

Differences in Men's and Women's Global, Sexual, and Ideal-Sexual Expressiveness and Instrumentality¹

Kelli-an Lawrance,² David Taylor, and E. Sandra Byers³

University of New Brunswick

It has been argued that young men's and women's behavior in heterosexual sexual situations follows traditional, culturally defined gender role prescriptions, and alternatively, that expectations have shifted such that young men's and women's gender-relevant personality attributes are converging. Using the Bem Sex Role Inventory, primarily Caucasian men (n = 94) and women (n = 95) described their attributes globally (GLOBAL), and in a heterosexual sexual situation (SEXUAL). They also described the ideal attributes that a man and a woman should have in a heterosexual sexual situation (IDEAL-SEXUAL). The men's expressive scores were lowest for GLOBAL, intermediate for SEXUAL, and highest for IDEAL-SEXUAL. The women's expressive scores were higher for IDEAL-SEXUAL than for either GLOBAL or SEXUAL. Both the men's and the women's instrumental scores were lowest for SEXUAL, intermediate for IDEAL-SEXUAL and highest for GLOBAL. Both globally and in a sexual situation, men's instrumental scores were higher than women's, while women's expressive scores were higher than men's. These results suggest that men are more expressive in a sexual situations than they are globally because they perceive attributes reflecting expressiveness as ideal for a man in sexual situation. Women are less instrumental in sexual situations than they are globally, but may wish to be more instrumental than they are. Young women may lack the behavioral skills to enact their ideal, or may fear negative

¹This research was conducted in partial fulfillment of the first author's Ph.D. requirements at the University of New Brunswick, under the supervision of Dr. E. Sandra Byers.

²Now at the Windsor-Essex County Health Unit in Windsor, Ontario. Portions of these data were presented at the meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Sex, Minneapolis, November 1991. The authors sincerely thank Lucia O'Sullivan, Guy Grenier, Caroline Ploem, and Raymond Eno for their helpful comments throughout the research process.

³To whom reprint requests should be addressed at Department of Psychology, Bag Service No. 45444, University of New Brunswick, Fredericton, New Brunswick, Canada, E3B 6E4.

consequences for departing from gender-typed behavior in the sexual situation. There were no differences in expressiveness or instrumentality of the ideal man and the ideal woman in a sexual situation. It is concluded that, despite some convergence of attributes in sexual situations, traditional gender role prescriptions continue to guide young men's and women's behavior in sexual interactions, but not their conceptions of ideal behavior.

According to traditional, culturally defined scripts, men are expected to be instrumental and assertive while women are expected to be expressive and nurturant. In fact, instrumental behaviors are often termed "masculine" while expressive behaviors are termed "feminine." A great deal of research, often using the Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1974), has compared men's and women's global self-descriptions along these dimensions. While originally conceptualized as a measure of gender roles (i.e., masculinity and femininity), this instrument appears to measure gender-relevant personality attributes related to instrumentality and expressiveness (Ballard-Reisch & Elton, 1992; Pedhazur & Tetenbaum, 1979; Spence, 1984). Despite some overlap between the genders, on average, men have higher instrumental scores, and women have higher expressive scores (Bem, 1974; Hiller & Philiber, 1985; Spence & Helmreich, 1978).

Expressiveness and instrumentality are seen to be conceptually independent (Bem, 1974; Spence & Helmreich, 1978). Thus, all individuals, and androgynous individuals in particular, may display instrumental and expressive traits/behaviors according to the perceived demands of the situation (Bem, 1975). Further, expectations for appropriate attributes and behavior for women and men differ from situation to situation (Orlofsky, 1981; Spence, 1984). Thus, it seems unlikely that a global measure can accurately describe an individual's attributes and behavior across all situations. Indeed, self-descriptions when specific social roles are made salient often differ from global descriptions of gender-relevant personality attributes (Daley & Rosenzweig, 1988; Rosenzweig & Daley, 1991; Uleman & Weston, 1986). For example, Uleman and Weston found that, compared to standard instructions to provide a global self-description, mothers of infants had higher instrumental and expressive scores, and fathers had lower instrumental scores when describing themselves as parents. Similarly, when the role of student was made salient, college students' expressive and instrumental scores decreased relative to standard instructions. Their expressive scores increased when the role of girlfriend/boyfriend was made salient.

The instability of self-descriptions across social roles may occur because the distinct behavioral expectations that are associated with the social role are not consistent with, or supersede, global gender role prescriptions.

Whether this is the case for the role of sexual partner is not known. Two conflicting views emerge regarding the extent to which behavior in sexual situations follows traditional gender role prescriptions. On one hand, some authors have argued that behavioral expectations in the sexual situation are particularly likely to be linked to more general gender role expectations (Gagnon, 1990; Simon & Gagnon, 1986). According to the traditional sexual script, men are socialized to assume an active, sex-directed, instrumental role in sexual situations; women, to assume a passive, sexually naive, love-directed, expressive role (Barbach & Levine, 1980; Byers, 1996; Hite, 1976; Zilbergeld, 1992). Nonstereotypic behavior with a sexual partner may result in negative social consequences (Allgeier & Fogel, 1978; Daley & Rosenzweig, 1988; Lewin, 1985). Thus, despite well-documented convergence in some aspects of male and female sexual behavior (e.g., rates of premarital intercourse; number of sexual partners (Oliver & Hyde, 1993)), there are still significant differences between women's and men's behavior in sexual settings (Carroll, Volk, & Hyde, 1985; Darling & Davidson, 1986; Leary & Snell, 1988).

In contrast to this view, other authors have argued that expectations have shifted such that women, like men, are expected to be highly sexual and take an active role in sexual activities (Macklin, 1983; LoPiccolo & Friedman, 1988). Further, both men and women are expected to be tender, caring, and concerned about their partner's pleasure (Farber, 1992; McCabe, 1987; Roche, 1986). Indeed, it appears that there are a variety of sexual behaviors which are perceived to be equally acceptable for men and women (Peplau, Rubin, & Hill, 1977; Sprecher, 1989).

To better understand women's and men's adherence to traditional gender role expectations in sexual situations, we compared college men's and women's descriptions of their own expressiveness and instrumentality both globally and in sexual situations. We also compared men's and women's descriptions of the ideal gender-relevant attributes for both men and women in a sexual situation. In a laboratory context, self-descriptions of attributes in sexual situations could be influenced by gender stereotypic expectations, participants' discomfort with the task of describing their sexual behavior in a group setting, or by faulty memory. Therefore, participants were asked to complete their sexual self-descriptions at home following sexual activities with a partner and with reference to their behavior in that sexual encounter.

In keeping with the argument that behavior is less stereotyped in sexual situations than in nonsexual situations or globally, Daley and Rosenzweig (1988) found that married male university employees described themselves as less instrumental and more expressive in sexual situations relative to work situations, social situations, and global self-descriptions. In

contrast, and more consistent with traditional gender role expectations, married women described themselves as more expressive in sexual and social situations than in work settings (Rosenweig & Daley, 1991). Unfortunately, the researchers did not examine differences in women's instrumentality across situations.

It is not known whether these findings are specific to married, middle-aged men and women. Research suggests that behavior becomes more androgynous with age (Neugarten, 1973). Young, unmarried men and women may be more likely to adhere to the traditional sexual script in sexual situations. Additionally, differences between men's and women's expressiveness and instrumentality in a sexual situation have not been investigated. For example, while men have been found to be more expressive in sexual situations than globally, there is no indication how this level of expressiveness compares to that of women in sexual situations. Therefore, we compared college men's and women's global self-descriptions and sexual self-descriptions. Based on previous research (Daley & Rosenzweig, 1988; Rosenzweig & Daley, 1991), we predicted that men would describe themselves as being more expressive and less instrumental in sexual situations than they are globally. Women were also expected to be more expressive in sexual situations than globally. No predictions were made about women's global and sexual levels of instrumentality. Finally, although we expected to see evidence of some convergence of men's and women's levels of expressiveness and instrumentality in the sexual situation, we hypothesized that women would be more expressive than men and men would be more instrumental than women in sexual situations as well as globally.

There are two possible explanations for why men's and women's gender-relevant personality attributes in sexual situations may differ as predicted. First, young men and women may perceive gender-stereotypic behaviors as desirable in sexual situations. Despite arguments that expectations for men and women have narrowed in sexual settings, men continue to be more active than women in initiating sexual activities (Blumstein & Schwartz, 1983; Byers & Heinlein, 1989; O'Sullivan & Byers, 1990), and in aggressively pursuing sexual desires (Clark & Hatfield, 1989; Miller & Marshall, 1987). Further, gender remains more closely related to sexual attitudes and behavior than does gender role-typing (Allgeier, 1981; Allgeier & Fogel, 1978). Accordingly, we would expect men's and women's descriptions of ideal attributes in sexual situations to be consistent with traditional gender-stereotypic prescriptions, and similar to their actual attributes in sexual situations.

Alternatively, young men and women may adhere to traditional sexual scripts, not because these scripts are desirable, but because they lack the skills and/or experience to behave in less traditional ways. That is, they *be-*

lieve that men and women should behave in less stereotypic ways in sexual settings than globally despite the fact their own behavior does not reflect this belief. If this is the case, we would expect descriptions of ideal attributes in sexual situations to be less consistent with traditional sexual scripts, and less gender-typed than descriptions of actual attributes in these situations.

Men and women may have different perceptions of ideal gender-relevant personality attributes for men and women (Hatfield, Sprecher, Pillemer, Greenberger, & Wexler, 1988). In particular, men may wish women to act in ways that are more consistent with the male script, and women may wish men to act in ways that are more consistent with the female script. For example, men have indicated that they want their partners to be more assertive about their sexual desires, and take a more active role in initiating and experimenting sexually (Hite, 1981; Hatfield et al., 1988). Women want men to be more tender and emotionally intimate during love-making (Halpern & Sherman, 1979; Hite, 1976). Thus, we predicted that, compared to men's descriptions, women would describe men as ideally more expressive and less instrumental in a sexual situation. Similarly, we predicted that, compared to women's descriptions, men would describe women as ideally more instrumental and less expressive.

Finally, in order to more fully understand expressiveness and instrumentality in the sexual situation, several characteristics which have been found to be related to sexual behavior and/or global personality-relevant attributes were assessed. These were: erotophobia-erotophilia, dating experience, sexual experience, and gender role ideology—conceptualized as one's beliefs about appropriate behaviors for men and women. Greater global instrumentality has been found to be related to greater erotophilia (Byrne & Kelley, 1992, ch 6), greater sexual experience (Allgeier, 1981; Leary & Snell, 1988), and more dating experience (Leary & Snell, 1988). Further greater global instrumentality is related to more liberal attitude towards women's roles for women and a more conservative attitude towards women's roles for men (Spence, 1984). Byrne and Kelley (1992) suggest that greater expressiveness is associated with greater erotophobia. Research shows that for women, greater expressiveness is related to a more traditional gender role ideology (Spence, 1984), and possibly to less sexual experience (Allgeier, 1981). For men, greater expressiveness is related to a more liberal attitude toward women's roles (Spence, 1984).

It seems likely that the relationships between these variables and expressiveness and instrumentality in sexual situations would be similar to those found for global self-descriptions. Namely, greater instrumentality in sexual situations was expected to be associated with greater erotophilia, greater sexual experience, and for women, more liberal attitudes towards women's roles. Alternatively, greater expressiveness in the sexual situation

was expected to be related to greater erotophobia, less sexual experience, and for men, more liberal attitudes towards women's roles. Because erotophobia-erotophilia, sexual experience, dating experience, and gender role ideology might also be related to men's and women's perceptions of the ideal attributes of men and women in sexual situations, these relationships were explored.

METHOD

Subjects

Participants were 101 male and 109 female students enrolled in introductory psychology classes at a Canadian university; all participants earned course bonus points for their participation. As this was a study of young, unmarried men and women, 7 men and 14 women who were married, or over the age of 30 were dropped from the study. Thus, the final sample included 189 never-married men and women whose average age was 19.3 (range, 17 to 29 years). While ethnicity was not assessed, based on other similar research and the ethnic make-up of the university it is estimated that the ethnic make-up of the sample was very largely Caucasian and born in Canada. Virtually all participants (99%) had been or were in a steady dating relationship, and had engaged in sexual activities of some sort. Most (80%) reported having engaged in sexual intercourse. MANOVA was employed to determine whether the men and the women differed in terms of number of dating partners, number of sexual partners, number of coital partners, and longest exclusive dating relationship. The function was significant, $F(4,178) = 3.0$, $p < .05$. Univariate follow-up analysis indicated that, compared to the men, the women reported fewer dating partners but an exclusive dating relationship of longer duration.

Materials

Respondents completed one questionnaire in the laboratory and one questionnaire at home.

A *background questionnaire* designed for this study was used to collect descriptive information from each participant. The questionnaire assessed age, relationship status (single, cohabiting, married), dating history (number of casual dating partners, number of steady dating partners, longest exclusive dating relationship), and sexual history (number of sexual partners, number of coital partners).

The *Bem Sex Role Inventory* (BSRI; Bem, 1974) consists of 60 items developed to reflect masculine, feminine and neutral gender role behaviors/characteristics. Respondents rate the extent to which each item applies to them on a 7-point Likert scale. The BSRI scales have been criticized on the grounds that they are multidimensional, do not measure masculinity and femininity as originally conceptualized, and include negative as well as positive attributes (Spence, 1984). In addition, some of the items on the original scales are not applicable to sexual situations, e.g., *love children*. Therefore, in this study, Instrumental (I) and Expressive (E) subscales scores were calculated based on the 2-factor structure for the BSRI determined by Ballard-Reisch and Elton (1992). They found a 13-item expressiveness factor consisting of the items *affectionate, sympathetic, sensitive to the needs of others, understanding, compassionate, eager to soothe hurt feelings, warm, tender, gentle, helpful, truthful, sincere and friendly*, as well as a 13-item instrumentality factor consisting of the items *independent, assertive, strong personality, forceful, has leadership abilities, willing to take risks, self-sufficient, dominant, willing to take a stand, aggressive, acts as a leader, individualistic, and competitive*. These factors have been shown to have good reliabilities, Cronbach's α for the expressive and instrumental scores = .89 and .87, respectively. Scores range from 13 to 91 with higher scores indicating greater expressiveness and greater instrumentality. There is a considerable amount of accumulated evidence for the validity of the BSRI scales as measures of expressiveness and instrumentality (Spence, 1984).

The BSRI was administered under three different instructional sets during the laboratory session and one instructional set during home-monitoring (see below). In the laboratory session, participants were instructed to describe themselves in general terms (GLOBAL); to describe how a woman should ideally behave in a heterosexual sexual encounter (FEMALE/SEX-IDEAL) and to describe how a man should ideally behave in a heterosexual sexual encounter (MALE/SEX-IDEAL). The internal consistencies for the GLOBAL scales were high, Cronbach's α = .85 and .89 for instrumentality and expressiveness, respectively. Internal consistencies for the other six versions of the BSRI ranged from .77 to .89, M = .83.

The *Sex Role Ideology Scale* (SRIS; Kalin & Tilby, 1978) is a 30-item scale measuring respondents' support of traditional, stereotypic gender roles. Respondents indicate the extent to which they agree with each item on a 7-point Likert scale. Scores on this measure range from 30 to 210. Low scores reflect support for traditional gender roles; high scores indicate a feminist/progressive ideology. Good reliability and validity have been demonstrated for this scale (Kalin & Tilby, 1978; Cota & Xinaris, 1989). Cronbach's α based on the current sample was .85.

The *Sexual Opinion Survey* (SOS; Fisher, Byrne, White, & Kelley, 1988) consists of 21 items designed to assess affective responses to sexual cues. On a 7-point Likert scale, respondents indicate the extent to which they agree with each statement. SOS scores range from 21 to 147 with low scores reflecting a negative emotional response to sexual cues (erotophobia), and high scores indicating a positive emotional response (erotophilia). Fisher et al. (1988) report good internal consistency and construct validity for the SOS. Cronbach's α for the current sample was .85.

Separate (gender-specific) versions of the *Heterosexual Behavior Inventory-Short Form* (HBI; Bentler, 1968a, 1968b) were administered to the men and the women. Both versions consist of 11 items representing a hierarchy of sexual activities (e.g., kissing, manual stimulation, oral stimulation, sexual intercourse). Participants indicate (yes/no) whether they have ever engaged in each activity in their lifetime. Higher scores represent greater sexual experience. Reliability of the HBI is good (Bentler, 1968a, 1968b). Cronbach's α for the current sample was .88.

The *home-monitoring measures* were completed only by participants who engaged in heterosexual sexual activities in the week following the laboratory session. Sexual activity was defined as *any* type of sexual interaction with a partner including kissing, necking, petting, sexual intercourse, oral-genital sex, etc. Participants were instructed to complete the BSRI following their first sexual encounter (if any) during that week by describing themselves in that sexual encounter (SEXUAL). They also described their relationship with that sexual partner (first date, occasional date, steady date), what sexual activities occurred, and whether the sexual encounter was typical of their sexual interactions with that partner. Most of the participants (72%) reported that the sexual interaction was "somewhat" to "very" typical; 8% could not say because it was their first date with that partner. Atypical interactions usually involved an old boyfriend/girlfriend, or a level of sexual intimacy that was lower or higher than usual. This suggests that participant reactivity to the home monitoring was minimal.

Procedure

Participants signed up for a laboratory session which was scheduled at a time that was convenient for them. Thus, each session consisted of mixed-sex groups of 3-10 people. They were informed of the nature of the study and that it would involve completing one questionnaire during the laboratory session and another questionnaire at home. They were told that the home questionnaire was to be completed after engaging in heterosexual sexual activities. All participants were instructed to return the questionnaire

at the end of the one week regardless of whether sexual activity had occurred. After obtaining informed consent, participants completed the laboratory measures in the following order: background questionnaire, GLOBAL(BSRI); FEMALES/SEX-IDEAL (BSRI) and MALE/SEX-IDEAL (BSRI) in counterbalanced order; and, SRIS, SOS, and HBI in counterbalanced order. Following completion of the laboratory questionnaire, participants were given the home questionnaire and pre-addressed envelope. They were instructed to return the questionnaire to a secure drop-off box, or to forward it through campus mail within one week whether or not they had engaged in sexual activity during that week. To minimize perceived pressure to engage in sexual activity, they were also informed that "it is quite common for a week to pass without any sexual encounters with a partner, and we expect that several participants in this study will have this experience." Participants were sent a reminder to return the home questionnaire if they had not already done so.

RESULTS

Home-monitoring questionnaires were completed by 56% of the original sample; 64 women and 42 men. An additional 48 (25%) respondents returned the home-monitoring questionnaire, but did not complete it because they had not engaged in sexual activities during the specified one-week period. Among those completing the home measures, 60% reported that they had been romantically involved with their date less than one year; 56% described their involvement as steady with a long-term commitment.

Discriminant analyses were conducted to determine whether completers and noncompleters of the home-monitoring questionnaire differed either in terms of their dating/sexual history (number of dating partners, sexual partners, and coital partners; longest exclusive dating relationship), or their gender role descriptions (GLOBAL, FEMALE/SEX-IDEAL, MALE/SEX-IDEAL). Noncompleters included both participants who did not return the home questionnaire and those who returned it and indicated that they had not engaged in sexual activity. The analysis of the dating/sexual history yielded a significant function, $X^2(4) = 23.65, p < .001$, which accounted for 12.0% of the variance. Number of dating partners ($r = .58$), number of sexual partners ($r = .51$), number of coital partners ($r = .65$), and longest exclusive dating relationship ($r = .66$) correlated significantly with the discriminant function. Completers reported greater dating/sexual experience than noncompleters. The second analysis revealed that completers and noncompleters did not differ with respect to their GLOBAL, FEMALES/SEX-IDEAL, and MALE/SEX-IDEAL instrumental and ex-

Table I. Descriptive Data for Situational Gender Roles, Attitudinal/Behavioral Measures, and Dating/Sexual History^a

Variable	Pooled		Men		Women	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
GLOBAL (I)	62.1	9.5	63.2	8.8	61.1	10.1
GLOBAL (E)	71.7	8.4	67.8	8.6	75.6	6.0
MALE-IDEAL (I)	62.1	9.5	61.7	10.5	62.6	8.3
MALE-IDEAL (E)	80.5	7.4	79.0	7.8	81.9	6.7
FEMALE-IDEAL (I)	59.2	8.5	59.4	8.4	58.9	8.6
FEMALE-IDEAL (E)	80.3	6.5	79.6	6.4	81.0	6.7
SEXUAL (I) ^b	56.8	9.3	58.3	8.4	55.8	9.8
SEXUAL (E) ^b	76.4	8.1	73.2	8.6	78.5	7.2
SRIS	137.4	20.7	129.7	19.8	145.0	18.8
SOS	85.8	17.4	91.1	14.1	80.6	18.8
HBI	8.4	2.9	8.2	3.4	8.6	2.3
No. of coital partners	3.0	3.6	3.1	3.5	2.8	3.6
No. of steady dating partners	5.5	5.2	6.0	5.9	5.0	4.4

^a*n* = 94 men and *n* = 95 women. GLOBAL = global self-description; MALE-IDEAL = description of male sexual ideal; FEMALE-IDEAL = description of female sexual ideal; SEXUAL = sexual self-description; (I) = instrumental subscale; (E) = expressive subscale; SRIS = Sex Role Ideology Scale; SOS = Sexual Opinion Survey; HBI = Heterosexual Behavior Inventory. Higher scores indicate greater expressiveness, instrumentality, erotophilia, sexual experience, and more liberal gender-role ideology.

^b*n* = 41 men, *n* = 62 women.

pressive scores, $X^2(6) = 10.77, p > .05$. Therefore, further examination of global and ideal-sexual self-descriptions are based on the full sample.

Descriptive data for the four Bem Sex Role Inventories, the Sex Role Ideology Scale, the Sexual Opinion Survey, the Heterosexual Behavior Inventory, and number of coital partners is presented in Table I. Intercorrelations amongst these variables are reported separately for men and women in Table II. Women's instrumental and expressive scores were positively correlated for the MALE/SEX-IDEAL BSRI for female respondents only. However, in support of the view that the instrumental and expressive subscales represent orthogonal dimensions, no significant correlations between instrumental and expressive scores were observed for any of the other BSRI.

Gender Differences in Descriptions of Global, Sexual, and Ideal-Sexual Attributes

A 2 (gender of respondent) by 3 (situation) repeated measures MANOVA was conducted to examine differences in men's and women's own global, sexual, and ideal-sexual gender roles. Participants not completing the SEXUAL BSRI were excluded from the analysis. Because we were in-

Table II. Intercorrelations Among Situational Gender Roles, Attitudinal/Behavioral Measures, and Dating/Sexual History for Men and Women^a

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. GLOBAL (I)	—	.07	.35 ^c	.20	.46 ^c	.13	.48 ^c	-.15	.17	.11	-.01	.04
2. GLOBAL (E)	.17	—	.22	.50 ^c	.07	.52 ^c	.22	.25	.00	.17	.16	.05
3. MALE-IDEAL (I)	.32 ^b	.03	—	.26 ^b	.48 ^c	.19	.35 ^b	.17	.02	.10	.02	.29 ^b
4. MALE-IDEAL (E)	.07	.55 ^c	-.10	—	.01	.75 ^c	-.07	.41 ^c	-.04	.06	.19	.07
5. FEMALE-IDEAL (I)	.36 ^c	.19	.56 ^c	.18	—	-.06	.54 ^c	-.13	.19	.05	-.02	.01
6. FEMALE-IDEAL (E)	.14	.43 ^c	.10	.68 ^c	.22	—	-.01	.48 ^c	-.15	.06	.29 ^b	.04
7. SEXUAL (I)	.36	-.09	.44 ^b	-.09	.18	.15	—	.13	.27	.04	-.12	.00
8. SEXUAL (E)	.03	.53 ^c	-.22	.33	.23	.25	.05	—	-.08	-.17	.27	.16
9. SRIS	-.23	.20	-.20	.20	.20	.02	-.24	.41 ^b	—	.31 ^b	.01	.14
10. SOS	-.06	.07	.13	-.07	.13	.05	.28	-.09	.14	—	.39 ^c	.45 ^c
11. HBI	.14	-.05	.15	-.22	-.03	.02	.17	-.37	-.08	.30 ^b	—	.47 ^c
12. No. of coital partners	.09	-.05	.07	-.14	-.00	.06	.11	-.04	.05	.08	.48 ^c	—

^a*n* = 94 men and 95 women except for correlations involving SEXUAL (I and E) which are based on the 42 men and 64 women who completed the home-monitoring questionnaire. Women's scores are reported above the diagonal; men's scores are reported below the diagonal. GLOBAL = global self-description; MALE-IDEAL = description of male sexual ideal; FEMALE-IDEAL = description of female sexual ideal; SEXUAL = sexual self-description; (I) = instrumental subscale; (E) = expressive subscale; SRIS = Sex Role Ideology Scale; SOS = Sexual Opinion Survey; HBI = Heterosexual Behavior Inventory.

^b*p* < .01.

^c*p* < .001.

terested in examining men's and women's perceptions of the ideal-sexual gender role for their *own* gender, MALE/SEX-IDEAL scores were used for men, while FEMALES/SEX-IDEAL scores were used for women. Expressive and instrumental scores were the dependent variables. Significant multivariate main effects were found for both gender of respondent, $F(2, 100) = 16.25, p < .001$, and situation $F(4, 98) = 46.02, p < .001$. In addition, the gender by situation interaction was significant, $F(4, 98) = 6.48, p < .001$. Therefore, instrumental and expressive scores were examined separately using repeated measures ANOVAs; significant effects were followed up with Tukey tests.

For the instrumental scores, the main effect for gender of respondent was marginally significant, $F(1, 102) = 3.33, p = .07$, such that the men's instrumental scores ($M = 61.7$) were higher than were the women's ($M = 58.8$). A significant main effect was also found for situation, $F(2, 101) = 20.32, p < .001$. Instrumental scores were highest for GLOBAL ($M = 63.0$), intermediate for SEX-IDEAL ($M = 60.0$), and lowest for SEXUAL ($M = 56.9$); all differences were significant. The gender by situation interaction was not significant. With respect to expressive scores, both the gender of respondent, $F(1, 101) = 30.23, p < .001$, and the situation, $F(2, 100) = 76.51, p < .001$, main effects were significant. The interaction effect was also significant, $F(2, 100) = 13.16, p < .001$. The men's expressive scores were significantly higher for SEX-IDEAL ($M = 78.2$) than for SEXUAL ($M = 73.1$), which was significantly lower than GLOBAL ($M = 67.2$). Women's scores were significantly higher for SEX-IDEAL ($M = 81.4$) than for either GLOBAL ($M = 76.9$) or for SEXUAL ($M = 78.5$). GLOBAL and SEXUAL did not differ significantly from each other. Women's expressive scores were higher than men's for GLOBAL and SEXUAL but not for SEX-IDEAL.

Ideal Attributes for Men and Women in Sexual Situations

All participants described the ideal attributes of both men and women in sexual situations. These descriptions were compared using a 2 (gender of respondent) by 2 (gender of actor) repeated measures MANOVA. The dependent variables were the expressive and instrumental scores. The multivariate main effect for gender of actor and the gender of actor by gender of respondent interaction were significant, $F(2, 184) = 11.09, p < .001$ and $F(2, 184) = 3.26, p < .05$, respectively. In addition, the gender of respondent main effect was marginally significant, $F(2, 184) = 2.64, p = .07$. Instrumental and expressive scores were followed up separately with repeated measures ANOVAs.

Follow up of the instrumental scores yielded only a main effect for gender of actor, $F(1, 185) = 20.40, p < .001$. In sexual situations, the ideal attributes for a man were perceived as more instrumental ($M = 62.1$) than the attributes for a woman ($M = 59.2$). For the expressive scores the gender of respondent main effect was qualified by a significant interaction between gender of respondent and gender of actor, $F(1, 186) = 5.49, p < .05$ and $F(1, 186) = 4.70, p < .05$, respectively. Compared to the men's ratings ($M = 79.6$), the women rated men as ideally more expressive (M 's = 82.0). The men's and women's ratings of the ideal expressiveness for a woman in a sexual situation did not differ, however (M 's = 79.6 and 80.9 for the men's and the women's ratings, respectively). The women and the men did not differ in how expressive they thought men or women ideally should be in a sexual situation.

Predictors of Sexual and Ideal-Sexual Expressiveness and Instrumentality

To determine whether attitudinal and behavioral variables were related to the men's and the women's ideal expressiveness and instrumentality in the sexual situation, canonical correlations were conducted separately for men and women. Wilks Lambda was used to evaluate the canonical correlation and a cut off of .30 was used to interpret correlations with the canonical variates. Two attitudinal measures (SRIS and SOS) and two behavioral measures (HBI and numbers of coital partners) were used to predict SEX-IDEAL instrumental and expressive scores. One significant canonical correlation emerged for the men, $F(16, 242) = 2.26, p < .01$, accounting for 28.7% of the variance. Sex role ideology ($r = -.84$), number of coital partners ($r = .30$) and HBI ($r = .53$) were correlated with the attitudinal/behavioral variate. The canonical variate accounted for 28.8% of the variance in its set of variables. The SEX-IDEAL canonical variate correlated with MALE/SEX-IDEAL I ($r = .45$), MALE/SEX-IDEAL E ($r = -.54$) and FEMALE/SEX-IDEAL I ($r = -.34$) and extracted 15.2% of the variance from this set of variables. Thus, men who were more traditional in their attitudes towards women's roles and had greater sexual experience described men as ideally more instrumental and less expressive and women as less instrumental than did less traditional, less experienced men. The two sets of variables were unrelated for the women.

Separate canonical correlations were conducted for men and women to determine whether SEXUAL instrumental and expressive scores were related to SRIS, SOS, HBI, and number of coital partners. For the men, the first canonical function was significant, $F(8, 68) = 3.40, p < .01$, ac-

counting for 44.3% of the variance in the solution. The sexual gender role canonical variate was correlated with expressive scores ($r = .84$) and instrumental scores ($r = -.52$) and extracted 48.8% of the variance from its own set of variables. The attitudinal/behavioral canonical variate correlated with SRIS ($r = .76$), SOS ($r = -.35$), and HBI ($r = -.65$). It accounted for 28.4% of the variance in its own set. Thus, men who described their own attributes in sexual situations as less expressive and more instrumental were more erotophilic, more sexually experienced, and held more traditional views towards women's roles. For the women, one significant canonical function emerged, $F(8, 110) = 3.62, p < .001$, account for 33.6% of the variance. SRI ($r = -.39$) and HBI ($r = .60$) were correlated with the attitudinal/behavioral variate, and extracted 15.9% of the variance from this set of variables. Both the expressiveness ($r = .84$) and instrumental scores ($r = -.58$) were correlated with the SEXUAL variate. This canonical variate accounted for 52.0% of the variance in its set of variables. Thus, the women who were more traditional in their attitudes towards women's role and had engaged in a wider range of sexual activities (but not had more coital partners) described themselves as more expressive and less instrumental in the sexual situation than did less traditional, less sexually experienced women.

DISCUSSION

The participants in this study were representative of most college populations in terms of the extent of dating and sexual experience as well as the levels of erotophobia-erotophilia and gender role ideologies found in other research (e.g., Caron, Davis, Halteman, & Stickle, 1993; Cota & Xinaris, 1989; Weis, Rabinowitz, & Ruckstuhl, 1992). Descriptions of gender-related attributes in sexual situations (SEXUAL) were obtained from 56% of the original sample. Because participants who completed the SEXUAL measure did not differ from noncompleters in their descriptions of their global attributes or the ideal attributes for men and women in sexual situations, analyses were based on the full sample whenever possible. It should be noted, however, that participants who completed the SEXUAL measure had more dating and sexual experience than did noncompleters. This is not surprising given that completion of the home-monitoring measures was contingent upon engaging in heterosexual sexual activities in the week following the laboratory session. Care should be taken in generalizing the results to college students with less dating/sexual experience.

*Gender Differences in Self-Descriptions of Global, Sexual, and
Ideal-Sexual Attributes*

In general, the men's and women's descriptions of their personality-related attributes were consistent with culturally-defined scripts for men and women. Both globally and in sexual situations, the men's instrumental scores were higher than the women's while the women's expressive scores were higher than the men's. In addition, the men described the ideal attributes for their own gender in a sexual situation as more instrumental than the women described the ideal attributes of women in that situation. Despite these differences, there was some evidence of a convergence of men's and women's personality-relevant gender role attributes in sexual situations.

In support of the view that expressive traits such as tenderness, caring, and consideration are valued for men as well as for women in the sexual situation (Farber, 1992; McCabe, 1987), the men reported being more expressive in the sexual situation than they are globally. Further, the men described the ideal-sexual attributes for a man as even more expressive than their own sexual gender role. With respect to instrumentality, the men described the ideal attributes for a man in a sexual situation as more instrumental than their own gender role in that situation, but as less instrumental than their global attributes. Thus, while the men may not be as instrumental as they would ideally like to be in sexual situations, their descriptions of ideal male attributes in sexual situations are, nevertheless, less instrumental than their descriptions of their own global attributes. Overall, these results suggest that men behave in less gender-typed ways in sexual situations than globally, and they do so because they believe that this type of behavior represents the ideal for men. These results are consistent with the findings of Daley and Rosenzweig (1988) that married men describe themselves as less instrumental and more expressive in sexual situations than globally. Further, the current results extend those findings by indicating that even young men believe that high expressiveness is ideal in sexual situations.

The college women, like the married women in Rosenzweig and Daley's (1991) study, described themselves as equally and highly expressive globally and in sexual situations. However, similar to the young men, the young women described the ideal attributes for a woman in a sexual situation as more expressive than their own attributes both globally and in the sexual situation. In terms of instrumental attributes, women reported their highest level of instrumentality for their global attributes, and their lowest level for their attributes in sexual situations. They did not, however, perceive their own sexual attributes as the ideal for women. Instead, they re-

ported that in sexual situations women should ideally be more instrumental than they themselves are. Thus, despite the fact that the young women in this sample described their own sexual attributes as equally or more traditional than their global attributes, they did not see this behavior as the ideal. Instead, they felt that, in a sexual situation, women should be both more expressive and more instrumental than they themselves are in sexual situations.

Young women may not behave more instrumentally because they fear that their sexual partner would respond negatively to such non-traditional behavior. College women in Lewin's (1985) study believed that refusing to engage in sexual activities initiated by their partner would anger and upset him, whereas agreeing to the unwanted sexual activity would result in fewer negative consequences overall. On the other hand, Byers and Heinlein (1989) found that married women who considered, but did not follow through with initiating sexual activities attributed their inaction to situational factors rather than to concerns about violating sexual norms.

It may be that young women lack the skills to implement the level of instrumentality they see as the ideal. A similar explanation was offered by O'Sullivan and Byers (1992) in their study of sexual initiations. They found that college women initiated sexual activity less frequently than college men, and that both the men and the women reported less pleasure with sexual activities resulting from women's than men's initiations. In any case, further research is needed to determine whether the discrepancy between women's actual and ideal levels of sexual instrumentality is attributable to a behavioral deficit or fear of social censure.

Ideal Attributes in Sexual Situations

It should be noted that both the men and the women felt that, in sexual situations, members of their own gender should ideally behave in ways that are both more instrumental and more expressive than they themselves act in those situations. That is, both men's and women's responses indicate that their own behavior in sexual situations does not match their ideal either for behaviors that are traditional described within gender roles (instrumentality for men, expressiveness for women) nor for behaviors that are non-traditional within gender roles (expressiveness for men, instrumentality for women.) These discrepancies might be a reflection of our sex negative society in which young men and women do not feel free to express themselves and their desires fully in sexual situations. Or, they might be a result of a sexual script which limits communication about sexual likes and dislikes. In either case, the results suggest that the attributes which men

and women exhibit in sexual situations are likely to change as individuals strive to achieve their ideals, and they are likely to change in a direction of convergence between young men's and women's roles in sexual situations. However, there is likely to be more convergence in expressiveness than in instrumentality. That is, men and women rated the ideal man as equally expressive in sexual situations as the ideal woman. However, consistent with the traditional sexual script (Byers, 1996), men and women rated the ideal man as more instrumental than the ideal woman. Despite the fact that women ideally think women should be more instrumental in sexual situations than they themselves are, they think that men should be even more instrumental. Thus, men are likely to remain the more active, initiating partner within heterosexual sexual encounters, at least among young couples.

Predictors of Sexual and Ideal-Sexual Gender Roles

Describing one's own attributes in sexual situations as more traditional was associated with self-reporting behaviors and attitudes that reflected traditional sexual scripts. The young men's sexual attitudes and behaviors were related to both their descriptions of their ideal-sexual gender role and their actual gender role behaviors in a sexual situation. In general, compared to less traditional men, men who were more traditional in attitudes and behaviors gave descriptions of their own and ideal behavior in sexual situations which were more in line with the traditional sexual script. Men who described their sexual gender role as less expressive and more instrumental (i.e., conforming more to the traditional sexual script) held more traditional views of women's roles, were more sexually experienced, and were more erotophilic. Similarly, men who described the ideal man's behavior in sexual situations as more instrumental and less expressive, and the ideal woman's behavior in these situations as less instrumental, also held more traditional views about women's roles and were more sexually experienced. In other words, these men's sexual attitudes, behaviors, and gender role were consistent with the traditional masculine sexual script which directs men to be sexually assertive and to value physical gratification over emotional closeness. These results suggest that, compared to their less traditional, less sexually experienced counterparts, young men whose sexual attitudes and behaviors reflect a traditional masculine script may be less likely to display qualities such as tenderness, sensitivity, understanding, and emotional intimacy in sexual situations with a partner and may be more likely to take charge in the sexual situation. Further, they behave in these ways because these are the behaviors that they see as ideal for men. These men also

may be less accepting of women's instrumental and assertive behavior in sexual situations.

The young women's sexual attitudes and behaviors were related to their actual attributes in sexual situations but not to their descriptions of ideal attributes for men or women in the sexual situation. Women's attributes in a sexual situation appear to be influenced by their sexual attitudes and behaviors. Having a more traditional view of women's roles, and greater sexual experience—as measured by the types of sexual behaviors engaged in but not number of coital partners—was associated with describing themselves as more expressive and less instrumental. Engaging in a wide range of sexual behaviors with few sexual partners is likely associated with having been in a long-term committed relationship. Thus, these results suggest that women who endorse a more traditional script for women in general tend to also behave in traditional ways in sexual situations within their long-term relationships.

Conclusions

These results suggest that young men's and young women's global, sexual, and ideal-sexual gender-relevant attributes continue to reflect traditional gender-typed prescriptions. For all situations, the men's attributes were more instrumental than the women's. Both globally and sexually, the women were more expressive than the men. However, there was also some evidence that men's and women's perceptions of the ideal attributes for men and women in sexual situations are converging. For example, the young men indicated that, compared to their own behavior in a sexual situation, a man should ideally be more expressive. The young women described the ideal gender role for a woman in sexual situations as more instrumental than their own sexual gender role. However, despite some convergence of attributes in sexual situations, traditional gender role prescriptions continue to guide young men's and women's behavior in sexual interactions to a greater degree than these prescriptions guide their conceptions of ideal behavior.

The finding that young men and women report that their own sexual behavior differs from their perceived ideal requires further investigation. One question raised by this result is whether men's and women's perceptions of the ideal-sexual attributes influences their own behavior in sexual situations; that is, do they eventually adopt their ideal? Alternatively, does their behavior influence their perceptions of the ideal attributes in a sexual situation? In addition, more research is needed to determine whether sexual experience influences sexual and ideal-sexual attributes, or vice versa.

Finally, while researchers have looked at the relationship between global expressiveness and instrumentality and variables such as sexual satisfaction (Kimlicka, Cross, & Tarnai, 1983) and sexual behavior/functioning (Leary & Snell, 1988; Obstfeld, Lupfer, & Lupfer, 1985) it would be informative to study how *sexual* attributes relate to these variables.

REFERENCES

- Allgeier, E. R. (1981). The influence of androgynous identification on heterosexual relations. *Sex Roles, 7*, 321-330.
- Allgeier, E. R., & Fogel, A. (1978). Coital positions and sex roles: Responses to cross-sex behavior in bed. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46*, 588-589.
- Ballard-Reisch, D., & Elton, M. (1992). Gender orientation and the Bem Sex Role Inventory: A psychological construct revisited. *Sex Roles, 27*, 291-306.
- Barbach, L., & Levine, L. (1980). *Shared intimacies: Women's sexual experiences*. New York: Anchor Press.
- Bem, S. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42*, 155-162.
- Bem, S. (1975). Sex role adaptability: One consequence of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31*, 634-643.
- Bentler, P. (1968a). Heterosexual behavior assessment—I Males. *Behavior Research and Therapy, 6*, 21-25.
- Bentler, P. (1968b). Heterosexual behavior assessment—II. Females. *Behavior Research and Therapy, 6*, 27-30.
- Blumstein, P., & Schwartz, P. (1983). *American couples: Money, work, sex*. New York: William Morrow.
- Byers, E. S. (1996). How well does the traditional sexual script explain sexual coercion? Review of a program of research. *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality, 8*, 7-25.
- Byers, E. S., & Heinlein, L. (1989). Predicting initiations and refusals of sexual activities in married and cohabiting couples. *The Journal of Sex Research, 26*, 15-29.
- Byrne, D., & Kelley, K. (1992). *Exploring human sexuality*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Caron, S., Davis, C., Halteman, W., & Stickle, M. (1993). Predictors of condom-related behaviors among first year college students. *The Journal of Sex Research, 30*, 252-259.
- Carroll, J., Volk, K., & Hyde, J. S. (1985). Differences between males and females in motives for engaging in sexual intercourse. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 14*, 131-139.
- Clark, R. D., & Hatfield, E. (1989). Gender differences in receptivity to sexual offers. *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality, 2*, 39-55.
- Cota, A., & Xinaris, S. (1989, June). *Psychometric properties of the Sex-Role Ideology Scale*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association, Halifax, Nova Scotia.
- Daley, D., & Rosenzweig, J. (1988). Variations in men's psychological sex-role self-perceptions as a function of work, social and sexual life roles. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy, 14*, 225-240.
- Darling, C., & Davidson, J. K. (1986). Coitally active university students: Sexual behaviors, concerns, and challenges. *Adolescence, 21*, 403-419.
- Farber, N. (1992). Sexual standards and activity: Adolescents' perceptions. *Child and Adolescent Social Work, 9*, 53-76.
- Fisher, W., Byrne, D., White, L. A., & Kelley, K. (1988). Erotophobia-erotophilia as a dimension of personality. *The Journal of Sex Research, 25*, 123-151.
- Gagnon, J. (1990). The explicit and implicit use of the scripting perspective in sex research. In J. Bancroft, C. Davis, & D. Weinstein (Eds.), *Annual Review of Sex Research* (Vol. 1). Mount Vernon, IA: The Society for the Scientific Study of Sex.

- Halpern, J., & Sherman, M. A. (1979). *Afterplay: A key to intimacy*. New York: Pocket Books.
- Hatfield, E., Sprecher, S., Pillemer, J. T., Greenberger, D., & Wexler, P. (1988). Gender differences in what is desired in the sexual relationship. *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality, 1*, 39-52.
- Hiller, D., & Philliber, W. (1985). Internal consistency of the Bem Sex Role Inventory. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 48*, 373-380.
- Hite, S. (1976). *The Hite report*. New York: Dell.
- Hite, S. (1981). *The Hite report on male sexuality*. New York: Knopf.
- Kalin, R., & Tilby, P. J. (1978). Development and validation of a sex-role ideology scale. *Psychological Reports, 42*, 731-738.
- Kimlicka, T., Cross, H., & Tarnai, J. (1983). A comparison of androgynous, feminine, masculine, and undifferentiated women on self-esteem, body-image, and sexual satisfaction. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 7*, 291-294.
- Leary, M., & Snell, W. (1988). The relationship of instrumentality and expressiveness to sexual behavior in males and females. *Sex Roles, 18*, 509-522.
- Lewin, M. (1985). Unwanted intercourse: The difficulty of saying no. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 9*, 184-192.
- LoPiccolo, J., & Freidman, J. M. (1988). Broad-spectrum treatment of low sexual desire: Integration of cognitive, behavioral, and systemic therapy. In S. R. Leiblum & R. C. Rosen (Eds.), *Sexual desire disorders*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Macklin, E. (1983). Effect of changing sex roles on the intimate relationships of men and women. *Marriage and Family Review, 6*, 97-113.
- McCabe, M. (1987). Desired and experienced levels of premarital affection and sexual intercourse during dating. *The Journal of Sex Research, 23*, 23-33.
- Miller, B., & Marshall, J. C. (1987). Coercive sex on the university campus. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 28*, 38-47.
- Neugarten, B. (1973). Personality change in later life: A developmental perspective. In C. Eisendorfer & M. P. Lawton (Eds.), *The psychology of adult development and aging*, Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Obstfeld, L. S., Lupfer, M. B., & Lupfer, S. L. (1985). Exploring the relationship between gender identity and sexual functioning. *Journal of Sex and Family Therapy, 11*, 248-258.
- Oliver, M. B., & Hyde, J. S. (1993). Gender differences in sexuality: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 114*, 29-51.
- O'Sullivan, L., & Byers, E. S. (1992). College students' incorporation of initiator and restrictor roles in sexual dating interactions. *The Journal of Sex Research, 29*, 435-446.
- Orlofsky, J. (1981). Relationship between sex role attitudes and personality traits and the Sex Role Behavior Scale—1: A new measure of masculine and feminine role behaviors and interests. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40*, 927-940.
- Pedhazur, E., & Tetenbaum, T. (1979). Bem Sex Role Inventory: A theoretical and methodological critique. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37*, 996-1016.
- Peplau, L., Rubin, Z., & Hill, C. (1977). Sexual intimacy in dating relationships. *Journal of Social Issues, 32*, 86-109.
- Roche, J. P. (1986). Premarital sex: Attitudes and behaviors by dating stage. *Adolescence, 21*, 107-121.
- Rosenzweig, J., & Daley, D. (1991). Women's sex roles in their public and private lives. *Journal of Sex Education and Therapy, 17*, 75-85.
- Simon, W., & Gagnon, J. (1986). Sexual scripts: Permanence and change. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 15*, 97-120.
- Spence, J. (1984). Masculinity, femininity, and gender-related traits: A conceptual analysis and critique of current research. In B. A. Maher (Ed.), *Progress in experimental personality research* (Vol. 13). New York: Academic Press.
- Spence, J., & Helmreich, R. (1978). *Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates, and antecedents*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Sprecher, S. (1989). Premarital sexual standards for different categories of individuals. *The Journal of Sex Research, 26*, 232-248.
- Uleman, J. S., & Weston, M. (1986). Does the BSRI inventory sex roles? *Sex Roles, 15*, 43-62.

- Weis, D. L., Rabinowitz, B., & Ruckstuhl, M. F. (1992). Individual changes in sexual attitudes and behaviors within college-level human sexuality courses. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 29, 43-59.
- Zilbergeld, B. (1992). *The new male sexuality*. Toronto: Bantam.