender expectations of others are absent. If gender role-identity is salient for the situation, actors are free to behave or present themselves in a manner that best suits their ideal gender role conception (role-identity theory) or may chose to base
their identity on a previous identity that resulted in a successful maintaining of the social interaction and may have been rewarding for the individual (self-presentation theory). Creating a situation where individuals know beforehand that investigators are looking for male and female differences and filling out the PAQ should cause gender identity to become a salient part of the actor’s identity in either public and private settings.

**Gendered Performance**

Past research involving public and private settings has focused on behavior rather than identity, as the present project proposes to do. The work of Kidder and associates evaluated the effects of public and private situations on gender specific behaviors, suggesting that these different situations can produce variations in behavior (1977). Kidder’s study was designed to look at differences in reward allocation between men and women in public and private settings. Twenty-two male and 23 female students were placed in an experimental situation that asked them to distribute a reward to a partner who was represented as having done much less work than they did. The subjects were allowed to give themselves and their partners up to 5 points for the work they did. The equity of the subject’s allocations was calculated by the distribution of the points allotted to self and other. A high score represented more generosity toward self while a low score represented more generosity to the partner. The results showed a mean equity score of 1.8 for men and .6
for women in public and scores of .2 for men and 2.0 for women in private. These results showed a significant interaction effect between sex and privacy \[F(l,41) = 4.12, p<.05\]. Such findings suggest that high performing men allocate rewards more in their own favor in public and opt for a more equal distribution in private, while women exhibit the opposite behavior, allocating rewards more equally in public and equitably in private. Kidder's work clearly demonstrates that settings play a significant role on how gender related behaviors are performed.

This study showed that when in public, the subjects' behavior conformed to traditional gender role stereotypes, with woman being more generous than men. In private, male and female differences were reversed. Such findings suggest, and self-presentation predicts, that individuals alter their behavior to conform to gender role expectations. With the constraint of meeting other's expectations gone, people alter their gender related behavior to satisfy their own internal conception of gender role-identity, which becomes self-verifying for the individual.

Once an individual begins to perform gender relevant behavior, such as describing him/herself on the PAQ, observations of his/her own performance are used in creating their definition of the situation. The individual monitors their behavior to evaluate how he/she acted in terms of masculine and feminine behavior. The actor observes his/her own performance and compares the observed behavior to his/her own desired performances if others are not present (for self-
verifying purposes). If others are present, they examine the reaction of others (to control the definition of the situation). For individuals who are highly aware that others (high in public self-consciousness) will be scrutinizing their performance, they will pay very close attention to reactions of their performance and alter their performance according to these reactions (self-presentation theory). According to Arkin, this would suggest a change in ones’ gender role-identity as one goes from one situation to the next, as ones’ behavior is representative of their identity in that situation. So, if ones behavior is seen as conforming and changing to the situational expectations then one can assume that their conception of self, including gender role identity, would also have to be changing as well.

People who are low in public self-consciousness pay less attention to others’ expectations and the results of this scrutiny and focus their attention on if their gender role-identity performance is meeting their own expectations. Role-identity theory would suggest identities are generally more internal and more stable across situations. However, if behavior does vary to fit the expectations of the situation, and the behavior does not fit their self-expectations, the individual is in a problematic situation. To resolve this dilemma the individual can leave the situation to eliminate any discomfort or they may distort the results of the behavior to fit their own expectations thus producing no change in identity. Another strategy to resolve the dilemma would result in the indivi-
dual altering their identity to match the expectations others have for them. Although role-identity theory does allow change over time in identity, their conception of self is much more stable than Ar-kin’s view. Individuals do try to keep a stable sense of self that meets their own expectations. Therefore if one is less aware of oth-ers’ expectations it seems more likely that their behaviors and their identity would reflect their own self-expectations resulting in a more stable gender role-identity as one moves from one situa-tion to the next.

The Effect of Public Self-Consciousness on Gendered Self-Presentation

Public self-consciousness has already been identified as a factor relevant to self-presentation in public situations. Public self-consciousness may also affect a person’s modification of the role-identity that motivates performance and this impacts actual performance. Public self-consciousness determines the degree to which an individual will be aware of or motivated by a desire to meet others expectations in their identity presentations (Carver & Scheier, 1981).

A study by Tice examined changes in identity in public set-tings as these relate to public self-consciousness (1992). Her experiment used 36 male and 44 female students. The subjects were pretested for public and private self-consciousness and then asked to portray themselves as either introverted or extroverted in de-pending on the experimental condition they were assigned to. After
their portrayal, the subjects were asked to rate themselves as introverted and extroverted to determine if this characteristic was integrated into their identity. The more this rated identity corresponded to their previous behavior, the more internalized the characteristic was seen to be. She then computed the correlation between public self-consciousness and internalization of the portrayed behavior. A substantial positive correlation was found between public self-consciousness and the subjects' internalization scores ($r = .61$, $p < .001$). This result suggests that those individuals who were high in public self-consciousness did internalize their introverted and extroverted behavior and made it a part of their overall identity. They enacted the behavior Tice asked them to present in order to conform or comply with demands placed upon them as members of the experiment. This is what self-presentation theorists would have predicted as the subjects altered their identity to fit their presentation of self. Those low in public self-consciousness did internalize their behavior but not to the extent that those high in public self-consciousness did; behaviors the subjects were asked to present became less a part of their self-conception. It appears that their identity was more stable between the public and private settings.

For those high in public self-consciousness, the motivation was to present themselves in a favorable manner to the experimenter in the public setting so they could benefit from this performance while those not high in public self-consciousness based their por-
trayal of self on their constructed identity.

One might expect similar differences in gender self-presentation between people high and low in public self-consciousness. Self-presentation theorists would emphasize that public expectations from an audience would serve to enhance the display of gender appropriate instrumental or expressive behaviors for males and females in public. Since subjects in the public condition will be led to believe that others in their group will know how each person in the group filled out the PAQ, this behavior constitutes public identity display. In the private condition subjects were assured that their responses would not be known to others in their group as a result the two groups can be compared to determine differences between the two settings.

Changes in presented identity, as measured by the PAQ should be especially pronounced for individuals who are high in public self-consciousness, because they are more cognisant of social expectations. Individuals who are high on this dimension would be more likely to alter their self-presentation to gain public approval from their audience than subjects low in public self-consciousness. This is expected, again, because publically self-conscious people should be more attuned to what others expect in terms of gender role presentations. Therefore, their behaviors, in the form of gender role performance, will be more likely to conform to audience expectations.

When individuals who are high in public self-consciousness
find themselves in a private setting they may present themselves differently than they do in public. Since there are no specific expectations imposed by other social actors in a private setting, the actor should instead recall similar situations in which gender role performance produced desirable results for them. Individuals high in public self-consciousness would use previous experience to guide their presentation in the private situation.

Individuals who are low in public self-consciousness should display similar gender characteristics whether their behavior is occurring in a public or private setting. According to role-identity theorists, individuals invoke role performance without much concern to the publicness or privateness of the setting in which they find themselves. This theory becomes particularly applicable for individuals who are low in public self-consciousness. These people would they have less tendency to seek the approval from their audience because they are less aware of their expectations. Individuals low in this dimension would tend to use their gender role identity they have created for themselves because they have less care for what type behaviors others around them wish to invoke. They should instead base their presentation on their own gender identity which meets their expectations for appropriate instrumental and expressive behavior.

From the perspective of a larger social context, it would seem reasonable to suggest that any audience related change in gender-identity presentation would be toward more traditional interpretations of masculinity or femininity for individuals who are high in
public self consciousness. Arkin clearly states that he would predict that most people conform to the traditional sex-role stereotypes because others approve of such conformity (1981). This then would suggest that males would present themselves as more masculine (scoring higher on instrumental qualities and lower on expressive qualities on the PAQ) and females as more feminine (scoring higher on expressive qualities and lower on instrumental qualities on the PAQ) in public than in private to comply social expectations concerning gender roles to maintain social interactions. This tendency would be particularly noticeable among men and women high in public self-consciousness.

When people present their gender identities they must first examine the gender related performance expectations of those around them, recall their previous performance of gender behaviors, or call upon their created gender role identity to guide their behavior depending on how publically self-conscious they are and what type of situation (public or private) they find themselves in. Because people first think about their presentation in some manner before enacting that presentation, the PAQ should be able to detect differences in how individuals think about themselves in terms of masculinity and femininity. The PAQ is designed to measure how people conceive of themselves in terms of the instrumental and expressive dimensions of gender identity. As a result, the PAQ score should be able to detect differences in how people think about their gender identity which can then be used to predict differential gender role
presentation in different settings as thought guides behavior.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to assess differences in individuals' gender role-identity presentation between public and private situations. In both public and private, males should generally present themselves as more masculine (instrumental) and females should present themselves as more feminine (expressive). Gender differences need to be examined first to ensure that the subjects are portraying themselves, generally, in a manner consistent with their social and gender role. If gender identity presentation is shown to be in line with normative expectations one can begin to look at situational differences in gender role identity presentation.

Next, public and private situational differences in gender identity presentation will be examined. Males and females who are high in public self-consciousness should design their gender related presentations in public settings to meet the normative expectations of that situation because these individuals are highly aware of those expectations, as predicted by self-presentation theory. Publicly self-conscious males and females should score higher on their respective dimensions: males scoring higher on the masculine (instrumental) and females scoring higher on the feminine (expressive) dimensions. Previous work has demonstrated that individuals alter their gender related behavior as they move from private to public situations. For males and females who are not high in public self-
consciousness there should be little difference in scores between
the public and private setting. Role identity theory predicts that
these individuals will base their presentations on their preconceiv-
ed notions of gender identity in both situations, and will not great-
ly effected by the expectations of others.

If this hypothesis holds true, then it would tend to support
the following: When people who are publicly self-conscious finds
themselves in public settings they will present themselves in line
with their gender expectations to maintain the interaction with oth-
ers and to escape any form of social sanction. This then suggests
that men would present themselves as more masculine/instrumental and
women would present themselves as more feminine/expressive in a pu-

clic setting. For those who are not publicly self-conscious their
gender role presentation would not differ because they are acting on
their internalized gender-identity rather than creating a presented
identity to match the expectations of others.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this research project was to examine the differences in gender role identity presentation in public and private settings for individuals who are high in public self-consciousness and for those who are not. Self-presentation theory predicts that those who are high in public self-consciousness will alter their presentation to conform to traditional gender role normative standards in public, while those who are not high in public self-consciousness should not alter their gender role identity in the different situations.

In order to test these assumptions, an experiment was devised to test the relationship among the three independent variables and dependant variable. This experiment exposed the subject to a public or private situation, the independent manipulated variable, in order to see if this manipulation, in conjunction with the two measured variables, males and females (sex) who are high or low in public self-consciousness, had an impact on the dependant variable. The dependant variable in this experiment was the subjects' conceptualizations of self, measured in terms of instrumental and expressive characteristics contained within the PAQ.

Traditionally, gender role identity has been used an independent variable but, as stated above, it was used as a dependent vari-
able in this experiment. Using gender role identity in this manner allows the researcher to determine the changes in how the subjects present themselves, in terms of instrumental and expressive qualities, to the other subjects and researcher. This was done across the two different settings, public and private, in order to determine differences in the gender role presentation of those high in public self-consciousness.

The Sample

The universe for this experiment was comprised of students attending one of four sociology and social psychology classes. Seventeen male and 47 female students were selected from a pool of volunteers producing a sample size of 64. Due to the small numbers of male volunteers, statistical analysis became problematic for computing a two-way analysis of variance. Therefore only data obtained from the female subjects were utilized for the public and private portion of this study.

Using non-randomly selected students as a sample produces a common problem that affects most social psychological laboratory experiments; less assurance of external validity than if a population or representative sampling procedure were employed. External validity refers to the extent to which a causal relationship can be generalized across populations or settings (Aronson, Brewer, & Carlsmith, 1985). Since the subjects aren’t randomly selected and represent a very narrow segment of a general adult population, the re-
sults of this study alone cannot be formally generalized to other populations or settings. Despite this limitation, researchers conducting laboratory experiments are confident that the results produced in such a setting are useful in understanding individuals in similar social settings (Aronson et al., 1985). The factors examined in this experiment do represent processes that occur within most individuals. Thus, with further research and a more representative population, the results obtained in this study, supported by the follow-up study, could be generalized to the population at large.

Experimental Design

To test the relationship among the independent and dependent variables a traditional laboratory experiment was conducted. Some critics would point out that such a design decreases external validity by creating an artificial setting that never truly simulates a social situation. However, this potential downside would be offset by an increase in internal validity. As control over the setting is enhanced, one can become more confident that the manipulations is having its desired effect on the dependant variable.

This experiment has attempted to create a realistic setting in which to examine the relationship among the variables of interest. The subjects found themselves in a mixed sex group setting in a university classroom. Choosing such a mundane setting allowed the researcher to generalize the results to other situations. The naturalness of this situation attempts to reduce the artificiality as-
sociated with many social psychology experiments carried out in laboratory settings.

Procedure

Subjects who volunteered to participate in this study were asked to report to a classroom for the experiment. They were welcomed by a male and a female research assistant dressed professionally in traditional gender appropriate clothing. A packet was handed out containing an informed consent agreement and two questionnaires.

The research assistants then began to explain the procedure for filling out the questionnaires, which were the same for both the public and private conditions (See Appendix B for the script used). The subjects had been told that "there are two studies being conducted today and therefore two questionnaires will be given, one for each of the two different research projects." The subjects were told that one project was for Dr. Wait, a professor, and another for Peter Stevenson, a graduate student (however, both questionnaires were for this research project). One questionnaire focused on perceptions of others while the other questionnaire focused on male and female interactions. The first questionnaire contained the Fenigstein, Scheier and Buss (1975) Self-Consciousness Survey. The second questionnaire contained Spence's Personal Attributes Questionnaire, the Keirsey Temperament Inventory (KTI), and four behavioral vignettes. Several manipulation checks were placed in a debriefing
questionnaire administered before the actual debriefing took place. Creating the illusion of two separate experiments was done so that the subjects would not associate public and private self-consciousness with the other surveys.

For both experimental conditions, the female research assistant began the session by explaining the perception of self and others questionnaire using the SCS before subjects were exposed to the public/private manipulation. The subjects were again told that this was not part of the experiment for which the second questionnaire will be administered. The subjects were given 10-15 minutes to fill out the questionnaire. The female research assistant thanked them for their participation for her part of the experiment then turned the group over to the male research assistant.

The male research assistant then explained his research project utilizing the PAQ, and KTI. This is where the public or private manipulation took place. For both procedures the respondents were told they would have 15-20 minutes to fill out the questionnaire. It was explained to the subjects in the public condition that, when the questionnaires are completed, they would be discussing their own responses with others in the class organized into mixed sex groups. Telling the subjects that they would discuss their responses established the expectation that their responses will be shared with others, thus enhancing the publicness of the setting. The subjects never actually discussed their responses. The experiment ended after the completion of the questionnaire thus
ensuring anonymity for the respondents.

In the public condition, the subjects were asked to write their names, addresses, and phone numbers on their questionnaire. Subjects were asked to write their name on a name tag and affix it to their shirts so that other participants in the mixed-sex discussion groups could identify them. This again was to enhance the publicness of the situation by placing the expectation in the subjects' minds that their responses would be seen by others who would know who they are.

The private condition differed from the public condition in that the subjects were told by the male research assistant that no one would know their results. The private condition did not require the subjects to place any form of identification marking on their questionnaire packet. The only identification on their response sheet was a code number so that all forms could be accounted for and matched to the first questionnaire.

In the private condition, anonymity was stressed and the subjects were also instructed to remove the consent portion of their packet and place the remaining forms in a plain envelope to ensure that no one could see their responses or identify them in any way. The subjects in this condition were also be told to sit as far apart from others as possible so no one could see their answers.

For both the public and private conditions the subjects were told once at the beginning of the experiment (in the informed consent letter) and when they were done filling out the questionnaires
that they were free to quit at any time. Once the questionnaires were completed, the male research assistant collected the packets and told the subjects that the student investigator, Peter Stevenson, was going to come in to talk to them. On the way out, the male research assistant thanked them for their help.

Peter Stevenson, the student investigator, came in the various classrooms and did the debriefing with the group. Those in the public condition were told that a group discussion of their responses was unnecessary as the intent of this experimental condition was done to create the expectation of having a public discussion of their responses. All subjects were given a debriefing questionnaire. This questionnaire asked those in the public condition if they expected to discuss their responses and if they knew the experimenter would be able to identify them via their response sheets. Those in the private condition were asked, via the debriefing questionnaire, if they had felt that the researcher could identify their responses (this is to determine if they felt this was a private situation). For both conditions, the subjects had been asked if they felt the two questionnaires were separate research projects. Finally, and again for both, the subjects were asked if they felt that their responses for the questionnaires would be kept anonymous.

After the subjects had indicated their beliefs about the experiment via the debriefing questionnaire, Peter Stevenson described the experiment. They were told that gender role identity is how we define ourselves as male and female and that gender role identity is
composed of instrumental and expressive elements, which were measured in the second part of the response packet. It was the experimenter's contention that the way individuals present their gender role identities would be affected by the expectations of others with whom a person anticipated interaction. The subjects were told that changes in the presentation of expressive and instrumental qualities might be greater for those who are higher in public self-consciousness because they are more attuned to the situational expectations of others. The subjects in the public condition were informed that the part of the experiment they were in focused on this public display. The results of their group's questionnaires would be compared to a group that didn't expect to share their responses with others, in order to see if there is a difference in their gender role presentations. The opposite was told to the subjects in the private condition.

Next, the subjects in both conditions were told that in order to get the best results possible it was necessary to deceive them by stating that there were two different experiments and, for those in the public setting, by telling them that they were going to share the results of the second questionnaire with the others. This was because it was necessary to obtain a SCS score without any situational effects and to get the PAQ scores with a situational effect. They were told that the major purpose of the experiment would be to compare grouped PAQ responses of subjects whose responses were expected to be public with responses of subjects who believed that
their scores were private.

Ethical Concerns

Because this experiment did involve the use of human subjects, ethical considerations were given special attention. The main dilemma with this research project was that it utilizes deception by not initially telling the participants the true nature of the study. Therefore, it was hard to get truly informed consent. However, the subjects were told that they were going to fill out a questionnaire that examined various personality factors in order to assess their perceptions of others and male and female interactions. Also, the names of the exact instruments being used were given in the informed consent agreement before the experiment began. Such an explanation was designed to provide the subject a sense of the experiment, and how it would be looking at various personality areas, giving them enough information to decide whether to participate.

It would have been advantageous to have not deceived the subjects. However, if the subjects were to be told of the deceptions beforehand, then the internal validity of the experimental conditions, for example, in terms of demand characteristics, would have been compromised. The experiment's potential academic worth justifies the use of such techniques because it is important to determine how situations affect gender identity presentation.

Overall, this experiment meets the criteria set within the American Psychological Associations' Guidelines for Ethical Consid-
erations (Aronson et al., 1985). The deception was of a moderate nature, the subjects were given enough information to consent, they were given many opportunities to decline, no physical or psychological harm was done, and they were told of the deceptions as soon as possible upon the experiment's completion with opportunity to take their response sheet and leave.

Measurements and Scoring

Self-Consciousness Scale

In this experiment, Fenigstein et al., (1975) Self-Consciousness Survey (SCS) was used to assess public self-consciousness, which is one of the measured independent variables (1985). This instrument was used before the subjects were exposed to the public or private manipulation in order to control for any unforeseen impact the public or private setting may have had upon self-consciousness. Once the subject's SCS score was computed it was used in the analysis phase to divide the subjects into two categories; low and high public self-consciousness.

The scale consists of 17 questions, 10 measuring the private dimension and 7 measuring the public dimension. The subject responded to these questions on a scale rated from 0 (extremely uncharacteristic) to 4 (extremely characteristic) (Fenigstein et al., 1975). The researcher used the traditional method to score the respondents, which required obtaining totals for both the public and private self-consciousness sub-scales. A total of each sub-scale
for each participant in the sample. The median was obtained for each sub-scale and was used to divide the sample into high and low public self-consciousness (Carver & Scheier, 1985).

In his past work with this scale, Carver has determined it to be valid (1988). He evaluated the construct validity by comparing private-self-consciousness with the results of sentence completion test. A .43 correlation was produced between private self-consciousness and expressions of self-focus in sentence completion. Carver also created tests to determine the convergent validity. A significant correlation, as reported by Carver and Scheier, was found between private self-consciousness and the Guilford-Zimmerman Thoughtfulness Scale demonstrating a relationship between the two theoretically related measures, suggesting convergent validity. Discriminate validity was determined by comparing public and private self-consciousness measures to IQ and social desirability measures and in both cases low and non-significant correlations were obtained. Such results suggest discriminant validity in that self-consciousness measures were not related to IQ and social desirability measure, to which they are theoretically unrelated.

**Personality Attributes Questionnaire**

The PAQ was used to measure the two dependent variables, masculinity and femininity. The subjects were given this instrument in the public or private experimental condition. The PAQ was used in this experiment is to see if the two manipulated independent vari-
ables had an impact on how the subjects think of themselves in terms of masculinity and femininity.

The PAQ consists of 24 bipolar items describing various personality characteristics on which the subjects must rank themselves on a five point Lickert-type scale (Spence, 1975). There are three eight item sub-scales within the questionnaire; the masculinity (M), femininity (F), and masculinity-femininity (M-F). Each subject ranks him/herself from 0 to 4, in terms of agreement, for each question. Scores for each scale are then summated. A high score indicates high masculinity on the M and M-F sub-scales and high femininity on the F sub-scale.

Traditionally the questionnaire is scored by totaling the M and F sub-scales, computing the median for each, and then classifying each the subjects on one of four dimensions; androgynous, masculine, feminine, or undifferentiated (Spence, 1975). This was be done in this experiment for several reasons. First, the researcher’s only interest is in the mean differences for the subjects on each sub-scale (M and F) as the public and private conditions are compared. Therefore, totals were obtained for each sub-scale. Second, this allows increased sensitivity to differences among the subjects on each dimension rather than comparing four mutually exclusive categories which would mask any slight changes. The M-F dimension was not used in this study. Utilizing the M and F dimensions alone gives a clear enough picture of where each subject falls on the masculine and feminine identity dimensions relevant to this
study.

The validity of the PAQ was established by Holmbeck and Bale (1988). These researchers set out to determine the construct, discriminant, and convergent validity. Construct validly was determined by comparing the PAQ to the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) and to the Instrumental and Expressive Behavior Inventory (IEBI). These three tests measure concepts that are theoretically related to each other and therefore there should be a significant amount of intercorrelation among the measures, which is what they found. There were moderate correlations between male components of the PAQ and BSRI and the instrumental components of the IEBI ranging from .2 to .67. Similar results were obtained for the female components of PAQ and BSRI and the expressive components of the IEBI ranging from .12 to .6. The highest degree of inter-correlation was the PAQ and BSRI. Some of the inter-correlation results between the PAQ and the BSRI are low because the BSRI measures personality dimensions beyond instrumental and expressive orientations (which are the only dimensions the PAQ is measuring). These other aspects of the BSRI produce the low inter-correlation results.

The same experiment by Holmbeck and Bale also demonstrated discriminant and convergent validity (1988). The masculine scales predicted instrumentality among males while the femininity scales predicted expressive behaviors among females supporting convergent validity. Discriminant validity for the PAQ was supported because the masculinity measures did not predict expressive behaviors while...
the femininity measures did not predict instrumental behaviors.

**Manipulation Checks**

The purpose of the manipulation checks in this experiment was to determine whether the main independent variable had any impact on the subjects. The subjects will be given this questionnaire after the experimental manipulations have ended and before the debriefing session begins. This research project used similar manipulation checks to the ones Tice used in her public and private experiment (1991). The manipulation checks consist of two questions, one asking if the subjects felt the experimenters could personally identify them and the other asked if other members of their research session would know how they personally responded to the questionnaire based on their responses to the second questionnaire. Possible scores for both questions could range from one (no one would know how they responded) to five (others would definitely know how they responded). Tice, in each one of her experimental conditions, found that these questions provided statistically significant support for the impact of the public and private situation variable upon the subjects (Tice, 1991).
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Reliability of the PAQ

Before conducting the analysis of the women’s PAQ scores for the experimental conditions, tests were conducted on the reliability of the PAQ for women in the study and on the significance of the manipulation checks, for both men and women. Reliability was assessed in order to assure that scores obtained from the women which represented the instrumental and expressive aspects of identity were consistent. This consistency means that the scores for the feminine questions were consistently predicting feminity (expressiveness) and that the scores for the masculine questions were consistently predicting masculinity (instrumentality). The reliability of the PAQ will be discussed in this section and the manipulation checks will be discussed in the following sections.

In order to conduct reliability tests for both the instrumental and expressive identity measures, a factor analysis of each dimension was conducted to get factor score coefficients for each question (indicator). For the first factor analysis, questions 1, 3, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16 (instrumental characteristics) were used. Before the actual factor analysis was done, the variables were examined using the Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy. A score of .65 was obtained, well above the lower limit of .60 which
is required to perform a factor analysis.

The results of the factor analysis, using the principle-components analysis technique, showed that all of items except question 10 loaded onto the first factor extracted (instrumentality). Factor loadings for the first unrotated factor can be found in Table 1. An Eigenvalue of 2.85 was obtained for the first factor, termed instrumentality, which accounts for 35.7% of the variance in the model. The factor loadings were all moderately high, indicating that the instrumentality factor was highly correlated with the indicators.

Table 1
Factor Loadings for the Instrumental Dimension of the PAQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Trait Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>Competitiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;.30</td>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>Never Gives Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>Self-Confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>Superiority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>Handles Pressure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The factor coefficient scores were then used to conduct an alpha reliability test. An alpha of .751 was obtained for the measure excluding question 10. The instrumental dimension of the PAQ does appear to be a reliable measure of that concept. The instrumentality scale which is used in the analyses that follow includes
item 10 in order to make this study comparable to others which have used the PAQ in its original form. Inclusion or exclusion of this item from the scale was found to make no appreciable difference in the analyses of variances reported later in this study.

To create a measure of the feminine (expressive) dimension for self-conception, a factor analysis of PAQ questions 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 14, 15 was conducted using the techniques described above. The first factor extracted using the principle-components technique exhibited substantial factor loadings for all eight of the indicators. An Eigenvalue of 3.42 was obtained for the first unrotated factor which accounts for 42.8% of the total item variance. Factor loadings for the first unrotated factor are reported in Table 2.

Table 2
Factor Loadings for the Expressive Dimension of the PAQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Trait Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>Devoted To Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>Gentleness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>Helpfulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>Kindness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>Aware Of Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>Warmth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An alpha reliability test was conducted on the eight expressive items. This test produced an alpha of .807 for this scale, indicating that it is a reliable measure of the expressive dimension.
of self-conception.

Results of the Manipulation Checks

A manipulation check was given to all subjects before the debriefing took place, in order to assess the impact of the public and private conditions. The check consisted of two questions, one asking if the subjects felt the experimenters could personally identify them via their response sheets that were used in the second session. The second question was similar in nature, but asked if other members of their research session would know how they personally responded to the questionnaire used in the second research session. Possible scores for both questions could range from one (no one would know how they responded) to five (others would definitely know how they responded). In the public condition, high scores were predicted, because the subjects should have felt that others would have known their responses. This was the purpose of the public manipulation. Low scores were predicted in the private manipulation because the subjects should have expected that their responses would be anonymous.

The mean score for question one in the public condition was 3.45, while the mean score in the private condition was 3.21. Subjects should have had a higher mean score in the public condition than the private, because they were led to believe their responses were not confidential, where in the private setting confidentiality was stressed. However, this was not the case: Both groups averaged
near the middle of the scale, although the difference was in the appropriate direction. The results of the one-way ANOVA showed that the mean difference between public and private conditions was not significant ($F = 1.68, P > .05$). This indicates that the manipulation failed to produce differences in the publicness or privateness of the situations that subjects could perceive.

Question two was examined next; the mean score for the public condition was 3.19 and 2.87 for the private condition. As with the first question a high average public score and a low average private score had been predicted. In this instance there was a difference in the appropriate direction. However, as in question one, the means were in the middle of the scale suggesting that for both conditions, subjects were not completely sure if their responses were confidential. A one-way ANOVA revealed that the mean differences between conditions for this question were again not significant ($F = 1.32, p > .05$). As with the first manipulation check, this indicates no significant difference in subject perceptions between the public and private conditions, and that this manipulation may have failed as well. This raises the two questions: Were the manipulation checks inadequate in identifying the presence of the independent variable? In this case the manipulations would have been successful but not perceived by the subjects. Or was were the checks accurate and the experimental manipulations had no effect upon the subjects? The latter seems to be the the most reasonable explanation. When the situational variation in the women's scores are examined, (To be
discussed in more detail in a later section) the results showed no statistically significant difference in the gender identity of the women in the study related to public verses private setting.

Gender Identity Scores for Males and Females

The instrumental and expressive identity scales were examined for the male and female members of the sample to determine if this sample scored inline with traditional conceptions of gender role identity. Previous work by other researchers, such as Janet Spence and her associates, have found that men as a group tend to score higher on the instrumental dimension while women as a group tend to score higher on the expressive dimension of the PAQ (Spence, 1975). This research project replicated Spence’s previous findings.

The mean scores for the men and women on the expressive dimension were 28.71 and 33.36 respectively. For the instrumental dimension, the means scores were 31.18 for the men and 28.87 for the women. Two one-way ANOVA’s were performed between sex and expressiveness and between sex and instrumentality. Both ANOVA’s produced statistically significant results. For the instrumental dimension $F = 4.88, p>.05$, and for the expressive dimension $F = 5.02, p>.05$. Both the males and females in the sample conceive of themselves in traditional gender role terms.

Situational Variation in Gender Identity

Situational variation in gender role identity was studied for
for the female members of the sample only. It was the original in-
tent of this project to study both men and women but due to the lack
of male volunteers, males had to be dropped from this portion of the
analysis. With only 17 males participating a two-way ANOVA the cell
sizes become too small to conduct a meaningful statistical analysis.

Examination the gender role identity scores for women was done
to test the proposition that women use differential presentation
strategies in public and private settings depending upon their level
of public self-consciousness. An extension of self-presentation the-
ory and theory on self-consciousness suggests that publicly self-
conscious women should portray themselves as more feminine (expres-
sive) and less masculine (instrumental) in public situations than in
private ones. This is because these publicly self-conscious women
are especially aware the normative expectations for women to portray
themselves in an expressive but not in instrumental ways. This sug-
gests that these women, who are high in public self-consciousness,
should score higher on the feminine dimension of the PAQ in public
than their counterparts who are low in public self-consciousness be-
cause these women are more aware of the presentation expectations
other social actors have for them. As a result there is a public
and private difference for in gender role identity for these women
but most notably for those women who are high in public self-
consciousness.

In private, where social constraints are lifted, a woman who is
publicly self-conscious may present themselves as less feminine (in-
strumental) and more masculine (instrumental) than in the public setting. Freed from normative demands, these women can present them­selves in any manner they choose, perhaps more in line with an ideal conception of who they are which may be less expressive and more instrumental than demanded by others.

In order to assess the differences in gender role identity for the 47 females in this study, the average expressiveness and instru­mentality scores for females were calculated, subdivided by public or private setting and by high or low public self-consciousness.

Table 3 presents the mean expressiveness score for women.

Table 3

Mean Scores for Women on the Expressive Dimension of the PAQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Self-Consciousness Level</th>
<th>Experimental Setting</th>
<th>Column Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>33.93 (14)</td>
<td>33.22 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>33.36 (11)</td>
<td>32.85 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Mean</td>
<td>33.68</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to assess the statistical significance of the interaction and main effects of the two independent variables on expressivity. Homogeneity of variance was assumed before conducting the ANOVA. The two-way ANOVA allows examination of the significance of the main effects and two-way in­teraction effects that the experimental setting (public or private)
and public self-consciousness (in terms of one being high or low) has upon the women subject’s expressive or instrumental scores.

The two-way ANOVA yielded no significant interaction or main effect for the women's mean scores on the feminine (expressive) dimension. The interaction of setting and public self-consciousness on expressiveness was not significant ($F = .007, p > .05$). According to the main hypothesis of this study, experimental setting and public self-consciousness should have had a combined effect on the women's presentation of gender role identity. The main effects in this study, the setting and public self-consciousness, were also not significant for the expressive dimension ($F = .298, p > .05$ and $F = .184, p > .05$ respectively). A significant effect but not as high as the interaction effect was expected for both independent variables. There was a slight difference in the wrong direction between public score (33.22) and private score (33.93) for the women who were high in public self-consciousness. This public and private difference was not as predicted, there should have been a difference in other direction meaning a larger public score than private. Overall, due to this lack of significance it can be concluded that the independent variables did not have any impact upon the women's presentation of gender identity via their PAQ expressiveness scores.

In Table 4 the results of the two-way ANOVA on the instrumental dimension are shown. This analysis produced no significant interaction or main effect for the independent variables of interest. The interaction effect between the setting and public self-
consciousness was not significant \( (F = 1.43, p > .05) \) along with the
two main effects, setting and public self-consciousness, \( (F = .496, p > .05 \) and \( F = .436, p > .05 \) respectively). As with the expressive
dimension, significant higher interaction and some what lower, but
still significant, main effects were predicted by the main hypothe­
ses of this study. The mean differences in between the public and
private setting for women who were high in public self-consciousness
were in the correct direction as predicted by the hypothesis (28.00
in public and 30.14 in private). This study provides no evidence
that the setting, public self-consciousness, or their combined ef­
fekt had any impact on the way the women in this study presented
themselves in terms of instrumentality on the PAQ.

Table 4
Mean Scores for Women on the Instrumental Dimension of the PAQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Self-Consciousness Level</th>
<th>Experimental Setting</th>
<th>Column Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>30.14 (14)</td>
<td>28.00 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>28.18 (11)</td>
<td>28.96 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Mean</td>
<td>29.28</td>
<td>28.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Results

This study determined both the instrumental and expressive
dimension of the PAQ had an acceptable internal consistency suggest­
ing that the PAQ was a reliable measure of expressive and instru-
mental qualities (gender identity). Significant differences in instrumen
tmental and expressive scores demonstrated that men and women do tend to portray themselves in line with traditional gender role expec-
tations. This replicated Spence's earlier work in that men portray themselves as more instrumental than the females did, while the females portray themselves as more expressive than the males.

The lack of statistical significance made difficult to determine if there were and public and private differences in gender role identities for women in the study. Women were not significantly more expressive or less instrumental in their self-views when their responses were known to others. The results also demonstrated that there was no significant difference by type of self-consciousness possessed by the women in this study. There were some public and private differences in the average PAQ scores of the women involved but because of the overarching lack of statistical significance it cannot be determined if the setting, public self-consciousness, or an interaction of the two independent variables caused these differences. This lack of significance along with the lack of statistical significance of the manipulation checks suggests that this difference was probably not due the independent variables. The examination of the results from the manipulation checks demonstrated that subjects were not aware of the impact of the public and private manipulations. Further examination of the problems with the manipulations and the manipulation checks will be discussed in the following chapter.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

In examining how individuals present themselves to others in terms of gender role identity, this research project has reaffirmed previous research by Spence and offered some first glimpses, although problematic, into whether some people may alter their presentations of gender role identity to conform to traditional standards of gender role identity.

Gender Identity Presentation for Men and Women

This research project has confirmed early findings by Janet Spence. When Spence first began to use the PAQ as a measure of instrumental and expressive traits in the mid-1970's, she found that males, compared to females, tended to think about themselves more in instrumental terms and less in expressive terms (Spence, 1975). Spence's results suggest that men generally think of themselves in a way that is accepting of traditional male gender roles (instrumentality) while women tend to accept and think of themselves in a traditionally expressive (feminine) manner. This research has found the same results approximately 20 years later in the private experimental condition, which is similar to the conditions under which Spence administered her questionnaire.

In the public condition of this study, the subjects also por-
trayed their gender role identities in traditional ways. The PAQ was used in the public manipulation as a measure of instrumental and expressive self-presentation. A basic assumption underlying this study was that thought drives action, so how people think of themselves in terms of gender role identity would serve to predict how they would portray themselves to others as male or female. The males did present themselves as more instrumental while the females presented themselves as more expressive. These two characteristics have been socially defined as appropriate for their respective sexes. In this study it appears that men and women both define and present their gender role identities along traditional and socially acceptable lines.

Public and Private Differences for Women

The mean scores obtained for the women showed little difference between the public and private conditions for women high in public self-consciousness. These women portrayed themselves as less expressive in public, which was not as predicted, and less instrumental in public, as predicted. Because these results were not statistically significant one can not be confident that they are related to the public or private nature of the anticipated setting. If one were to look at the mean scores that were obtained, while ignoring the lack of statistical significance, there is some minimal support for one of the main hypotheses of this experiment. The women high in public self-consciousness, on the instrumental dimension,
did score noticeably lower on the PAQ in public than in private. This was as predicted: the women's presentation of self seemed to conform to traditional normative standards in which women are expected not to portray themselves as instrumental (masculine). This suggests that the women may have been aware of such general social expectations.

For the expressive dimension there was a slight difference between the public and private scores for the women high in public self-consciousness, but this difference was in the wrong direction. The women in these categories portrayed themselves as less expressive in public than in private. It was predicted that the opposite would occur: they would be more expressive in private than in public. It should first be noted that this difference was very slight (a .73 difference between the two conditions) and could be considered no appreciable difference. This study predicted that the differences would be due to an interaction effect between the settings and public self-consciousness and the significance tests show that this did not occur.

The lack of statistical significance does not mean that the original hypothesis and the theoretical extensions of self-presentation theory and role identity were ill conceived. The lack of significance means that the intended variables did not have their intended impact. As a result, this does lead to concern over the impact of the experimental manipulations. The fact that the manipulation checks were not significant lends credence to the suspicion
that the experimental manipulations may have not had the desired ef-
fact upon the subjects. If this is true, the impact of public dis-
closure on identity self-presentation would not have been strong
evenough to produce the predicted differences in the dependent vari-
able. There is a strong possibility that the experimental manipula-
tions were flawed. The following section will focus on the problems
with the design of this experiment.

The Manipulation Checks

The manipulation checks were designed to ascertain the follow-
ing: First, if the subjects felt that the experimenters would be
able to connect them, by name, to their responses. Second, if they
felt that others with whom they expected to interact would have
known how they responded to their identity questionnaire. Because
both checks were found to not be statistically significant, two pos-
sibilities arise. First, the manipulation checks may have been ade-
quate measures of subject perceptions, and the public/private man-
ipulation of the independent variable failed. Or second, that the
manipulation checks were invalid, and that a real public/private in-
dependent variable difference was created. Since, there is no way
to determine if the checks really did accomplish this, it becomes
difficult to understand how the subjects perceived their experiment-
al setting to know if the manipulations worked.

Even if the statistical significance of the checks were to be
ignored, the males and females in the sample responded near the mid-
dle of the scale for each of the two questions used. Even if the manipulation checks had been found to be statistically significant, it would have been difficult to determine if the subjects actually perceived the situations as either public or private. This raises questions about the public and private manipulations. It appears that in private some felt their responses weren’t going to be kept anonymous and in public the subjects weren’t sure that their responses would be publically identifiable. It could be that the subjects weren’t aware of the publicness or privateness of the setting, in this case then, it is unlikely that the manipulation would have had its intended impact. Another problem could have been that the subjects were not clear on what the experimenter was asking via these questions. In this case the manipulation check would need to be rewritten to enhance its clarity. Because the manipulations were not significant it is most likely that the subjects could not perceive the publicness or privateness of the setting, and therefore this manipulation may not have had its intended effect upon the subjects.

**Issues With the Public Manipulation**

The above discussion suggested that the experimental manipulations themselves may have been faulty. Baumeister and Tice offer some insight as to why this may have occurred for the public manipulation (1986). They see self-presentation as just one of several strategies for guiding and regulating behavior. There are three
situational requirements for individuals to enact a self-presentational behavior: (1) The situation must be public; (2) The situation must contain possible implications for one's self; and (3) There must be symbolic relevance of the situation to one's aspired identity, in other words, will there be some form of reward or sanction attached to a particular presentation of self (Baumeister & Tice, 1986).

In this instance the public situation may not have been perceived as a public situation by the women in the study, thus not meeting the first precondition. If this is true, the public condition would need to be redesigned to have a more powerful impact upon the subjects. Even if the experimental situation was powerful enough to have an impact upon the subjects, it may have satisfied the other two pre-conditions discussed by Baumeister and Tice. The way the experiment was conceived the women should have seen the situation as having implications for their self-evaluation, but this may not have happened. The women in the public experimental condition were told that they would be discussing their questionnaire responses with others in their mixed sex group. Just telling the subjects this may not have had a strong enough impact on the women so they could perceive possible gender role identity implications. Showing the subjects a video featuring an intense discussion concerning gender interactions before their exposure to the manipulations might be a good corrective measure.

Another reason for the lack of significant variation between
the public and private settings for the women's PAQ scores may be
that the requirements of Baumeister and Tice's third precondition
were also not achieved. The subjects may not have seen any symbolic
relevance of the experimental setting to their aspired gender iden-
tity goals. This is because the subjects may not have perceived the
threat of a sanction or possibility of gaining some form of reward;
if the subjects felt that there was nothing to be gained or lost by
a positive portrayal the motive to alter one's identity would be
lost. Adding footage of individuals being lightly sanctioned for
non-normative gender identity portrayals to the video mentioned
above should add to that symbolic relevance.

In Defense of the Public and Private Manipulations

The experimental conditions created in this experiment were
designed to be as realistic as possible. The experiment was pur-
posefully created to simulate public and private environments that
the subjects might face in real life. The private condition was a
mundane setting where the subjects found themselves sitting spread
out in a classroom answering questions about themselves. This semi-
isolated setting is one that a college student would experience many
times during their period of enrollment. The public setting was
also created to be as high in mundane realism as possible in that
the subjects found themselves answering the same questions but in a
setting where everyone knew them and where they expected to discuss
their responses. This setting is not unlike any other discussion/
A seminar group that a student would typically find themselves in while in a college environment.

The conditions could have been designed in such a way to be more powerful and perhaps have produced clearer results and significant manipulation check differences. However, in doing so the experiment would have lost this mundane realism and enter into the realm of the highly artificial. One of the main criticisms of experimental research is that the experimental settings are unrealistic (Aronson et al., 1985). If there is to be a fault in the design of the experiment, it seems is better to err on the side of realism.

**The Possibility of No Identity Change Between Settings**

An alternative explanation for the results of this experiment is that the experimental manipulations had no significant effect because the women did not really alter the way they conceived their gender role identities between public and private situations. This would indicate that the gender role identity they have created stays constant regardless of the situational requirements. This proposition, however, becomes problematic when one considers public and private differences in gender related behavior (Baumeister & Tice, 1986).

**The Problem of Self-Presentation of Identity and Behavior**

Kidder's work clearly demonstrated that there are public and private differences in gender related performances for both men and
women. If one uses the assumption that gender role identity serves as a guide for behavior, then the individuals in Kidders' study should have altered their gender role identity in ways that allow them enact differential behaviors in the public and private settings. If one interprets the results of this study to indicate that the women involved did not alter their gender role identities in the public and private situations then these results do not fit well with the basic assumption of both self-presentation theory and role-identity theories that behavior follows identity.

If the above assumption is true, then the gender role identity one creates for him/herself may be a more loosely defined construct rather than coherent plans of action, which McCall and Simmons suggest (1991). Individuals may create a general sense of who they are as male and female which stays constant, but then alter their behaviors to fit the situational requirements. This suggests that men and women would be acting with a very purposive intent in order to reap the rewards offered in a public situation by performing gender appropriate behavior. In private they could then return to their loosely defined sense of self to guide their behavior. In other words, individuals perform in a socially accepted manner in public because of possibility of some benefit or threat of sanction. They can avoid or relieve any dissonance they might feel from the discrepancy between their behavior and gender identity by attributing it to the possible rewards or sanctions. According to cognitive dissonance theorists, this would not result in a change of identity
because the women in the study would be able to attribute the in-
consistency between their gender role-identity and their situated
behavior to an external source (Baumeister & Tice, 1986). Alter-
natively, people may not notice the identity-behavior discrepancies.
Therefore, one could have a stable gender role identity in both pub-
lic and private settings while still seeing behavioral differences.
The only way to examine these assumptions would be to conduct anoth-
er experiment that looks for differences in gender role identity
while simultaneously measuring gender related behavior.

Future Directions for This Research

This study has offered some preliminary glimpses into how in-
dividuals present their gender role identity. However, due to lack
of significance of the results of this study it would be prudent to
replicate the study using a larger sample. It also seems essential
to include more males in the study as well. More importantly, it
may be very enlightening to intensify the impact of the experimental
 situations and include gender-related behavior measures into the re-
 plication. This would be useful because it would allow the research-
er to determine if gender role identity remains the same while spe-
cific behaviors are enacted to cope with the requirements of a pub-
lic or private settings.

A larger sample with more equivalent numbers of males and fe-
males both high and low in public self-consciousness seems necessary
to the hypothesis which was proposed. This study originally intend-
ed to examine the responses of both males and females. Males had to be excluded from an important section of this analysis because there were not enough males to conduct a proper two-way ANOVA. Increasing the sample size from 47 total subjects to approximately 60 male and 60 females seems desirable. A larger sample size may aid in obtaining significant results for both males and females. The number of females used in this study barely met the criteria for conducting the significance test, and as statistical significance is a function of sample size, a larger sample is more likely produce significant results.

The public and private manipulations must definitely be revised and clarified. There was some concern that these manipulations did not have the intended effect upon subjects, and may have been the primary factor accounting for the lack of differences in gender identity presentation. In revising these manipulations it becomes necessary to balance the strength of the impact versus the believability of the experimental setting. This balance can be struck by revising the settings in the following ways: The public condition could be carried out using a focus group style. A mixed-sex group of 10-15 subjects could be brought to a room and given the PAQ where they orally had to respond to each item and state why they did so. This would be a believable setting and have a stronger public impact than just the anticipation of discussing the results with their discussion group as was done in this study. The impact of the private setting could also be enhanced by isolating the mixed-sex group sub-
jects into individual study-carrels. This way the subjects could not see each other as was previously done. This alteration should aid in enhancing the privateness of the setting. For both settings the instructions should also be clearly emphasised so the subjects are clear as to the publicness and privateness of the experiment so the setting can be anticipated by the subject right from the start of the experiment. Making these alterations should result in experimental settings that will have the intended effect upon the subjects.

The public manipulation would also have to be altered in such a way to meet Baumeister and Tice's second and third self-presentational criteria (1986). Subjects need to perceive that their presentation of self must have symbolic relevance to themselves and the experimental setting has implications for their gender role identity. The public condition would need to be altered to make it clearer to the subjects that they situation did have potential gender implications. The best way to do this would be by showing them the video that was discussed above.

A way to advance this line of research, as mentioned above, would be to add some behavioral measures into this revised study. Bringing in the same equity measures as Kidder used would be useful in determining if people alter their behaviors, gender role identity, or both to conform to the situational requirements of public and private settings. Having the subjects engage in some activity and afterwards, in the public or private setting, distribute points
determined by each member's participation level should be sufficient to examine behavioral changes. This addition to the study plus the alterations mentioned above should provide the necessary revisions to more powerfully assess gender role identity and gender-related behavioral changes in public and private settings.
Appendix A

Protocol Clearance From the Human Subjects
Institutional Review Board
Date: April 3, 1995
To: Stevenson, Peter
From: Richard Wright, Interim Chair
Re: HSIRB Project Number 95-03-23

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project entitled "Situational stability of gender role identity: A study of the impact of public and private settings on gender role identification" has been approved under the expedited category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

Please note that you must seek specific approval for any changes in this design. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date. In addition if there are any unanticipated adverse or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: Apr 3, 1996
xc: Wait, Robert, SOC
Appendix B

Scripts Used in the Experimental Conditions
Script for the Public Condition
Once the subjects are in the classroom the male and female assistants will enter together.

Female ass’t: "Hello my name is (use your name here). You are here today to participate in two research projects. The first one, which I will explain and conduct, is for Dr. Wait, a professor in the Sociology Department. The second research session will be conducted by (insert male ass’t name here). His session is for Peter Stevenson, a graduate student in the Sociology Department, and will be explained in greater detail in the second half of the session. The total time for both sessions should be about one hour."

Male ass’t leaves the classroom.

Female ass’t: (While handing out questionnaire packet.) "Before we begin the first research session, you need to look at the first page of your packet. You will see an informed consent letter concerning both research sessions. I would like you to carefully read this letter. If you have any questions about the consent letter feel free to bring them to my attention. If you fully agree with its contents and want to participate in the two research sessions, please sign it where indicated. If you choose not to participate you may do so and you will still get credit for attending. It is my hope that you all will choose participate in both sessions since both projects involve interesting research that will be explained to you following your participation. When you are finished with the letter please remove it from you packet. I will be come around and collect them when everyone is finished with the letter."

Female ass’t will give the subjects as much time as they need to read and sign the consent letter. If any subjects choose not to sign the consent agreement they are to receive a slip indicating that they came for the session and they are to receive their credit/extra credit. Collect the letter when all students are finished.

Female ass’t: "Now that you all have completed the consent letter, it is time to begin the first research session. This session will consist of a single questionnaire designed to look at you how you perceive yourself and others around you. When filling out the questionnaire do not put your name on it (stress this point). Your responses will be kept confidential. No one will be able to connect you to your responses. The code number at the top right corner of your sheet cannot be used to identify you personally, but it is there so we can account for all of the questionnaires when we are done. To fill out the questionnaire just follow the directions at the top of the response sheet. You will have about 15 minutes to fill out this sheet. You are free to leave the session at any time. If you have any questions, please raise your hand and I will come to speak with you. When you are done with the questionnaire, please detach it from your packet. I will collect it later."
Give the subjects about 10-15 minutes to complete the questionnaire. Do not walk around and look at their responses as they must feel that their answers will be kept confidential. If anyone chooses to leave, give them a slip indicating the have attended the session so they can receive credit/extra-credit. When all the subjects are done collect this questionnaire.

Female ass’t: "Now that you are all finished with the research session, Dr. Wait and I would like to thank you for your time and to express our appreciation for your participation. Mr. (insert male ass’t name) will be in to conduct the second research session."

Female ass’t leaves the classroom.

Male ass’t: (as walking into the classroom) "Hi, my name is (insert your name). I am conducting this second research session for Peter Stevenson, a graduate student in the Sociology Department. Mr. Stevenson’s research project has to do with male and female interactions. We will start this session with a questionnaire and then break into small mixed-sex groups to discuss your responses. It is important that you pay attention to your responses because you will be asked specific questions related to your responses in your groups. All members of the groups are then expected to participate in the discussion by sharing your responses with others in your group so they can give you some feedback concerning your answers.

"Before I hand out the questionnaire, I would first like to pass out these name tags and have you all write your full name on the tag and stick it on your shirt. Please write your name in as large letters so we’ll all be able to see who you are. (Once they have all stuck the tag on their chest) Now I would like all of you to stand up and introduce yourself to the other participants. Please give us your name, major, and your personal interests or hobbies. It is important we all get to know each other because we will be discussing our responses in mixed sex groups when you are done filling out the questionnaire."

Let all the subjects introduce themselves. Make sure they give out more than just their name.

Male ass’t: "Now that we’ve met each other, let’s begin. We will start by filling out the second questionnaire in your packet. (Hold up the questionnaire so they can see where you are). First, I would like you to write your name, permanent address, and phone number at the top of the questionnaire. (Give them time to do this). To fill out the questionnaire follow the directions at the top. If you have any questions, shout them out so we can all hear as others may have the same question. When you are all finished sit quietly. You are still free to leave at any time during the session. Once everyone is finished we will get into groups and discuss each others
Give the subjects about 10-20 minutes to fill out the response sheet. If anyone chooses to leave give them a slip indicating the have attended the session so they can receive credit/extra-credit.

Male ass't: "Now that everyone is finished, please stay in you seats as Mr. Stevenson will be in shortly to begin the discussion section. I would like to thank you for your time and appreciate your coming here today." (Male ass't leaves the classroom).

Script For The Private Condition

Once the subjects are in the classroom the male and female assistants will enter together.

Female ass’t: "Hello my name is (use your name here). You are here today to participate in two research projects. The first one, which I will explain and conduct, is for Dr. Wait, a professor in the Sociology Department. The second research session will be conducted by (insert male ass’t name here). His session is for Peter Stevenson, a graduate student in the Sociology Department, and will be explained in greater detail in the second half of the session. The total time for both sessions should be about an hour."

Male ass’t leaves the classroom.

Female ass’t: (While handing out questionnaire packet.) "Before we begin the first research session, you need to look at the first page of your packet. You will see an informed consent letter concerning both research sessions. I would like you to carefully read this letter. If you have any questions about the consent letter feel free to bring them to my attention. If you fully agree with its contents and want to participate in the two research sessions, please sign it where indicated. If you choose not to participate you may do so and you will still get credit for attending. It is my hope that you all will choose participate in both sessions since both projects involve interesting research that will be explained to you following your participation. When you are finished with the letter please remove it from you packet. I will be come around and collect them when everyone is finished with the letter.

Female ass’t will give the subjects as much time as they need to read and sign the consent letter. If any subjects choose not to sign the consent agreement they are to receive a slip indicating that they came for the session and they are to receive their credit/extra credit. Collect the letter when all students are finished.

Female ass’t: "Now that you all have completed the consent letter, it is time to begin the first research session. This session will
consist of a single questionnaire designed to look at how you perceive yourself and others around you. When filling out the questionnaire do not put your name on it (stress this point). Your responses will be kept confidential. No one will be able to connect you to your responses. The code number at the top right corner of your sheet cannot be used to identify you personally, but it is there so we can account for all of the questionnaires when we are done. To fill out the questionnaire just follow the directions at the top of the response sheet. You will have about 15 minutes to fill out this sheet. You are free to leave the session at any time. If you have any questions, please raise your hand and I will come to speak with you. When you are done with the questionnaire, please detach it from your packet. I will collect it later."

Give the subjects about 10-15 minutes to complete the questionnaire. Do not walk around and look at their responses as they must feel that their answers will be kept confidential. If anyone chooses to leave, give them a slip indicating the have attended the session so they can receive credit/extra-credit. When all the subjects are finished collect this questionnaire.

Female ass’t: "Now that you are all finished with the research session, Dr. Wait and I would like to thank you for your time and to express our appreciate your participation. Mr. (insert male ass’t name) will be in to conduct the second research session."

Female ass’t leaves the classroom.

Male ass’t: (as walking into the classroom) "Hi, my name is (insert your name). I am conducting this second research session for Peter Stevenson, a graduate student in the Sociology Department. Mr. Stevenson’s research project has to do with male and female interactions. I would like to start by asking you all to spread out as far as possible from each other. This is to ensure that no one can see your responses."

Give the subjects time to spread out.

Male ass’t: "I would like you all to go to the first page of the second sessions’ questionnaire (hold it up to show them). To fill it out, follow the directions printed at the top of the response sheet. Please do not write your name or any other personal information on the response sheet. We want you to respond honestly to each question and we assure that your responses can’t be traced back to you. You will see a code number at the top of the response sheet. This is not to identify you but, as in the first session, to account for all the response sheets. If you have any questions about the questionnaire please raise your hand and I will come and answer them. When you are done place your questionnaire fold it over and staple it shut (Show them what you mean) then place them into the bin in the front of the
classroom. Once you've placed your questionnaire in the bin, return to your seat until everyone else is finished."

Give the subjects about 10-20 minutes to fill out the response sheet. If anyone chooses to leave give them a slip indicating they have attended the session so they can receive credit/extra-credit. Make sure they place the questionnaires in the bin.

Male ass't: "Now that everyone is finished, this session has concluded. Please stay in your seats as Mr. Stevenson will be in shortly to explain this research session to you. I would like to thank you for your time and effort. We appreciate your coming here today."

Male ass't leaves the classroom.
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