

Linking Personal Values to Gender¹

Lina Di Dio, Carina Saragovi, and Richard Koestner²

McGill University

Jennifer Aubé

University of Rochester

Two studies were conducted to investigate the relation between personal values and aspects of gender. Study 1 used the Rokeach Value Survey (RVS) to examine the nature of stereotypes concerning the values of the "typical man" and the "typical woman". Results supported the hypothesis that men are viewed as more likely to endorse agentic values, such as freedom and accomplishment, whereas women are viewed as more likely to endorse communal values, such as friendship and equality. Study 2 assessed men and women's possession of stereotypic sets of masculine and feminine values, using the RVS, and examined their relation to gender-related personality traits, gender-related interests and role behaviors, and global self-perceptions of masculinity and femininity. Masculine values were found to be significantly related to socially desirable masculine traits, socially undesirable masculine traits, masculine interests and a global self-concept of masculinity. Feminine values were shown to be significantly related to socially desirable feminine traits, feminine interests, feminine role behaviors, and a global self-concept of femininity. These results suggest that gender-linked personal values merit inclusion with traits, interests, role behaviors, and global self-concepts as part of an emerging multidimensional conception of gender characteristics.

"Masculinity" and "femininity" are labels for socially constructed categories that acknowledge differences between men and women in the extent to

¹This research was funded by a grant to Richard Koestner from the Fonds Pour La Formation De Chercheurs Et L'Aide A La Recherche (FCAR-Quebec) and by the Social Science and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC-Canada). Lina Di Dio was funded by a fellowship from the Canadian-Italo Business Persons Association (CIBPA).

²Correspondence concerning this manuscript should be sent to Richard Koestner, Psychology Department, McGill University, 1205 Dr. Penfield Avenue, Montreal, PQ, H3A 1B1, Canada.

which they possess certain characteristics. "Masculine" characteristics are those which people ascribe to men more often than to women. "Feminine" characteristics are those which are attributed more frequently to women than to men. The most common way for researchers to assess masculine and feminine qualities is with either the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) (Bem, 1974) or the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974). Both of these inventories assess socially desirable personality traits related to instrumentality and expressiveness. Instrumentality, more commonly associated with males, refers to traits that are self-assertive and goal-oriented, (e.g., "independent", "decisive"), whereas expressiveness, more commonly associated with women, refers to interpersonally-oriented, nurturant traits (e.g., "kind", "aware of other's feelings") (Spence, 1984). Research using these measures indicated that socially desirable masculine and feminine traits are two independent constructs.

Traits are not the only aspect of personality that reflect cultural stereotypes about men and women, however. Societal standards also guide which occupations, leisure interests, and role behaviors are differentially valued by males and females. For example, being a football fan and playing poker are leisure interests which are stereotypically associated with men in American society whereas gardening and going to plays are associated with women. Similarly, a role-specific behavior such as "giving same-sex friends a friendly slap on the back" is associated with men whereas "being the first to say I'm sorry after a dispute with a romantic partner" is associated with women. Individual differences in the extent to which people endorse such gender-related interests and role behaviors can be assessed with the Sex Role Behavior Scale (SRBS) (Orlofsky & O'Heron, 1987). Research with this instrument supports the notion that it is possible for the same individual to display both masculine and feminine attributes. In fact, research with the SRBS has shown that scores on the male-valued and female-valued scales not only are *not* negatively correlated with each other, there is even a significant tendency for them to be positively correlated (Aubé & Koestner, 1995; Orlofsky & O'Heron, 1987).

When relations between personality traits, interests and behaviors, and attitudes were examined, only moderate positive correlations emerged among the different measures related to either masculinity or femininity (Ashmore, 1990). This lead gender researchers to favor a multidimensional approach to assessing gender characteristics. Spence (1993) suggested that gender identity be conceptualized as a multifactorial construct in which factors such as personality traits, role-behaviors, leisure activities and occupational interests are only loosely connected with one another. Whereas the two-factor theory of gender emphasized that an individual might simultaneously be high on both masculine and feminine traits, Spence's multifac-

torial model of gender suggested, as well, that someone might be high on masculine traits, moderate in their display of masculine role behaviors, and low in their possession of masculine interests. Implicit in Spence's Multifactorial Model of Gender is that the complexity of gender can only be fully understood when multiple aspects of gender are considered simultaneously. Koestner and Aubé (1995) reviewed three recent studies that demonstrate ways in which research guided by Spence's multifactorial approach can advance our understanding of how gender characteristics develop, how they impact on psychological adjustment, and how they influence relationships. These authors also called for gender researchers to expand the types of personality characteristics they assess in their attempts to capture gender. The present study was designed to consider whether personal values may represent an important component to include in the multifactorial approach to studying gender.

Values can be defined as prescriptive or proscriptive beliefs that are intimately linked with the self and are organized into relatively enduring hierarchies of importance (Rokeach, 1973). According to Rokeach (1973), there are two types of values: 1) terminal values, which are general goals or end-states of existence, and 2) instrumental values, which are modes of conduct. Both types of values can be assessed with the Rokeach Value Survey (RVS), a widely used instrument that requires individuals to rank order personal values in terms of their importance (Braithwait & Scott, 1991). Research with the RVS has shown that, although there is some overlap in the values American men and women consider important, they differ in the relative emphasis they place on many values. Rokeach (1973) reported that men valued a comfortable life, a sense of accomplishment, freedom, social recognition, and an exciting life more highly than did women, whereas women valued salvation, inner harmony, wisdom, self-respect, a world at peace, and happiness more highly than did men. Similarly, Ryker (1992) found that male college students placed a higher value priority on a comfortable life, an exciting life, pleasure, and social recognition, whereas female college students were found to place a higher value priority on a world at peace, equality, inner harmony, and self-respect.

One can speculate that these gender differences reflect the differential socialization of men and women in Western industrialized societies. Men, who have traditionally been the breadwinners, seem to be more materialistic, achievement-oriented, and pleasure-seeking than women. Conversely, women, who have traditionally been the caregivers, seem to be more oriented toward religious values, emotional well-being, and a world free of intergroup conflict. If these sex differences in values are indeed due to socialization, then values should be considered as another dimension of a multifactorial model of gender identity.

Feather (1984) conducted two studies examining the relation between the values from the RVS and gender-related personality traits, as assessed by the BSRI and the EPAQ. The rationale behind these studies was that if someone perceives himself/herself to possess certain personality traits, he/she will also tend to view those traits as important qualities. For instance, a man who describes himself as very independent will also regard independence as an important value by which he defines himself. Results demonstrated that masculine traits were significantly positively correlated with the importance assigned to freedom, social recognition, an exciting life, and being ambitious and independent (Feather, 1984). Feminine traits were significantly positively correlated with the importance assigned to mature love, inner harmony, and being loving, forgiving, helpful, honest, and polite. One limitation with Feather's study is that the instrumental values contained in the RVS overlap too closely with the attributes contained in both the EPAQ and the BSRI, therefore their strong correlations may merely reflect shared method variance. This issue was addressed in the present study by employing the scale of terminal values only.

Furthermore, Feather's study did not systematically investigate the existence of stereotyped perceptions regarding the values men and women hold. Thus far, no one has yet applied to the domain of personal values the standard methodology used by Rosenkrantz et al. (1968) to identify gender-related personality traits. This approach requires a sample of men and women to judge the extent to which various attributes are more typical of men or women in a given culture. Rosenkrantz et al.'s (1968) findings showed that certain personality traits are more likely to be ascribed to men (i.e., independent, assertive), whereas other personality traits are more likely to be ascribed to women (i.e., nurturant, gentle). A similar approach was used to develop the masculine and feminine interests and role behaviors included on the SRBS.

The purpose of the present research was (a) to specify which values, from the Rokeach Value Survey, are considered more typical of men, and which are considered more typical of women in our society, and (b) to relate individual differences on these gender-typical sets of values to other aspects of gender, such as gender-related personality traits, interests, role behaviors, and global self-concepts as masculine or feminine. Two studies were conducted. The first study required subjects to complete the terminal values subscale of the RVS with regard to their beliefs about the values of the "typical woman" and the "typical man." This is the typical procedure employed to assess gender-stereotypes. We hypothesized that a set of values related to agency, such as a sense of accomplishment and social recognition, would be more strongly associated with men than women whereas a set of values related to communion, such as mature love and true friendship,

would be more strongly associated with women than men. Bakan (1966) proposed that agency and communion are the two fundamental modalities of human existence where agency is defined as involving a focus on the self and forming separations, whereas communion is defined as involving a focus on others and forming connections.

A previous study by Raymond, Damino and Kandel (1974) used a methodology similar to Study 1 to examine sex stereotyping in values. However, these authors used only the instrumental values from the Rokeach Value Survey and found relatively little evidence that college students held different stereotypes for men and women. Thus, reliable stereotypes were apparent for only three of the 18 values. Men were perceived to be more ambitious than women and women were perceived to be more broad-minded and forgiving than men. It is perhaps noteworthy that ambitious and forgiving reflect agency and communion, respectively.

The second study required subjects to prioritize the terminal values of the RVS with reference to themselves, as well as to complete measures of socially desirable gender-related traits, undesirable gender-related traits, gender-related interests, gender-related role behaviors, and global self-concepts of gender. Our first hypothesis was that men would be more likely to endorse "masculine" values than women, whereas the reverse would be true for "feminine" values. Second, it was hypothesized that masculine values would show positive relations with measures of masculine traits, interests, and role behaviors. For instance, an individual who highly values a sense of accomplishment and freedom is more likely to be assertive and independent, and be interested in competitive games. However, feminine values are expected to show positive relations with feminine traits, interests, and role behaviors. That is, an individual who highly values mature love and true friendship is more likely to be nurturant and warm in relations with others, and interested in visiting art museums and attending plays.

STUDY 1

Method

Subjects

Sixty-one subjects were recruited through an availability sample from the community through direct solicitation. There were 35 females and 27 males, all residents of Montreal, Quebec. The subjects' ages ranged from 17-55; the mean age was 28 years. A majority of the participants reported English as their native language (73%), 13% reported French as their na-

tive language, and 13% reported that their native language was neither English nor French. The ethnic composition of the sample was 83% Caucasian, 17% noncaucasian. The main religious affiliations of participants were: Roman Catholic, 23%; Jewish, 26%; Protestant, 10%; other, 13%; and no religious preference, 23%.

Procedure

Subjects were required to complete a general information form and a shortened version of the RVS. Completion of the questionnaires required approximately 15 minutes.

Measures

The Rokeach Value Survey (RVS; Rokeach, 1973) is a 36-item measure intended to differentiate people according to their goals in life (terminal values), or modes of conduct (instrumental values) (Rokeach, 1967). The second subscale assessing instrumental values was eliminated, thereby shortening this scale to 18 items. Respondents were required to arrange the eighteen terminal values in order of their relative importance to the typical woman and to the typical man, respectively, as guiding principles in their life. All participants first rated the typical woman, then the typical man. The rank-ordering procedure is standard for the administration of the RVS. Some examples of terminal values are: mature love, true friendship, an exciting life, and freedom. The convergent and discriminant validity of this instrument has been supported (Braithwait and Scott, 1991). It has also shown good test-retest reliability over a period of 14–16 months ($r = .69$) (Rokeach, 1973).

Results and Discussion

To examine participants' judgments of the typical values held by men and women, a $2 \times 2 \times 18$ Multiple Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was performed with Sex of Participant as a nested factor, and both Sex of Target and Type of Values as crossed factors. The MANOVA revealed a significant main effect for Type of Value, $F(17, 1003) = 65.32, p < .0001$ and a significant interaction effect for Sex of Target \times Type of Values, $F(17, 1003) = 22.00, p < .0001$. No other effects approached significance (p 's $> .20$). The main effect for Type of Value indicates that certain values are rated as more important than other values. The interaction indicates that par-

ticipants believed that the typical woman and the typical man differ in the relative importance they assign to the 18 values included on the Rokeach scale. Importantly, the absence of a three-way interaction involving Sex of Target suggests that male and female raters did not differ in their judgments of the relative values held by the typical woman and the typical man.

To understand the stereotypes of the values held by women and men, paired *t*-tests were performed on the rankings of the values of the typical woman and the typical man. Table I presents the mean rankings of the 18 values. The values are listed in descending order according to the size of perceived sex differences. It can be seen that seven values were judged to be significantly more strongly associated with women than with men: True friendship, inner harmony, happiness, a world of beauty, mature love, equality, and family security. It can also be seen that seven values were judged to be significantly more strongly associated with men than with women: An exciting life, social recognition, a comfortable life, national security, accomplishment, pleasure, and freedom.

These results indicate that identifiable societal stereotypes exist regarding the values possessed by men and women. It is noteworthy that the personal values associated with the two sexes appear to reflect Bakan's (1966) fundamental distinction between agency and communion. Agency, which is more characteristic of men according to Bakan, involves a focus on the

Table I. Mean Value Rankings for the Typical Man and the Typical Woman

| Values | Typical woman | Typical man | <i>t</i> -test (61) |
|--------------------|---------------|-------------|---------------------|
| True friendship | 6.09 | 10.72 | -7.42** |
| Inner harmony | 7.53 | 11.72 | -6.35** |
| Happiness | 3.56 | 6.16 | -5.04** |
| A world of beauty | 12.70 | 15.81 | -4.99** |
| Mature love | 4.96 | 7.79 | -4.89* |
| Equality | 9.25 | 12.11 | -4.38** |
| Family security | 5.95 | 8.11 | -3.82** |
| Salvation | 15.11 | 15.69 | -1.15 |
| A world of peace | 13.71 | 13.85 | -0.25 |
| An exciting life | 11.24 | 6.53 | 6.93** |
| Social recognition | 10.72 | 5.88 | 6.51** |
| A comfortable life | 8.69 | 5.91 | 5.22** |
| National security | 16.33 | 13.96 | 4.89** |
| Accomplishment | 9.06 | 5.69 | 4.87** |
| Pleasure | 10.12 | 8.00 | 3.39** |
| Freedom | 8.55 | 6.52 | 3.03* |
| Wisdom | 11.54 | 10.87 | 1.07 |
| Self-respect | 5.95 | 5.40 | 0.91 |

**p* < .01.

***p* < .001.

self and forming separations whereas communion, which is more characteristic of women, involves a focus on others and forming connections. A concern with freedom, recognition, accomplishment, excitement, and national security all connote the self-direction, self-expansion, and self-protection that are hallmarks of agency. A concern with love, family, friendship, inner harmony, and equality all connote caring, consideration and forming connections, hallmarks of a communal orientation.

In their attempt to establish a universal structure of human values, Schwartz and Bilsky (1987) made a distinction among two classes of values that parallels Bakan's notion of agency and communion. Specifically, they distinguished among values that serve individualistic interests, such as a sense of accomplishment or social recognition, and those that serve collectivistic interests, such as equality and true friendship. These authors further distinguished values into seven categories of motivational content. The masculine stereotypes identified in this study overlap with Schwartz and Bilsky's motivational categories of achievement and self-direction whereas the feminine stereotypes overlap with their prosocial and maturity categories.

STUDY 2

Study 1 found that people do, in fact, have gender stereotypes about which values are relatively more important for men versus women. Rather than examining gender stereotypes, Study 2 inquired about subjects' own personal values. Having identified two sets of seven personal values that are stereotypically associated with men and women, respectively, our goal was to examine whether individual differences in these sets of personal values would be associated with other individual differences in gender-linked personality characteristics. Feather (1984) had previously shown that socially desirable masculine traits were positively correlated with the importance assigned to freedom, social recognition, and an exciting life whereas socially desirable feminine traits were positively correlated with the importance assigned to mature love, inner harmony, true friendship, and family security. Note that these correlates overlap with the stereotypical masculine and feminine values identified in Study 1. Study 2 seeks to replicate Feather's finding of an association between personal values and gender-related socially desirable traits as well as to establish the relation of gender-linked values with undesirable gender-related traits, gender-related interests, gender-related role behaviors, and global self-concepts of gender. It is expected that moderate positive correlations will emerge between the set of masculine values identified in Study 1 and other masculine person-

ality characteristics and between the feminine set of values and other feminine characteristics.

Method

Subjects

One hundred and five McGill University students were recruited from two undergraduate psychology classes. The sample consisted of 61 women and 44 men, between the ages of 17 and 37, with a mean age of 20. Seventy-seven subjects were students from a social psychology class and participated in the study as part of a course requirement. Due to a disproportionate ratio of women to men, it was necessary to recruit additional male subjects. These subjects were obtained from a list of students from an introductory psychology course who agreed to participate in psychology experiments. Twenty-five male subjects were remunerated ten dollars for their participation. Overall, participants reported English as their native language (77%), 12% reported French was their native language, and 11% reported that their native language was neither English nor French. The ethnic composition of the sample was 73% Caucasian, and 27% noncaucasian. The main religious affiliations of participants were: Roman Catholic, 25%; Jewish, 28%; Protestant, 13%; other, 10%; and no religious preference, 25%.

Procedure

Participation involved completing a battery of self-report questionnaires that inquired about subjects' gender-related personality traits, role-behaviors, leisure activities and occupational interests, values, and gender identity. Subjects were contacted by phone, briefly informed about the study, and asked to participate. Subjects were run in groups of eight to ten, in a classroom in the psychology department of McGill University. Completion of the questionnaires required approximately one hour. There was a ten-minute debriefing during which the purpose of the study was explained.

Measures

The Rokeach Value Survey (RVS; Rokeach, 1973). As in Study 1, only the terminal values portion of the RVS was employed. However, here sub-

jects were asked to rank the 18 values in order of importance to themselves. The ranks ranged from 1 (most important) to 18 (least important).

The Extended Personal Attributes Questionnaire (EPAQ; Spence, Helmreich, & Holahan, 1979) consists of 40 items which are rated on a 5-point scale. The EPAQ assesses one's self-perceived socially desirable and socially undesirable gender-related personality traits (Spence, 1974). It contains six subscales; three scales pertain to positively-valued masculine and feminine traits; Masculine (M), Feminine (F), and the Sex-appropriate (MF). The other three pertain to negatively-valued masculine and feminine personality traits, negative Masculinity (M-), and two four-item scales for negative Femininity, the (Fc-) which refers to Bakan's (1966) unmitigated communion, and the (Fva-) which is verbal passive aggressiveness (Spence, Helmreich, & Holahan, 1979). We consider only the unmitigated communion scale in this article and label it as undesirable feminine traits. The (M) scale consists of self-assertive, instrumental items that are considered socially desirable in both sexes but are more likely to be endorsed by men, such as "very independent" or "very competitive" (Cronbach's $\alpha = .75$). The (F) scale consists of expressive items that are considered socially desirable in both sexes but that are more likely to be endorsed by women, such as "very gentle" or "very helpful to others" (Cronbach's $\alpha = .82$). The (MF) scale contains items that are considered socially acceptable for members of one sex but socially unacceptable for members of the other sex (e.g., (F) "feeling easily hurt"-(M) "feelings not easily hurt"). Empirical studies seldom include this scale (Spence, 1984) therefore it was not used in the present study. The (M-) scale contains items that are considered socially undesirable in both sexes, but are attributed more frequently to males than to females, for example, "arrogant" (Cronbach's $\alpha = .81$). The (Fc-) scale assesses traits that are considered inappropriate for both sexes but are more often associated with women. An example of an (Fc-) item is "submissive" (Cronbach's $\alpha = .42$).

The Short-Form Sex Role Behavior Scale (SRBS; Orlofsky, 1981) is a 96-item inventory consisting of male-valued (M), female-valued (F), and sex-specific (MF) interests and behaviors. The scale was further shortened by eliminating the (MF) scale in order to decrease administration time. It examines four components of behavior, each containing male-valued and female-valued items: recreational activities, occupational interests, social and dating behaviors, and marital behaviors (Orlofsky & O'Heron, 1987). Recreational activities include such things as "basketball" (M) and "volleyball" (F). Examples of gender-related occupational interests are "accountant" (M) and "social worker" (F). Social and dating behaviors include "telephoning an opposite-sex person for a date" (M) and "taking special care of one's appearance" (F). Marital behaviors include "being the one

to initiate sexual interactions" (M) and "being very perceptive of a spouse's changes in mood and responding to them in some way" (F). Responses were recorded using a five-point rating scale ranging from "not at all characteristic of me" to "extremely characteristic of me."

We follow Aubé and Koestner (1995) in combining the two subscales assessing recreational activities and occupational interests to form a scale labelled "Interests," and combining the subscales assessing social and marital behaviors to form a scale labelled "Role Behaviors." Male-valued and female-valued Interests and Role Behaviors displayed good internal reliability (Cronbach's α 's > .75).

The Sex Role Identity Scale (SRIS; Storms, 1979) is a bipolar measure of "a global self-concept of one's masculinity and femininity." It consists of six items; three items concerning a masculine identity and three items concerning a feminine identity. Subjects rate themselves on a 7-point rating scale ranging from "not at all masculine" to "very masculine" and "not at all feminine" to "very feminine". The questions are as follows: How masculine/feminine is your personality? How masculine/feminine do you act/appear and come across to others? and, In general how masculine/feminine do you think you are? The SRIS has strong internal consistency; the three masculine identity items intercorrelate .66, while the three feminine identity items intercorrelate .68 (Storms, 1979). Conceptualization of global gender identity as a bipolar dimension is supported by the fact that masculine identity items correlated negatively with feminine identity items, $r = -.64$ for men and $r = -.74$ for women (both p 's < .001) (Storms, 1979).

Results and Discussion

A Masculine Value Orientation was assessed by calculating subjects' mean ranking for an exciting life, social recognition, a comfortable life, national security, accomplishment, pleasure and freedom. A Feminine Value Orientation was assessed by calculating subjects' mean ranking for true friendship, inner harmony, happiness, a world of beauty, mature love, equality and family security. A paired t -test revealed that feminine values were ranked as more important than masculine values, $t(103) = 9.15$, $p < .0001$, Feminine $\mu = 7.04$ and Masculine $\mu = 9.58$. T -tests between sexes revealed a significant difference on masculine values, $t(103) = -2.12$, $p < .05$. Men ranked masculine values as significantly more important ($\mu = 9.17$) than did women ($\mu = 9.87$). A significant sex difference also emerged for feminine values, $t(103) = 2.49$, $p < .05$, indicating that women rated them as more important ($\mu = 6.75$) than did men ($\mu = 7.44$).

Pearson correlations were performed to examine the relations between the sets of masculine and feminine values identified in Study 1 and all of the other gender-related variables. To facilitate presentation of these results the value rankings were reversed so that higher scores now reflected greater importance. Table II displays the correlations between masculine values and the other masculine measures. One-tailed *t*-tests of significance are reported because clear directional predictions were made. It can be seen that significant positive relations emerged with socially desirable masculine traits, undesirable masculine traits, masculine interests and global self-concept as masculine. A factor analysis of the six masculine characteristics yielded only a single factor (Eigen Value = 2.53), accounting for 42% of the variance. This suggests that masculine values cohere reasonably well with previously developed measures of masculine personality characteristics.

Table III displays the correlations between feminine values and other measures of feminine characteristics. It can be seen that significant positive relations emerged with socially desirable feminine traits, feminine interests,

Table II. Correlations Among Masculinity Measures

| | Desirable traits | Undesirable traits | Interests | Role behaviors | Global self-concept |
|------------------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------|---------------------|
| Personal values | .18* | .29* | .21* | .14 | .18* |
| Desirable traits | | .24* | .33*** | .33*** | .29** |
| Undesirable traits | | | .21* | .35*** | .36*** |
| Activities & interests | | | | .47*** | .48*** |
| Role behaviors | | | | | .36*** |

**p* < .05.

***p* < .01.

****p* < .001.

Table III. Correlations Among Femininity Measures

| | Desirable traits | Undesirable traits | Interests | Role behaviors | Global self-concept |
|------------------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------|---------------------|
| Personal values | .32** | .08 | .29** | .18* | .29** |
| Desirable traits | | .17* | .38*** | .32*** | .44*** |
| Undesirable traits | | | .11 | .25** | .28** |
| Activities & interests | | | | .35*** | .42*** |
| Role behaviors | | | | | .55*** |

**p* < .05.

***p* < .01.

****p* < .001.

feminine role behaviors, and a global self-concept as feminine. A factor analysis of the six feminine characteristics also yielded only a single factor (Eigen Value = 2.59), accounting for 43% of the variance. This suggests that feminine values cohere reasonably well with previously developed measures of feminine personality characteristics.

Correlations were performed to consider the relation between the masculine and feminine scales of the various measures. Significant negative relations emerged for role behaviors ($r = -.22, p < .05$) and for personal values ($r = -.55, p < .01$). The strong negative correlation between masculine and feminine values can be attributed to the rank ordering procedure required for the Rokeach Value Survey. Such a format systematically imposes a negative relation between various items, inflating the strength of negative relations among sets of items.³

Multiple regression analyses were conducted to examine possible sex differences in the relation of various gender characteristics to personal values. Specifically, masculine personal values were regressed on Sex, the five other masculine personality scales, and the five Sex \times Masculine Personality interaction terms. A similar analysis was conducted for the Feminine scales. Neither analysis revealed any interactions with Sex that approached significance (p 's $> .10$). Thus, Sex does not appear to moderate the relation of gender-linked personal values to other gender-related personality measures.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The present study builds on previous work by Feather et al. (1984) in suggesting that the values people hold may be an important component of gender identity. The results of Study 1 confirmed that values figure prominently in people's implicit stereotypes about gender. Distinct sets of seven values were found to be stereotypically associated with each sex. The values which were particularly associated with men, labelled "masculine," could be conceptualized as reflecting an orientation toward agency. The values which were particularly associated with women, labelled "feminine," could be conceptualized as reflecting an orientation toward communion. Agency and communion appear to represent two superordinate lines along which personality stereotypes about the sexes are formed, whether the content of the stereotypes involve traits, interests, role behaviors, or personal values. Stated differently, the consequences of differential socialization pressures

³A factor analysis that included both masculine and feminine characteristics was conducted but yielded a confusing pattern of results. Because of the strong negative relation of masculine and feminine values, these two items emerged as their own factor with loadings in opposite directions.

on the personality development of males and females can most readily be observed in the relative emphasis placed on agency and communion.

Study 2 assessed gender characteristics multidimensionally in order to consider whether the gender-linked sets of values identified in Study 1 might merit inclusion as an additional component in Spence's (1993) multifactorial model of gender characteristics. Spence proposes that the various categories of attitudes, traits, interests, preferences and behaviors that distinguish men and women in a given culture do not contribute to a single, underlying factor but instead to a number of loosely connected factors. She suggests that gender-related phenomena can be divided into at least three critical domains: (a) Gender identity (defined as one's basic sense of masculinity or femininity); (b) instrumental and expressive personality traits that are stereotypically associated with men and women in our society; and (c) gender-related interests, role behaviors and attitudes. Previous studies indicated that masculine personality traits, interests, role behaviors and global self-concept are moderately positively correlated with one another (r 's ranging from .15 to .45) and that the same is true for parallel measures of feminine characteristics (Aubé, Norcliffe, & Koestner, 1995; Aubé & Koestner, 1995). Our correlational results suggest that personal values fit reasonably well with other aspects of gender. The mean correlation of feminine values with the five other feminine measures was .23, whereas the mean correlation for masculine values with its masculine counterparts was .20. Even more convincing, separate factor analyses of all of the feminine and masculine personality characteristics yielded single-factor structures on which personal values loaded highly.

Koestner and Aubé (1995) recently called upon gender researchers to take note of theoretical developments in the general personality literature pointing toward the complexity of personality processes. In particular, they noted that the bulk of psychological research on gender has focused too narrowly on the level of dispositional traits, measuring individual differences in the traits of expressiveness and instrumentality. Gender researchers' tendency to focus on the level of traits is not surprising as personality researchers in general have concentrated on this level. However, McAdams (1995) argues that such an approach is useful primarily for describing the most general and observable consistencies in an individual's behavior. Trait approaches fail to account for the fact that much of human behavior is conditional, varying across situational contexts and developmental stages.

Koestner and Aubé (1995) urged gender researchers to make an effort to assess gender-related constructs at the level of what McAdams (1995) has called Personal Concerns. McAdams argues that personal concerns differ from traits in that they are more contextualized by time, place, and

role considerations. They speak to the question of what people strive to do in their lives, and include the goals, plans, strategies, activities and roles that individuals pursue. These constructs, unlike dispositional traits, are likely to be couched in motivational and developmental terms. McAdams adds that dispositional traits yield only a "psychology of the stranger" and that it is at the level of personal concerns that we really begin to know a person. Koestner and Aubé proposed that gender-related role behaviors, interests, occupational goals and values all belong in McAdams' level of personal concerns.

Personal values would appear to represent a particularly important aspect of personality to consider in future gender research. Personal values are thought to represent beliefs about desired goals that are developed as a result of socialization processes (Rokeach, 1973). Values would appear to more directly reflect differential socialization pressures faced by females and males than do traits, role behaviors and interests, and hence are particularly in tune with current conceptions of "masculinity" and "femininity" as labels for socially-constructed categories rather than the result of biological determination. Personal values, unlike traits and role behaviors, also possess significant motivational features that are likely to energize, select and direct behavior into the future.

REFERENCES

- Aubé, J., & Koestner, R. (1995). Gender characteristics and relationship adjustment: Another look at similarity-complementarity hypotheses. *Journal of Personality*, *63*, 879-904.
- Aubé, J., Norcliffe, H., Craig, J.-A., & Koestner, R. (1995). Gender characteristics and adjustment-related outcomes: Questioning the masculinity model. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *21*, 284-295.
- Ashmore, R. D. (1990). Sex, gender and the individual. In L. A. Pervin (Ed.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*, (pp. 486-526). NY: Guilford.
- Bakan, D. (1966). *The duality of human existence*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *42*, 155-162.
- Braithwait, V. A., & Scott, W. A. (1991). Values. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of Personality and Social Psychological Attitudes. Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes Series, Vol. 1* (pp. 661-746). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Feather, N. T. (1984). Masculinity, femininity, psychological androgyny, and the structure of values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *47*, 604-620.
- Koestner, R., & Aubé, J. (1995). Multifactorial approaches to the study of gender. *Journal of Personality*, *63*, 681-710.
- McAdams, D. P. (1995). What do we know when we know a person? *Journal of Personality*, in press.
- O'Heron, C. A., & Orlofsky, J. L. (1990). Stereotypic and nonstereotypic sex role trait and behavior orientations, gender identity, and psychological adjustment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *58*, 134-143.

- Orlofsky, J. H., & O'Heron, C. A. (1987). Stereotypic and nonstereotypic sex role trait and behavior orientations: Implications for personal adjustment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 1034-1042.
- Raymond, B., Damino, J., & Kandel, N. (1974). Sex stereotyping in values: A comparison of three generations and two sexes. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1974*, 163-166.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The Nature of Human Values*. New York: The Free Press, Collier Macmillan Publishers.
- Rosenkrantz, P., Vogel, S., Bee, H., Broverman, I., & Broverman, D. (1968). Sex-role stereotypes and self-concepts in college students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 32*, 287-295.
- Ryker, J. A. (1992). Value priority differences between males and females [On-line]. *EDRS Availability: Microfiche, Paper*. Abstract from: ERIC database: ERIC Item: ED351274.
- Schwartz, S. H., & Bilsky, W. (1987). Toward a universal psychological structure of human values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*, 550-562.
- Spence, J. T. (1993). Gender-related traits and gender ideology: Evidence for a multifactorial theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64*, 624-635.
- Spence, J. T. (1984). Masculinity, femininity and gender-related traits: A conceptual analysis and critique of current research. *Progress in Experimental Personality Research, 13*, 1-97.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R. L., & Holahan, C. K. (1979). Negative and positive components of psychological masculinity and femininity and their relationships to self-reports of neurotic and acting out behaviors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37*, 1673-1682.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1974). The Personal Attributes Questionnaire: A measure of sex role stereotypes and masculinity-femininity. *Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 4*, 43-44.
- Storms, M. D. (1979). Sex role identity and its relationships to sex role attributes and sex role stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37*, 1779-1789.