

Women's Ideals for Masculinity across Social Contexts: Patriarchal Agentic Masculinity Is Valued in Work, Family, and Romance but Communal Masculinity in Friendship

Michael Quayle^{1,2}, Graham Lindegger², Kirsty Brittain², Neesa Nabee², and Charlene Cole²

University of Limerick; University of KwaZulu-Natal

Author Note

Michael Quayle, Centre for Social Issues Research, Department of Psychology, University of Limerick and School of Applied Human Sciences, University of KwaZulu-Natal; Graham Lindegger, School of Applied Human Sciences, University of KwaZulu-Natal; Kirsty Brittain, School of Applied Human Sciences, University of KwaZulu-Natal; Neesa Nabee, School of Applied Human Sciences, University of KwaZulu-Natal; Charlene Cole, School of Applied Human Sciences, University of KwaZulu-Natal

The present research was supported by funding from the South African National Research Foundation (grant #TTK1206141295).

Correspondence concerning this manuscript should be addressed to Michael Quayle, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Education and Health Sciences, University of Limerick, Limerick, Ireland. E-mail: mike.quayle@ul.ie

The final publication is available at Springer via [dx.doi.org/ 10.1007/s11199-017-0772-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-017-0772-9)

Abstract

The present study explores women's ideals for masculinity in different social contexts (work, family/romance, and friendship) and compares how traditional (agentic) and non-patriarchal (communal) masculinity are valued in each context. Survey data were collected from one international ($N = 159$) and three South African samples ($Ns = 86, 100, 161$) of women. Results show that although women value patriarchal ideals for masculinity, agentic and communal versions of masculinity are valued differently across contexts. Specifically, traditional agentic versions of masculinity were most valued in the contexts most important to the long-term production of viable identity (family/romance and work). It was only in friendship that non-patriarchal communal masculinity was consistently idealized over traditional agentic masculinity. The results are discussed in relation to hegemonic masculinity (HM) and system justification theory (SJT). Congruent with SJT, women idealized versions of masculinity that may not be in their own or their group's best interests, but in line with HM, the results emphasized the fluidity of masculinity and that the same individual can simultaneously idealize different versions of masculinity depending on the context. Because stereotypes are both explanations for the status quo and warrants for behaving in one way or another, these collective ideals for masculinity and contextual boundaries may be important obstacles to achieving gender equity.

Keywords: masculinity; gender identity; romance; family; professional identity; friendship; sex role attitudes

Women's Ideals for Masculinity across Social Contexts: Patriarchal Agentic Masculinity Is Valued in Work, Family, and Romance but Communal Masculinity in Friendship

Although women are involved in the social construction and validation of ideals for masculinity in collaboration with men, researchers have primarily focussed on men's perspectives on masculinity (Connell & Messerschmidt 2005; Messerschmidt 2012; Talbot & Quayle 2010). Qualitative research has shown that there are multiple versions of masculinity, with different versions being most valued or appropriate in particular contexts (Pfeffer, Rogalin, & Gee 2016). There are also substantial differences in the ways that masculinity is defined across cultures (Guimond 2008) and across specific contexts within cultures (Mehta, & Dementieva 2016). The present study quantitatively explores women's ideals for masculinity across the contexts of work, family/romance, and friendship to explore (a) whether women support patriarchal ideals for masculinity, (b) whether women value multiple versions of masculinity, and (c) whether versions of masculinity are valued differently across contexts. In doing so, the study bridges and compares two literatures of gender oppression: hegemonic masculinity (HM) and system justification theory (SJT).

In the framework of hegemonic masculinity, it is argued that multiple versions of masculinity exist and that these are valued differently in different contexts (Connell & Messerschmidt 2005; Messerschmidt 2012). In HM it is acknowledged that women are subordinated by patriarchal versions of masculinity and that, to be successful, women often need to subscribe to *emphasized femininity*, enacting identities complementary to and supportive of patriarchal versions of masculinity. However, little research in HM has explored women's constructions of masculinities or their investments in different versions (Connell & Messerschmidt 2005; Messerschmidt 2012; Talbot & Quayle 2010).

On the other hand, women's investments in patriarchal features of the gender system have been thoroughly explored by research in system justification theory, which has been described as a model of the cognitive basis for hegemony (Jost & Burgess 2000; van der Toorn & Jost 2014). SJT research has provided substantial evidence that people subordinated by hierarchical systems are often—perhaps even usually—complicit in representing them in ways that support their own subordination.

However, although SJT and related cognitive models such as benevolent sexism (Glick & Fiske 2001) and social dominance orientation (Sidanius & Pratto 1999) articulate and explore differences and flexibility in the ways unfair systems are cognitively appraised (e.g., with ambivalence), their representations of the gender system itself tend to be individualized, monolithic, and static. SJT, for example, argues that individuals are psychologically motivated to uphold the status quo (Jost & Banaji 1994; Jost, Banaji, & Nosek 2004), and provides a useful framework for understanding unitary and static systems, but at the risk of overlooking diversity and dynamics in symbolic systems (Pfeffer et al. 2016; Subašić, Reynolds, Reicher, & Klandermans 2012).

There is a potentially useful synergy between HM and SJT research. HM research has shown that there are many versions of masculinity, and even many patriarchal versions (Messerschmidt 2012; Talbot & Quayle 2010), but it has paid little attention to the perspectives of women in the social construction of masculinity. SJT research has shown that women are complicit in upholding the patriarchal gender system; but has paid little attention to the multiplicity and contextual flexibility of masculinity. Despite the clear relevance of each to the other, to date these literatures have had almost no overlap. At the time of writing, a Thompson Web of Knowledge search for papers with both “system justification” and “hegemonic

masculinity” in the topic fields yielded just one result. This non-overlap is partly because HM is a sociological theory of how power is exerted through symbolic systems whereas SJT is a psychological model of individual perception, cognition, and response (cf. Pfeffer et al. 2016). Notwithstanding these paradigmatic differences, the present paper is a modest attempt to bridge these two literatures, exploring how women construct masculinities in ways that conform in some ways to orthodox patriarchal versions (consistent with SJT), but also how these constructions differ substantially across contexts (consistent with HM).

Hegemonic Masculinity and Emphasized Femininity

The theoretical framework of hegemonic masculinity was developed to understand how the patriarchal domination of women and subordinated men (including men and women who defy heteronormative gender identities) is sustained by democratically enforced social practices and symbolic structures (Connell 1987; Connell & Messerschmidt 2005). It is argued that men who are able to produce or support favourable forms of masculinity are privileged by the structures of hegemonic masculinity. Although less commonly considered, it is also argued that women who produce forms of femininity that favourably dovetail with hegemonic masculinity are also able to benefit from hegemonic systems, but in so doing they are likely to contribute—either actively or inadvertently—to the maintenance of the hegemonic gender system (Connell 1987; Connell & Messerschmidt 2005). For many women this may be preferable to the alternative, because women and men who are unable or unwilling to produce identities that comply with the required forms of masculinity or emphasized femininity are systematically subjugated and excluded from valued identities, experiences, and social domains (cf. Kandiyoti 1988).

Masculinities as Collaborative Productions

In HM, masculinity is not considered a fixed, formulaic, and prescriptive set of rules for behaviour; rather, it is a collaborative production by which individual men (and women) use the symbolic and material resources available to them to position themselves in relation to locally imposed hegemonic standards, simultaneously producing identity and reinforcing (or challenging) the hegemony. We need to understand the “complex strategic combinations of compliance, resistance and co-operation” between those embedded in the gender hegemony, including dominant men and everyone subordinated because “the interplay among them is a major part of the dynamics of change in the gender order as a whole” (Connell 1987, p. 184). Masculinity is thereby produced and validated (or challenged) collaboratively by men, women, and other subjugated groups.

Much has been written exploring the role of men in constructing ideal versions of masculinity (for reviews of the male bias in masculinity research, see Messerschmidt 2012; Talbot & Quayle 2010; Whorley & Addis 2006; Wong, Steinfeldt, Speight, & Hickman 2010). However, it is increasingly acknowledged that gender scholarship exploring “hegemonic masculinity now needs to give much closer attention to the practices of women” (Connell & Messerschmidt 2005, p. 848) and to how men’s and women’s gender definitions interlock in the collaborative production and reproduction of the hegemonic gender system. Masculinity research should therefore not focus exclusively on men and how they define masculinity for themselves, but also on how women define it in order to ultimately explore how hegemonic masculinity is *collectively* produced and validated (Messerschmidt 2012).

Although women are oppressed by patriarchal hegemonic masculinity, for many reasons they may also be complicit in idealising, authenticating, supporting or not opposing patriarchal

and oppressive masculinities (Kandiyoti 1988), not least because doing so in many cases would result in physical, financial or emotional harm. As Connell (1987, p. 187) argued: “the construction of femininity...is likely to polarize around compliance or resistance to this [masculine] dominance.” However, it is not subjugation by force that the idea of hegemony helps us to understand; rather, it is the production of social realities in which patriarchy seems both natural and just. Even when the gender hegemony is resisted, in many contexts the odds are stacked in such a way that producing any successful gender identity requires at least some complicity with traditional/patriarchal gender structures regardless of individual gender or views on patriarchy.

Social Role Theory and System Justification

Social role theory holds that the roles most commonly undertaken by or associated with women and men become the premise for gender stereotypes and that stereotypes arise on the basis of contingencies between categories and behaviours that become generalized, normative, and injunctive (Eagly et al. 2000). Accordingly, once a hierarchical system is established it becomes psychologically self-sustaining. System justification “refers to psychological processes contributing to the preservation of existing social arrangements even at the expense of personal and group interest” (Jost & Banaji 1994, p. 1), particularly how people subordinated within hierarchical systems support representations and ideologies that oppress them. SJT has been described as a theory of the cognitive processes underlying hegemony (Jost 2001). However, where HM considers the gender system to be contextual and fluid, consisting of multiple hierarchically nested masculinities and femininities with different relations of power and privilege in different contexts, SJT considers how “stereotypes are used to explain the existing social system” (Jost & Banaji 1994, p. 10), generally conceptualizing “the ... system” as

relatively static and unitary. Indeed, SJT is quite specifically a theory of how the gender system *remains* static and unitary (Jost 2001).

SJT has a great deal of empirical support in research describing hierarchical intergroup systems generally (Jost et al. 2004) and in gender specifically (Jost & Kay 2005). Research has shown that both women and men tend to be supportive of patriarchal gender stereotypes, particularly—but not only—when stereotypes of men and women are complementary, representing men and women as both having strengths and weaknesses that justify their roles and obligations in the gender system (Glick et al. 2000). Research in benevolent sexism has shown that across a wide variety of cultures women endorse aspects of benevolent sexism, particularly in hostile conditions (Glick et al. 2000).

More recent work has shown that different contexts have different systems of gender relations embedded in stereotypical representations and that these systems complement each other in ways that support the status quo. For example, Cikara and colleagues (Cikara, Lee, Fiske, Glick, & Jost 2009) found that women's power and positive stereotypes in the domestic sphere impeded their power and progress in the public sphere. Becker (2010) found that women endorsed hostile sexist beliefs when thinking about women in the work context but benevolent sexist beliefs when thinking about women in the domestic sphere. So although SJT provides support for the claim of HM that people subordinated in hierarchical systems are often complicit in their reproduction, it is important to also consider how “the system” consists of distinctive representations nested in multiple contexts. It is important as well that SJT is a theory emphasizing stasis and HM is a theory emphasizing how patriarchy is defended through fluidity and change.

Multiple Masculinities Across Contexts

Central to HM is the notion that hegemonic masculinity is fluid and multiple, adapting to historical change while maintaining patriarchy (Connell & Messerschmidt 2005). The requirements for enacting dominant versions of masculinity evolve culturally and historically (Connell 1993) and also differ across contexts (Thompson & Bennett 2015), such as in different branches of the military (Barrett 1996), in therapy groups (Ezzell 2012), or on sports teams (Schacht 1996). People therefore engage different versions of masculinity (and gender more broadly) in different contexts and situations (Connell & Messerschmidt 2005; Edley & Wetherell 1997, Wetherell & Edley 1999), and some of these identities are more closely aligned with patriarchal dominance than others. When considering hegemonic masculinity it is therefore important to ask what contexts are most conducive to alternative versions of masculinity, which contexts are most resistant to change, and how contexts interlock to defend patriarchy.

The Importance of Ideals

Fully realizing any of the idealized features of hegemonic masculinity is difficult for most men, and attaining all of them is usually impossible. Ideals of hegemonic masculinity in a context are unlikely to be “normal” in the sense that most men achieve them (Connell & Messerschmidt 2005). Nevertheless, hegemonic masculinity is structured around normative ideals reflecting what is most honoured and respected in a man. These ideals become symbolic resources for enforcing hegemonic masculinity despite the fact that no ordinary men can achieve them (Connell 1987; Donaldson 1993).

These ideals of hegemonic masculinity and interlocking identities for women are central to many of the grand narratives from which people derive a sense of life-meaning, including marriage and romance (Backus & Mahalik 2011; Burns 2000) and work careers (Batnitzky,

McDowell, & Dyer 2009). Ideals can drive and shape the future plans and ambitions that people have for themselves and others, as well as how people judge identities as successful or shameful in a given context. Despite the fact that gendered ideals can never be fully embodied in practice, and are often not even possible, they are still used as yardsticks for shaping plans and ambitions and judging success, status, and shame (Riley 2003).

Group identity ideals, as a special type of stereotype, also act as collective-level explanations for the way things are and for how things turn out (Haslam, Turner, Oakes, Reynolds, & Doosje 2002). More than that, ideals are collective representations of how the world *should* be and therefore have ideological functions in deciding the appropriateness of identities and actions in particular social contexts and the value of the contexts themselves. Ideals are symbolic resources on which people may draw in social interaction to make sense of social practices and social situations and to justify behaviour and interpretations of behaviour—in that sense they provide symbolic warrants to determine who should be well or badly treated and by whom (cf. Durrheim, Quayle, & Dixon 2016).

Prentice and Carranza (2002) have shown that prescriptive ideals for masculinity in “American society” emphasize agentic characteristics. However, Talbot and Quayle (2010) showed how women idealized different versions of masculinity in different contexts, supporting traditional dominant masculine traits in the contexts of romance and family, but alternative egalitarian non-hegemonic traits when these versions were positioned in the contexts of friendship and, to a lesser extent, work.

The Present Study

Based on SJT we expected women to endorse traditional/patriarchal ideals for masculinity in some contexts (Hypothesis 1), but based on HM we expect these to differ across

contexts (Hypothesis 2). Specifically, based on qualitative research (Talbot & Quayle 2010) and quantitative research on benevolent sexism (Becker 2010; Cikara et al. 2009), we expected women to endorse traditional patriarchal versions of masculinity in domestic and romantic contexts (Hypothesis 2a). We were less sure about women's ideals for masculinity in the work context because Talbot and Quayle's (2010) South African participants endorsed relatively non-patriarchal versions of masculinity in the work context, but in other countries research suggests that stereotypes of masculinity at work are likely to be traditional and patriarchal (Becker 2010; Cikara et al. 2009). We therefore tentatively expected ideals for work masculinity to be relatively egalitarian in South Africa (Hypothesis 2b). Based on Talbot and Quayle's (2010) results we expected patriarchal versions of masculinity to be least, and communal masculinity to be most, idealized in friendship (Hypothesis 2c).

Method

Participants and Design

Four replicated quantitative studies sampled a total of 506 women from a range of ages and backgrounds to explore contextual variation in women's ideals for masculinity. These replications were designed as an integrated programme of research and were written and submitted as minor dissertations. No questions or materials used in the replications are unreported except for minor items like demographics. No comparable replications have been omitted from the analysis.

Replication 1 sampled 86 non-student South African women between the ages of 30 and 60 ($M = 47.43$, $SD = 7.10$) who were all married and employed. Sampling was purposive and participants were approached at local community and church groups and those who agreed were asked to pass the survey link on to people they knew might be interested.

Replications 2 and 3 sampled young people in and around a University campus in South Africa, resulting in ethnically and culturally diverse samples of women who were mainly university students. Replication 2 consisted of 100 participants between the ages of 18 and 25 ($M = 20.31$, $SD = 1.82$). Replication 3 sampled 161 participants aged between 18 and 60 ($M = 21.61$, $SD = 5.04$). Participants were individually approached in public spaces on campus and invited to participate.

Replication 4 aimed to extend the findings beyond the context of South Africa and sampled 159 women between the ages of 20 and 64 ($M = 31.32$, $SD = 9.01$) from 16 different countries (46 from the United States; 22, United Kingdom; 13, Jamaica; 11 Russian Federation; 10, Sweden; 10, Canada; 8, Australia; 8, Ukraine; 7, Norway; 7, South Africa; 6, Ireland; 5, Finland; 3, Latvia; 1 each from China, New Zealand, and the Philippines). Participants were recruited through online social networks, first by snowball sampling through researchers' personal online networks and second by inviting members from Facebook. We intentionally invited users from Facebook pages and apps oriented to traditional (e.g., Hot, Cute or Okay, 2017) and feminist concerns (e.g., Being a Strong Independent Woman, 2017). This allowed us to explore whether the patterns observed in South Africa are comparable to globalized patterns, although the number of women sampled from each individual country was too small to allow specific inter-country comparisons.

In Replications 1, 2, and 4 participants self-selected into the study if they identified as female. Replication 3 specifically sampled people identifying as male or female, but only those identifying as female were included in the current analysis. Missing data were treated case-wise in each stage of analysis. No participants were dropped from analysis for procedural reasons (e.g. spoiled questionnaires).

Procedure

All four replications used the same two-stage design. After obtaining informed consent, participants were asked (a) to rate a list of 35 adjectives for manliness, and then (b) to select the ten adjectives from the list most ideal for a man in each of three contexts: work, friendship, and family/romance.

In Stage 1, participants were first presented with the list of 35 adjectives and given these instructions: “For each of the personality traits listed below, please indicate how ‘manly’ you think they are by circling a number between 1 (‘Not Manly’) and 10 (‘Very Manly’).” In Stage 2, they were asked to identify which ten of these adjectives best described the *ideal man* in each of the three contexts, namely marriage/family, friendship, and work with the following instructions adapted to each context:

Please take a moment to think about an Ideal Husband/Partner [Ideal Male Friend; Ideal Male Work Colleague]. Think about what you would like from him in terms of the role that he would play in the family [in your life; in the work environment] and also in terms of the ideal characteristics that you would like him to possess.

Then please circle/select the 10 words on the list below which best describe this Ideal Husband/Partner [Ideal Male Friend; Ideal Male Work Colleague].

For the contexts of romance/family and work we added a sentence asking participants currently single or unemployed to imagine their ideal in the future. In Replications 1, 2 and 3, the contexts were rated in the same order (family/romance first, then friendship, and finally work). There were minor variations across replications in method of delivery and target contexts.

Replication 1. Data collection was completed online using Limesurvey (LimeSurvey Project Team/Carsten Schmitz 2012). The order of the adjectives was randomized in each list,

and contexts were presented in the same order for each participant. No incentives were offered. Unlike the other three replications where all participants completed both sections, in our first study, 36 participants completed the first stage only (rating adjectives) and 50 completed the second stage only (selecting adjectives as ideal).

Replications 2 and 3. The questionnaires were administered in paper-and-pencil format. The order of the adjectives was randomized in each list and contexts were presented in the same order for each participant. A sweet was offered to each participant as an incentive.

Replication 4. Participants were asked to rate the contexts of “family” and “romantic partner” separately, instead of collapsing them as in the other replications. The order of the adjectives was the same in each list, and contexts were presented in the same order for each participant. No incentive was offered. Contexts were rated in the same order as other replications except that family and romance were split and rated last. Data collection was completed online using LimeSurvey (LimeSurvey Project Team/Carsten Schmitz 2012).

Measures and Outcomes

We aimed, first, to describe empirically the extent to which certain traits are considered by women to be “manly” and, second, to explore how women’s idealized versions of masculinity varied across contexts. A list of 35 gendered adjectives was developed using the Gough Adjective Check List (1952) as a starting point. Negative and outdated words were dropped, as were synonyms. Characteristics identified more recently as being norms of masculinities were included (Prentice & Carranza 2002; Sherriffs & McKee 1957; Talbot & Quayle 2010). Although many studies have use gendered adjective inventories such as this one to directly assess gender representations, in our study we took the extra step of asking participants to rate the “manliness” of the words themselves in Stage 1 and then use their own ratings as the basis

for quantifying the “manliness” of the words selected as ideal in each context in Stage 2.

Results

Preliminary Analyses

Masculinity factors. The first stage of analysis used factor analysis to distinguish between different versions of manliness and the extent to which each adjective corresponded to these dimensions. Because factor analysis ideally requires large samples, a global factor analysis using principle components extraction and varimax rotation was initially performed on all adjective ratings from the four replications combined ($N = 456$) to identify overall patterns. The scree plot showed that a two-factor solution was most appropriate, with these two factors accounting for 46.45% of the overall variance.

The rotated factor loadings for the first factor in the combined analysis are displayed in Table 1 and show that the factor is driven by communal characteristics (Bakan 1966; Eagly et al. 2000). The adjectives with the highest loadings on this factor were caring, kind, understanding, respectful, helpful, sincere, reliable, sympathetic, nice, thoughtful, affectionate, friendly, and sensitive. This *communal masculinity* aligns with what Demetriou (2001) called *new masculinity*. The rotated factor loadings for the second factor oriented to agentic characteristics (Bakan 1966; Eagly et al. 2000) (see Table 1). The most indicative adjectives were tough, strong, masculine, powerful, dominant, protective, driven, assertive, courageous, handsome, decisive, and ambitious. This *agentic masculinity* aligns with the version of masculinity often referred to as *traditional masculinity* in HM research (Connell 1995; Demetriou 2001; Frosh, Phoenix, & Pattman 2002; Speer 2005). This two-factor analysis was also conducted for each replication, and these confirm that this factor structure was stable across samples. (These within-sample analyses are available as an [online supplement](#).)

Across the combined sample, the mean manliness ratings of the 35 adjectives ranged between 6.50 (nice) and 8.48 (protective) and ranked roughly as one would expect (see Table 1), from characteristics conventionally related to traditional hegemonic masculinity with the highest manliness ratings (e.g., courageous, strong, tough, powerful) and non-traditional features rated as least manly (e.g., nice, thoughtful, affectionate).

Adjective scoring. The second stage of analysis quantified participants' ratings of the types of manliness ideal in each context by collating the factor loadings for the adjectives selected as ideal in context and using these to construct a factor-based scale. Each participant had selected ten words from the list of 35 that best represented ideal masculinity in each context. These were coded for selection (1 if selected; 0 if not). Weighted factor based scales (de Vaus 2002; Rummel 1970) were calculated for each factor in each context as the average of the products of the replication-specific factor loading and selection-code (thereby including it if 1; excluding it if 0). This procedure scored the subset of adjectives selected by each participant for each context weighted by its loading on each factor, resulting in a factor-based scale.

To illustrate the procedure: if a participant in Replication 4 had selected the adjective *caring* to describe the ideal male work colleague, then it would contribute .756 (i.e. 1 times the factor loading) for the first dimension and .052 for the second dimension for the context of work (see the [online supplement](#) for context-specific factor loadings). This procedure would be repeated for each adjective selected by each participant, and the scores averaged. For each participant this resulted in a measure theoretically ranging between -1 and +1 for each type of masculinity (communal and agentic) in the context. The procedure was repeated for each context. To make the estimates of communal and agentic masculinity more directly comparable, they were standardized prior to analysis. This procedure resulted in z-scores estimating the extent

to which participants' ideals supported communal masculinity and agentic masculinity in the contexts of family, friendship and work for Replications 1, 2, and 3 and family, friendship, work, and romance for Replication 4.

Comparing Masculinities across Contexts

In order to test our hypotheses, differences in *z*-scaled communal and agentic masculinity were compared using paired-samples *t*-tests (Hypothesis 1) with Bonferroni corrections for multiple comparisons, and differences in communal and agentic masculinity were compared across contexts using repeated-measures multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) for each replication and for the combined results (Hypotheses 2 and 2a, b, and c) with Sidak corrections for multiple pairwise comparisons. Because the assumption of sphericity was violated in several of these models, significance tests are reported with Greenhouse-Geisser corrections where appropriate. To explore the actual descriptions used by participants to characterize ideal masculinity across contexts we explored the combined data with multinomial logistic regression.

Replication 1: Mature non-student women. Although there were significant differences between agentic and communal masculinity in the contexts of family/romance, $t(49) = -2.67$, $p = .010$, $d = .73$, and friendship, $t(49) = -9.98$, $p < .001$, $d = 2.75$, these favoured communal masculinity in both cases (see Table 2a). Hypothesis 1 predicted that women would endorse agentic ideals for masculinity, and it was therefore not supported in our study. Exploring differences across contexts, the multivariate test for within-subjects effects was significant, $F(4,46) = 42.03$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .79$, Wilk's $\lambda = .22$, with univariate tests indicating significant differences by context for both communal, $F(1.55, 75.93) = 32.09$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .40$, and agentic masculinity, $F(1.86, 91.08) = 47.94$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .54$. Patterns of significant differences supported Hypothesis 2a (see Table 2a), which predicted that agentic masculinity

would be more valued in domestic and romantic contexts with significant differences in the expected direction observed in the friendship:work and friendship:family comparisons.

Hypothesis 2c predicted that patriarchal versions of masculinity would be least, and communal masculinity most, idealized in friendship. This pattern was supported because ideals for friendship significantly differed from both other contexts for both communal and agentic masculinity and these differences were all in the predicted direction. The results provide limited support for Hypothesis 2b, which predicted that ideals for work would be relatively egalitarian in the South African context, because although women in our sample did not idealize particularly high levels of communal masculinity at work, there was no significant difference between agentic and communal masculinity in that context.

Replication 2: Young women sampled at a South African university. Supporting Hypothesis 1, which predicted support for patriarchal ideals for masculinity, agentic masculinity was favoured over communal masculinity in the contexts of family, $t(99) = 3.61, p < .001, d = .70$, and work, $t(99) = 4.42, p < .001, d = .86$, although communal masculinity was significantly favoured in friendship, $t(99) = -9.41, p < .001, d = 1.82$. The multivariate test for within-subjects effects was significant, Wilk's $\lambda = .33, F(4,96) = 49.40, p < .001, \eta^2 = .67$. Univariate tests indicated significant differences across contexts for both communal, $F(1.52, 150.80) = 24.40, p < .001, \eta^2 = .20$, and agentic masculinity, $F(1.88, 186.22) = 66.70, p < .001, \eta^2 = .40$. As displayed in Table 2b, patterns of significant differences broadly support Hypothesis 2, which predicted ideals for both agentic and communal masculinity to differ across contexts. Specifically, for both communal and agentic masculinity, there were significant differences for the friendship:family and friendship:work comparisons but not for family:work. The results support Hypothesis 2a, which predicted endorsement of traditional patriarchal versions of

masculinity in domestic and romantic contexts, and Hypothesis 2c, which predicted agentic masculinity to be least, and communal masculinity to be most, idealized in friendship. This replication does not support Hypothesis 2b, which predicted egalitarianism in the work context, because agentic masculinity was significantly more idealized in the work context than was communal masculinity.

Replication 3: Young women sampled at a South African University. Hypothesis 1 predicted that agentic masculinity would be idealized in some contexts, and this was so in the contexts of family, $t(151) = 7.96, p < .001, d = 1.18$, and work, $t(121) = 7.99, p < .001, d = 1.40$. Communal masculinity was preferred in the context of friendship, $t(148) = -7.85, p < .001, d = 1.26$. The multivariate test for within-subjects effects was significant, Wilk's $\lambda = .29, F(4,118) = 73.44, p < .001, \eta^2 = .71$. Univariate tests indicated significant differences by context for both communal, $F(1.73, 209.75) = 38.11, p < .001, \eta^2 = .24$, and agentic masculinity, $F(1.96, 237.44) = 100.83, p < .001, \eta^2 = .46$. Patterns of significant pairwise comparisons (displayed in Table 2c) supported Hypothesis 2, which expected ideals to differ across contexts. Specifically, for both communal and masculinity, the friendship:family and friendship:work comparisons were significant as was the work:family comparison for agentic masculinity. These results supported Hypothesis 2a, which expected agentic masculinity to be idealized in domestic and romantic contexts, and Hypothesis 2c, which predicted that communal masculinity would be most, and agentic masculinity least, idealized in the context of friendship. Hypothesis 2b predicted ideals for work masculinity to be relatively egalitarian in South Africa but was not supported by the results because participants idealized agentic significantly more than communal masculinity in the work context.

Replication 4: International online sample. This replication asked female participants

to select adjectives indicative of their ideals of masculinity in the contexts of family, friendship, work, and romance. There were no significant differences between agentic and communal masculinity in the contexts of family or romance. Supporting Hypothesis 1, which predicted endorsement for agentic masculinity in some contexts, agentic masculinity was preferred in the context of work, $t(158) = 4.39, p < .001, d = .67$, although communal masculinity was preferred in friendship, $t(158) = -13.76, p < .001, d = 2.02$. The multivariate test for within-subjects effects was significant, Wilk's $\lambda = .33, F(6, 153) = 52.99, p < .001, \eta^2 = .68$. Supporting Hypothesis 2, which predicted ideals to differ across contexts, univariate tests indicated significant differences by context for both communal, $F(2.19, 342.37) = 41.32, p < .001, \eta^2 = .21$, and agentic masculinity, $F(2.11, 332.77) = 40.31, p < .001, \eta^2 = .20$.

As shown in Table 2d, the friendship:family, friendship:romance, and friendship:work comparisons were significant for both for communal and agentic masculinity. Additionally for agentic masculinity the work:family and work:romance comparisons were significantly different. Communal masculinity was favoured only in the context of friendship. This pattern of results provides some support for Hypothesis 2a, which expected women to endorse agentic versions of masculinity in domestic and romantic contexts because agentic masculinity was significantly higher in family and romance than in friendship; but, it was also significantly lower than in the context of work. The pattern of significant comparisons provides strong support for Hypothesis 2c, which predicted that communal masculinity would be most, and agentic masculinity would be least, favoured in the context of friendship. Hypothesis 2b was not relevant here because it related only to South African contexts.

Combined results across replications. There were significant differences between agentic and communal masculinity in every context. Agentic masculinity was favoured in the

contexts of family, $t(460) = 5.71, p < .001, d = .50$, and work, $t(430) = 8.69, p < .001, d = .81$, providing support for Hypothesis 1. Communal masculinity was preferred in the context of friendship, $t(457) = -19.55, p < .001, d = 1.75$.

We ran a MANOVA on the combined data from all replications to determine the significance of the overall pattern of effects, Wilk's $\lambda = .303, F(4, 427) = 245.93, p < .001, \eta^2 = .70$. Univariate tests indicated significant differences across context for both communal, $F(1.62, 697.40) = 117.79, p < .001, \eta^2 = .22$, and agentic masculinity, $F(1.75, 753.88) = 277.29, p < .001, \eta^2 = .39$. As shown in Table 2e, the differences in communal masculinity were significant when comparing the contexts of friendship:work and friendship:family, but not when comparing work:family ($p = .103$). The differences in agentic masculinity were significant across all context comparisons. These results support hypotheses 1, 2, 2a, and 2c. Hypothesis 2b was not relevant here because the combined sample includes South African and international participants.

Summary of results across replications. The patterns were not identical across contexts: Indeed in replication 1 (which purposively sampled a non-student population of married women) differences between agentic and communal masculinity were significant, but opposite to hypotheses. However, unexpected patterns were overwhelmed when the samples were combined. In general, the results supported Hypothesis 1, which predicted that women would idealize agentic masculinity in at least one context, because in three of the four replications women favoured agentic over communal ideals for masculinity.

Hypothesis 2 was generally supported in all replications because there were significant differences in the extent to which each version of masculinity was idealized across contexts in each replication. Hypothesis 2a predicted that women would idealize agentic masculinity in the

context of family/romance. Although, as reported previously, there were minor variations across replications, this prediction was certainly the case in the combined results (see Table 2e) because agentic masculinity was significantly more idealized than was communal masculinity within that context, and agentic ideals were significantly more idealized in family than in friendship (although less in family than in work). Tentative Hypothesis 2b was not supported because, in the context of work, agentic masculinity was considered more ideal than was communal masculinity in all replications except for replication 1. Descriptively, although there was strong agreement across replications about the ideal of agentic masculinity at work, there were disparities across replications regarding the extent to which communal masculinity was *not* valued at work, with the South African student sample in replication 3 and the international sample in replication 4 idealizing communal masculinity in the context of work far less than the sample of mature South African women in replication 1 or the South African student sample in replication 2.

There was strong and consistent support for Hypothesis 2c which predicted that communal masculinity would be most, and agentic masculinity would be least, valued in the context of friendship. The predicted pattern was observed across all four replications and in the combined analysis: Communal masculinity was highly prized, and agentic masculinity was unwelcome in friendship.

Characterizing Masculinity Ideals

The multinomial logistic regression model predicting context from the adjectives selected as context descriptions was significant, $\chi^2(90) = 1722.71, p < .001$, and accounted for a very large proportion of the variance, indicating substantial consistency in the way contexts were characterized by participants (Nagelkerke's pseudo $R^2 = .81$). As shown in Table 3, compared to

the ideal friend, participants were significantly *less* likely to characterize the ideal husband/partner as easy-going, sympathetic, friendly, helpful, self-reliant, nice, and kind. Compared to the ideal friend, the ideal husband/partner was significantly *more* likely to be characterized as hardworking, strong, handsome, and affectionate. Compared to the ideal friend, participants characterized ideal masculinity in the work context as less affectionate, caring, outgoing, sensitive, and easy-going and *more* ambitious, assertive, dynamic, driven, powerful, and hardworking.

Discussion

The present study asked women to (a) rate the “manliness” of gender-related adjectives and (b) identify which descriptions are ideals for masculinity in the contexts of work, family/romance, and friendship to test the hypotheses that women sometimes endorse traditional patriarchal ideals for masculinity (Hypothesis 1) but that ideals differ across contexts (Hypothesis 2), with traditional patriarchal ideals most idealized in domestic and romantic contexts (Hypothesis 2a), less in work contexts (Hypothesis 2b), and (2c) least in friendship (Hypothesis 2c). Results supported Hypotheses 1, 2, 2a, and 2c but not Hypothesis 2b, supporting recent work showing that contemporary gender ideals in important contexts have changed very little in recent decades (Haines, Deaux, & Lofaro 2016). The present study, however, does highlight the possibility that shifts in stereotypes are contextually bounded and that substantial change can occur in some contexts without propagating to others.

Both systems justification theory and the concept of hegemonic masculinity are useful for explaining key features of women's ideals for masculinity evident in our results. In line with expectations derived from HM, SJT, and benevolent sexism, results confirm that patriarchal representations of ideal masculinity are reproduced by many women in some contexts. In both

HM and SJT it is argued that the power of the gender system derives from the distributed ideological consent of those subject to it, as well as that it is maintained mainly by complicity rather than force. In this light, it is entirely unsurprising that women subordinated in the gender system contribute to upholding and reproducing it.

However, in line with HM, these representations differ across contexts, with women's ideals for masculinity being most agentic and patriarchal in the contexts of romance/family and work, and least patriarchal in the context of friendship—the least important or prestigious of these contexts for developing life-narratives. HM emphasizes the multiplicity and contextual fluidity of hegemonic masculinity, noting that the specific demands of the hegemonic gender system change from context to context and evolve over time, all the while preserving patriarchal privilege in most contexts (Connell & Messerschmidt 2005). The present study supports this model in two ways. First, there were substantial differences in women's ideals for masculinity across contexts. Second, the study identified two distinctive versions of masculinity that were valued differently across contexts, supporting the central argument of HM that masculinity is both multiple and fluid.

These findings echo work exploring SJT through the lens of benevolent sexism (cf. Cikara et al. 2009; Clow, Ricciardelli, & Bartfay 2015), which also has identified substantially different gender representations across contexts and which emphasizes that the resilience of patriarchal gender systems lies partly in the way contexts act as bulkheads to change. Egalitarianism in one context (e.g., friendship) does not naturally or inevitably propagate to other contexts, and women's success in some contexts (e.g., as homemakers) may actually impede progress in others (Cikara et al. 2009; Clow et al. 2015).

In our results it seems important that the contexts in which women selected the most

traditional/orthodox ideals for masculinity are particularly central to the production of identity and the practical allocation of resources and status in society. For example, the ideal husband or romantic partner was described as less sympathetic, helpful, and kind, as well as more strong, handsome, and hard-working. This characterization of the ideal husband or romantic partner fits well with traditional romantic narratives, and it also provides ideological justification for gender inequity in domestic labour, which is still the reality for most women (Baxter, Haynes, Western, & Hewitt 2013; Bernhardt, Noack, & Lyngstad 2008; Davis & Greenstein 2004; Tai & Treas 2013). Work and family, especially, are contexts in which feminists, both men and women, might hope to idealize equality and less dominant, patriarchal versions of masculinity given the importance of achieving equity in those contexts for success and well-being.

It is possible that participants in our study selected characteristics ideal for *anyone* in each context, in other words, that the ratings indicate characteristics of the ideal friend, partner, and worker regardless of gender. This is particularly possible in the contexts of work and friendship. Just as Schneider & Bos (2014) found greater overlap between male and professional identities than between female and professional identities, our results showed that ideals for men at work map onto stereotypes of men in general. Even if this is the case, it is still instructive that the ideals for masculinity overlap with contextual ideals in ways that validate patriarchal dominance. However, in the context of the romantic or domestic partner, this alternative explanation does not hold for heterosexual women because ideals for men in this context did not emphasize the care and nurturance that one would expect of *anyone* in that context (as they did for the ideal friend), but rather emphasized features of traditional hegemonic masculinity dramatically different from ideals for women in those contexts. These findings invite us to consider the ways in which contextual boundaries may constrain correspondent inferences from

roles to stereotypes (Eagly & Steffen 1984; Eagly et al. 2000).

Our findings are also consistent with Jost and Kay's (2005) argument that complementary gender stereotypes (in general) have a system justifying effect; in other words that complementary stereotypes for men and women give a sense that everyone has their place in a system that, overall, appears just and fair. The present study reminds us that gender ideals are not merely complementary across categories (i.e., for men and women), but across contexts as well. This raises the possibility that equality in some contexts (e.g., in friendship, where men are expected to be highly communal) can offset inequality in others (e.g., in family or romance). For example, if you can say that your romantic partner is your best friend, then any gender inequality idealized in the symbolic context of romance is offset by the equality embedded in friendship. The status and power embedded in each of these contexts is not equivalent, however, and people tend to associate agency with high-status roles and communion with low-status ones (Eagly & Steffen 1984; Eagly et al. 2000; Jost & Kay 2005). Therefore any sense of overall fairness masks underlying injustice.

These stereotypes and ideals justify systems of inequality (Jost & Kay 2005), but are not inevitable; rather, they are produced strategically to defend group identity and privilege (Haslam et al. 2002; Reicher, Hopkins, & Condor 1997). Further research is required to tease out how gender ideals intersect with contextual ideals and how these intersections may act as bulkheads against gender equality.

To some extent our results are also consistent with social role theory (Eagly et al. 2000) because the agentic ideals for masculinity in the contexts of work and family/romance align with role-related stereotypes for men as workers and providers. However, gender-role theory argues that stereotypes arise from correspondent inferences about specific roles that are generalized

across roles and contexts. The present study, in line with HM, identifies a particular context (friendship) where the general ideals for masculinity are suspended in favour of communal ideals that are specifically and locally idealized in that context. It is worth noting that, compared to romance/family and work contexts, platonic friendship is a historically new and egalitarian invention (Peele 2009) that transcends a long history of prohibition of cross-gender relationships outside of marriage and family structures (although there is an argument that cross-sex friendships have an evolutionary basis; see Bleske-Rechek & Buss 2001). The provenance of the context is undoubtedly related to its non-patriarchal ideals for masculinity, which is a reminder that the contexts are historically, geographically, and culturally bound (Connell 1987).

We must return for a moment to the problem of paradigmatic differences: Key authors in HM are deeply resistant to individualized interpretations of hegemony (Connell & Messerschmidt 2005; Messerschmidt 2012; Pfeffer et al. 2016), whereas SJT has been specifically described as a model of the cognitive basis for hegemony (Jost & Burgess 2000; van der Toorn & Jost 2014). The finding that women's ideals for masculinity support traditional and patriarchal versions of masculinity could be interpreted according to SJT as evidence of participants' individual false consciousness. If women's ideals for men provide a warrant for men to continue as usual, then the corollary is that the burden of change rests primarily on women.

Social constructionist models like HM, however, argue that our results are indicative of how gender is ideologically embedded in the collective symbolic representations by which we make sense of gender (Dixon & Wetherell 2004). Because rejecting masculine ideals may require rejecting valued potential self-identities as well, patriarchal versions of masculinity may have considerable social inertia (cf. Park, Young, Troisi, & Pinkus 2011). For example, in the

context of heterosexual romance, valued masculine ideals are often traditional and patriarchal (Talbot & Quayle 2010), but these ideals of masculinity-for-romance may be difficult for one to reject without excluding one's-self from the narrative of romance altogether. The resilience of the hegemonic social order is partially derived from a collective willingness to suspend expectations of equitable gender norms in valued contexts (Talbot & Quayle 2010).

If traditional, dominant, patriarchal ideals of masculinity dovetail with highly valued forms of social life, such as business, family and romance, this may somewhat explain how certain contexts of social practice are more resistant to gender transformation than are others (cf. Becker 2010; Cikara et al. 2009). Although women are increasingly encouraged to take on agentic characteristics, men are still systematically deterred from communal roles, careers, and contexts (Croft, Schmader, & Block 2015). These expectations, however, can and do change: The ideals for hegemonic masculinity (the version of masculinity most revered and respected) can be changed over time and across contexts. For example, Banchevsky and Park (2016) show that people (in the U.S.) perceive typical contemporary fathers as more communal than those in the past, and they expect that this trend will continue. Others have shown communal ideals for masculinity to vary substantially across countries, with hegemonic masculinity in South Africa being substantially more "traditional" and agentic than in Sweden, where communal characteristics are now fundamental to hegemonic masculinity in some contexts, particularly in parenthood (Jewkes et al. 2015). Although cross-cultural comparison was not an intended aim of our study, we can report that the results for South African (replications 1, 2 and 3) and international (replication 4) samples were similar for friendship and work but less so for family and romance. So although there are many cross-cultural similarities in these particular gender ideals (cf. Williams, Satterwhite, & Best 1999), there are also some differences that emphasize

the potential flexibility of these ideals.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

A serious risk with this tradition of research is that, in attempting to understand the structure and dynamics of the existing gender system, we re-inscribe and reify the gender binary and associated heteronormativity at the heart of that system (Knights & Kerfoot 2004; Peterson 2003). So, although theoretically our study subscribes to a social constructionist notion of gender, methodologically it has relied on operationalisations of gender and context that only partially capture the multiplicity and fluidity of gender or the intersectional nature of identity.

Similarly, the characterization of the vast range of real-life contexts of masculinity into a few predefined categories (work, friendship, and family/romance) is very narrow; in reality there is a very broad range of contexts important to people in characterizing different requirements of masculinity and these contexts do not have clear boundaries. The categories we have chosen are neither exhaustive nor mutually exclusive (because, for example, an office romance conflates at least two of them). We asked our participants to roughly divide their social world in a way that matched our own theoretical models, but that may or may not have mapped on to their own ways of differentiating identity contexts. Furthermore, as predicted by HM, even contexts that are still strongly patriarchal like “work” are not uniformly dominated by men; for example, Clow et al. (2015) show that different versions of masculinity are required in the work context of nursing compared to more male-dominated domains like business. The range of adjectives we selected for participants to choose from to characterize ideal masculinity within each context was just as crude and may or may not map on to participants’ own ways of characterizing ideal and non-ideal masculinity in different contexts. Our lack of systematic counterbalancing could also have resulted in order effects or introduced demand characteristics.

Perhaps more importantly, it is not inevitable that there is any practical relationship between symbolic ideals, stereotypes, and actual practice at all. Selecting ideals in a questionnaire may be different to women's actual practices in real-life contexts (Spears & Smith 2001). Nevertheless, ideals provide importance reference standards against which personal experiences are judged (Connell & Messerschmidt 2005). We also know that people's other values and identities are likely to impact on how they construct contextual gender ideals. For example, Backus and Mahalik (2011) found that feminist women were less likely than non-feminists were to value traditional, patriarchal norms for romantic partners.

Practice Implications

Our findings are simple ideas and as core features of both HM and SJT approaches to understanding gender, power, and patriarchy, they are not novel. However, they are powerful because they provide a compelling reason why traditional norms of hegemonic masculinity are so resistant to change and why some contexts are more resistant to change than others. For example, understanding the ways that women construct ideals for masculinity could be instructive in exploring questions about paid work, such as: Why women are still paid less for equal work (Weichselbaumer & Winter-Ebmer 2005)? Why women do more domestic work (Davis & Greenstein 2004), more unappealing domestic work (Tai & Treas 2013) and yet still think that gender inequity in domestic work is fair (Baxter et al. 2013), even in Norway and Sweden which are among the most gender-equal countries in the world (Bernhardt et al. 2008)? If old-fashioned patriarchal features of masculinity are idealized in a particular context, men who uphold these ideals are likely to be considered ideal, and it should be no surprise that society fails to be outraged at inequities that mirror these ideals.

Our simple set of findings therefore leaves us with a challenge: How is it possible to

reimagine narratives, stereotypes, and other symbolic resources related to important contexts (such as work and family/romance) to enable ordinary people to idealize gender differently, that is, in ways that better promote equity? Is this even possible, or are cultural narratives of things like work and romance too culturally powerful and affectively enjoyable to allow the space for change? In this sense, hegemonic masculinity is a hopeful framework (Connell & Messerschmidt 2005). Whereas SJT explains why hierarchies seem natural, inevitable, and unchangeable, HM argues that the hegemony only appears natural and inevitable from within. Once change has occurred, it seems strange that it once seemed so unobtainable. However, to obtain such change, the symbolic capital of traditional hegemonic masculinity must be de-linked from valued contexts such as romance and work, the contexts themselves must be re-imagined to de-masculinize them, and equitable gender ideals must be woven into workable identity narratives in all life contexts—not just the ones that are relatively unimportant to life goals and narratives like friendship.

We suspect that traditional hegemonic characteristics are idealized in important contexts because the narratives and stereotypes defining the contexts are so closely aligned to traditional norms of masculinity. For example, if you imagine the features required by “a person” to succeed in business, they will most likely overlap substantially with characteristics traditionally idealized in masculinity. Similarly, romance is structured around a narrative of male agency and, therefore, producing a romantic life-narrative requires constructing a suitably romantic (and therefore traditionally masculine) life-partner. In other words, the requirements for masculinity are deeply embedded in the symbolic and discursive structure of these contexts. Indeed, we argue that they are so deeply embedded that individual women and men who wish to participate in these contexts are likely to find it difficult to construct ideals of masculinity in alternative ways

and that alternative ideals of masculinity will probably require more effort and negotiation to sustain than conventional ones (cf. Talbot & Quayle 2010).

Our research emphasizes that effort is required to de-link the symbolic representations of masculinity from symbolic representations of important life contexts like business and family. With little effort, aspects of important contexts (education, work, politics, sport, etc.) can be emphasized that highlight the inadequacies of traditional versions of masculinity. The ways we describe and structure contexts could emphasize new gender ideals and place the onus on men to find new (non-patriarchal) ways of being in order to succeed in those environments.

Conclusion

Our results contribute to the current dialogue in gender studies by bridging research in SJT and HM to provide evidence (a) that women play an important role in the idealization of patriarchal masculinity despite their own subordination by it; (b) that there are multiple versions of masculinity; (c) that the extent to which women value traditional features of masculinity in relation to alternative communal features of masculinity depends very much on the context in which the masculinity is being considered; (d) that two contexts of critical importance to the production of modern identity narratives (work and romance) are also contexts in which traditional, agentic versions of masculinity are particularly idealized by many women and in which communal masculinity is much less valued; and (e) that the same person can support traditional or alternative versions of masculinity simultaneously, depending on the context. Women and people of other genders construct masculinity in concert with men, and achieving equality in important contexts might require us to collectively recalibrate ideals for masculinity with feminist principles.

References

- Backus, F. R., & Mahalik, J. R. (2011). The masculinity of Mr. Right: Feminist identity and heterosexual women's ideal romantic partners. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 35*(2), 318-326. doi: 10.1177/0361684310392357
- Bakan, D. (1966). *The duality of human existence: An essay on psychology and religion*. England: Rand McNally.
- Banchefsky, S., & Park, B. (2016). The 'new father': Dynamic stereotypes of fathers. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 17*(1), 103-107. doi: 10.1037/a0038945
- Barrett, F. J. (1996). The organizational construction of hegemonic masculinity: The case of the US navy. *Gender, Work & Organization, 3*(3), 129-142. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0432.1996.tb00054.x
- Batnitzky, A., McDowell, L., & Dyer, S. (2009). Flexible and strategic masculinities: The working lives and gendered identities of male migrants in london. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 35*(8), 1275-1293. doi: 10.1080/13691830903123088
- Baxter, J., Haynes, M., Western, M., & Hewitt, B. (2013). Gender, justice and domestic work: Life course transitions and perceptions of fairness. *Longitudinal and Life Course Studies, 4*(1), 78-85.
- Becker, J. C. (2010). Why do women endorse hostile and benevolent sexism? The role of salient female subtypes and internalization of sexist contents. *Sex Roles, 62*(7-8), 453-467. doi: 10.1007/s11199-009-9707-4
- Being a Strong Independent Woman. (2017, March 3). Retrieved from <https://www.facebook.com/Being-a-Strong-Independent-Woman-185781448134898>
- Bernhardt, E., Noack, T., & Lyngstad, T. H. (2008). Shared housework in Norway and Sweden:

- Advancing the gender revolution. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 18(3), 275-288.
- Bleske-Rechek, A. L. & Buss, D. M. (2001). Opposite-sex friendship: Sex differences and similarities in initiation, selection, and dissolution. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27(10), 1310-1323. doi: 10.1177/01461672012710007
- Burns, A. (2000). IV. Looking for Love in Intimate Heterosexual Relationships. *Feminism & Psychology*, 10(4), 481-485.
- Cikara, M., Lee, T. L., Fiske, S. T., Glick, P., & Jost, J. T. (2009). Ambivalent sexism at home and at work: How attitudes toward women in relationships foster exclusion in the public sphere. In A. C. Kay & H. Thorisdottir (Eds.), *Social and psychological bases of ideology and system justification* (pp. 444-462). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Clow, K. A., Ricciardelli, R., & Bartfay, W. J. (2015). Are you man enough to be a nurse? The impact of ambivalent sexism and role congruity on perceptions of men and women in nursing advertisements. *Sex Roles*, 72(7-8), 363-376. doi: 10.1007/s11199-014-0418-0
- Connell, R.W. (1987). *Gender and power*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Connell, R. W. (1993). The big picture: Masculinities in recent world history. *Theory and Society*, 22(5), 597-623. doi: 10.1007/bf00993538
- Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J.W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender & Society*, 19, 829-859. doi: 10.1177/0891243205278639
- Croft, A., Schmader, T., & Block, K. (2015). An underexamined inequality: Cultural and psychological barriers to men's engagement with communal roles. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 19(4), 343-370. doi: 10.1177/1088868314564789
- Davis, S. N., & Greenstein, T. N. (2004). Cross-national variations in the division of household

- labor. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66(5), 1260-1271. doi: 10.1111/j.0022-2445.2004.00091.x
- Demetriou, D. Z. (2001). Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity: A critique. *Theory and Society*, 30(3), 337-361.
- de Vaus, D. A. (2002). *Surveys in social research* (5th ed.). London: Routledge.
- Dixon, J., & Wetherell, M. (2004). On discourse and dirty nappies: Gender, the division of household labour and the social psychology of distributive justice. *Theory & Psychology*, 14(2), 167-189.
- Donaldson, M. (1993). What is hegemonic masculinity? *Theory and Society*, 22(5), 643-657.
- Durrheim, K., Quayle, M., & Dixon, J. (2016). The struggle for the nature of 'prejudice': 'Prejudice' expression as identity performance. *Political Psychology*, 37(1), 17-35. doi: 10.1111/pops.12310
- Eagly, A. H., & Steffen, V. J. (1984). Gender stereotypes stem from the distribution of women and men into social roles. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46(4), 735-754.
- Eagly, A. H., Wood, W. & Diekmann, A. B. (2000). Social role theory of sex differences and similarities: A current appraisal. In T. Trautner & H.M. Eckes (Eds.), *The developmental social psychology of gender* (pp. 123-174). New York: Psychology Press.
- Edley, N., & Wetherell, M. (1997). Jockeying for position: the construction of masculine identities. *Discourse and Society*, 8, 203-217.
- Ezzell, M. B. (2012). "I'm in control": Compensatory manhood in a therapeutic community. *Gender & Society*, 26(2), 190-215.
- Frosh, S., Phoenix, A., & Pattman, R. (2002). *Young masculinities*. New York: Palgrave.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2001). An ambivalent alliance: Hostile and benevolent sexism as

- complementary justifications for gender inequality. *American Psychologist*, 56(2), 109-118.
- Glick, P., Fiske, S. T., Mladinic, A., Saiz, J. L., Abrams, D., Masser, B., ... López, W. L. (2000). Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: Hostile and benevolent sexism across cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(5), 763-775. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.79.5.763
- Gough, H. G. (1952). Identifying psychological femininity. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 12, 427-439. doi:10.1177/001316445201200309
- Guimond, S. (2008). Psychological similarities and differences between women and men across cultures. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2(1), 494--510. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-9004.2007.00036.x
- Haines, E. L., Deaux, K. & Lofaro, N. (2016). The times they are a-changing ... or are they not? A comparison of gender stereotypes, 1983–2014. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 40(3), 353-363. doi: 10.1177/0361684316634081
- Haslam, S. A., Turner, J. C., Oakes, P. J., Reynolds, K. J., & Doosje, B. (2002). From personal pictures in the head to collective tools in the world: How shared stereotypes allow groups to represent and change social reality. In C. McGarty, V. Y. Yzerbyt & R. Spears (Eds.), *Stereotypes as explanations: The formation of meaningful beliefs about social groups* (pp. 157-185). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hot, Cute or OK. (2017, March 3). Retrieved from <https://apps.facebook.com/hotcuteokay/>
- Jewkes, R., Morrell, R., Hearn, J., Lundqvist, E., Blackbeard, D., Lindegger, G., ... Gottzén, L. (2015). Hegemonic masculinity: Combining theory and practice in gender interventions. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 17(2), 96-111. doi: 10.1080/13691058.2015.1085094

- Jost, J. T. (2001). Outgroup favoritism and the theory of system justification: A paradigm for investigating the effects of socioeconomic success on stereotype content. In G. B. Moskowitz (Ed.), *Cognitive social psychology: The Princeton symposium on the legacy and future of social cognition* (pp. 89-102). Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Jost, J. T. & Banaji, M. R. (1994). The role of stereotyping in system-justification and the production of false consciousness. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 33(1), 1-27. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8309.1994.tb01008.x
- Jost, J. T., Banaji, M. R., & Nosek, B. A. (2004). A decade of system justification theory: Accumulated evidence of conscious and unconscious bolstering of the status quo. *Political Psychology*, 25(6), 881-919. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9221.2004.00402.x
- Jost, J. T., & Burgess, D. (2000). Attitudinal ambivalence and the conflict between group and system justification motives in low status groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26(3), 293-305. doi: 10.1177/0146167200265003
- Jost, J. T., & Kay, A. C. (2005). Exposure to benevolent sexism and complementary gender stereotypes: Consequences for specific and diffuse forms of system justification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88(3), 498-509. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.88.3.498
- Kandiyoti, D. (1988). Bargaining with patriarchy. *Gender & Society*, 2(3), 274-290.
- Knights, D., & Kerfoot, D. (2004). Between representations and subjectivity: Gender binaries and the politics of organizational transformation. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 11(4), 430-454. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0432.2004.00241.x
- LimeSurvey Project Team / Carsten Schmitz. (2012). *LimeSurvey: An open source survey tool*. Hamburg. Retrieved from <http://limesurvey.org>
- Mehta, C. M., & Dementieva, Y. (2016). The contextual specificity of gender: Femininity and

- masculinity in college students' same- and other-gender peer contexts. *Sex Roles*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1007/s11199-016-0632-z
- Messerschmidt, J. W. (2012). Engendering gendered knowledge: Assessing the academic appropriation of hegemonic masculinity. *Men and Masculinities*, 15(1), 56-76.
- Park, L. E., Young, A. F., Troisi, J. D., & Pinkus, R. T. (2011). Effects of everyday romantic goal pursuit on women's attitudes toward math and science. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 37(9), 1259-1273. doi: 10.1177/0146167211408436
- Peele, M. (2009). New worlds of friendship: The early twentieth century. In B. Caine (Ed.), *Friendship: A history* (pp. 279-216). London: Routledge.
- Petersen, A. (2003). Research on men and masculinities: Some implications of recent theory for future work. *Men and Masculinities*, 6(1), 54-69. doi: 10.1177/1097184X02250843
- Pfeffer, C. A., Rogalin, C. L., & Gee, C. A. (2016). Masculinities through a cross-disciplinary lens: Lessons from sociology and psychology. *Sociology Compass*, 10(8), 652-672. doi: 10.1111/soc4.12396
- Prentice, D. A., & Carranza, E. (2002). What women and men should be, shouldn't be, are allowed to be, and don't have to be: The contents of prescriptive gender stereotypes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 26(4), 269-281. doi: 10.1111/1471-6402.t01-1-00066
- Reicher, S., Hopkins, N., & Condor, S. (1997). Stereotype construction as a strategy of influence. In R. Spears, P. J. Oakes, N. Ellemers & S. A. Haslam (Eds.), *The social psychology of stereotyping and group life* (pp. 94-118). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Riley, S. C. E. (2003). The management of the traditional male role: A discourse analysis of the constructions and functions of provision. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 12(2), 99-113. doi: 10.1080/0958923032000088300

- Rummel, R. J. (1970). *Applied factor analysis*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Schacht, S. P. (1996). Misogyny on and off the "pitch": The gendered world of male rugby players. *Gender and Society, 10*(5), 550-565.
- Schneider, M. C., & Bos, A. L. (2014). Measuring stereotypes of female politicians. *Political Psychology, 35*(2), 245-266. doi: 10.1111/pops.12040
- Sherriffs, A. C., & McKee, J. P. (1957). Qualitative aspects of beliefs about men and women. *Journal of Personality, 25*(4), 451-464. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.1957.tb01540.x
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Spears, R., & Smith, H. J. (2001). Experiments as politics. *Political Psychology, 22*(2), 309-330.
- Speer, S. A. (2005). *Gender talk: Feminism, discourse, and conversation analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Subašić, E., Reynolds, K. J., Reicher, S. D., & Klandermans, B. (2012). Where to from here for the psychology of social change? Future directions for theory and practice. *Political Psychology, 33*(1), 61-74. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9221.2011.00864.x
- Tai, T., & Treas, J. (2013). Housework task hierarchies in 32 Countries. *European Sociological Review, 29*(4), 780-791.
- Talbot, K., & Quayle, M. (2010). The perils of being a nice guy: Contextual variation in five young women's constructions of acceptable hegemonic and alternative masculinities. *Men and Masculinities, 13*(2), 255-278. doi: 10.1177/1097184X09350408
- Thompson, E. H. J., & Bennett, K. M. (2015). Measurement of masculinity ideologies: A (critical) review. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 16*(2), 115-133. doi: 10.1037/a0038609

- van der Toorn, J., & Jost, J. T. (2014). Twenty years of system justification theory: Introduction to the special issue on "Ideology and system justification processes. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *17*(4), 413-419. doi: 10.1177/1368430214531509
- Weichselbaumer, D., & Winter-Ebmer, R. (2005). A meta-analysis of the international gender wage gap. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, *19*(3), 479-511.
- Wetherell, M., & Edley, N. (1999). Negotiating hegemonic masculinity: Imaginary positions and psycho-discursive practices. *Feminism & Psychology*, *9*(3), 335-356.
- Whorley, M. R., & Addis, M. E. (2006). Ten years of psychological research on men and masculinity in the United States: Dominant methodological trends. *Sex Roles*, *55*(9), 649-658. doi: 10.1007/s11199-006-9120-1
- Williams, J. E., Satterwhite, R. C., & Best, D. L. (1999). Pancultural gender stereotypes revisited: The five factor model. *Sex Roles*, *40*(7), 513-525. doi: 10.1023/A:1018831928829
- Wong, Y. J., Steinfeldt, J. A., Speight, Q. L., & Hickman, S. J. (2010). Content analysis of Psychology of Men & Masculinity (2000-2008). *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *11*(3), 170-181. doi: 10.1037/a0019133

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics and Overall Factor Loadings for 35 Adjectives Defining Masculinity

| Adjectives | <i>n</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | Factor Loadings | |
|-----------------|----------|----------|-----------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| | | | | Communal Masculinity | Agentic Masculinity |
| Protective | 454 | 8.48 | 1.768 | 0.204 | 0.615 |
| Masculine | 450 | 8.24 | 2.294 | -0.219 | 0.745 |
| Courageous | 455 | 8.02 | 1.878 | 0.364 | 0.553 |
| Strong | 453 | 8.00 | 1.965 | -0.053 | 0.750 |
| Tough | 452 | 7.93 | 2.040 | -0.171 | 0.762 |
| Hardworking | 452 | 7.90 | 1.791 | 0.594 | 0.333 |
| Confident | 452 | 7.89 | 1.807 | 0.423 | 0.431 |
| Powerful | 455 | 7.84 | 1.961 | -0.004 | 0.684 |
| Driven | 452 | 7.71 | 1.991 | 0.394 | 0.585 |
| Ambitious | 450 | 7.64 | 1.746 | 0.471 | 0.434 |
| Assertive | 451 | 7.63 | 1.870 | 0.288 | 0.574 |
| Respectful | 453 | 7.48 | 2.122 | 0.767 | -0.012 |
| Handsome | 453 | 7.44 | 2.307 | -0.127 | 0.513 |
| Self-reliant | 452 | 7.28 | 2.073 | 0.574 | 0.315 |
| Reliable | 452 | 7.27 | 2.238 | 0.741 | 0.112 |
| Dominant | 450 | 7.23 | 2.427 | -0.203 | 0.665 |
| Decisive | 453 | 7.19 | 2.123 | 0.381 | 0.455 |
| Self-controlled | 452 | 7.15 | 2.144 | 0.638 | 0.196 |
| Intelligent | 450 | 7.14 | 1.931 | 0.628 | 0.282 |
| Helpful | 452 | 7.05 | 2.025 | 0.746 | 0.047 |
| Outgoing | 452 | 7.00 | 1.921 | 0.247 | 0.343 |
| Friendly | 451 | 6.98 | 1.961 | 0.652 | -0.037 |
| Sincere | 449 | 6.87 | 2.138 | 0.746 | 0.021 |
| Caring | 454 | 6.86 | 2.094 | 0.819 | -0.074 |
| Dependable | 454 | 6.86 | 2.412 | 0.496 | 0.200 |
| Understanding | 453 | 6.84 | 2.176 | 0.769 | 0.040 |
| Kind | 452 | 6.81 | 2.087 | 0.779 | -0.037 |
| Easy-going | 452 | 6.78 | 1.989 | 0.505 | 0.272 |

| | | | | | |
|--------------|-----|------|-------|-------|--------|
| Adaptable | 453 | 6.75 | 1.883 | 0.572 | 0.292 |
| Affectionate | 449 | 6.74 | 2.007 | 0.664 | 0.111 |
| Dynamic | 449 | 6.54 | 1.820 | 0.414 | 0.361 |
| Thoughtful | 452 | 6.51 | 2.166 | 0.715 | 0.009 |
| Nice | 453 | 6.50 | 1.993 | 0.721 | -0.071 |
| Sympathetic | 452 | 6.25 | 2.318 | 0.738 | -0.102 |
| Sensitive | 452 | 5.97 | 2.375 | 0.639 | -0.116 |

Note. Factor loadings < .3 shown in grey to emphasize factor structure.

Table 2

Mean Tables for Communal and Agentic Masculinity across Contexts and Replications

| Masculinity | Relationship Context | | | |
|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | Work <i>M (SD)</i> | Family ^a <i>M (SD)</i> | Romance ^b <i>M (SD)</i> | Friendship <i>M (SD)</i> |
| (a) Replication 1: Mature Non-Student South African Women (<i>n</i> = 86) | | | | |
| Communal | .18 (.49) _{c,x} | .25 (.63) _{c,x} | | .67 (.54) _{d,x} |
| Agentic | .12 (.61) _{c,x} | -.22 (.40) _{d,y} | | -.80 (.53) _{e,y} |
| (b) Replication 2: Young South African College Women (<i>n</i> = 100) | | | | |
| Communal | -.11 (.63) _{c,x} | -.30 (.87) _{c,x} | | .46 (.54) _{d,x} |
| Agentic | .47 (.72) _{c,y} | .28 (.78) _{c,y} | | -.65 (.67) _{d,y} |
| (c) Replication 3: Young South African College Women (<i>n</i> = 161) | | | | |
| Communal | -.33 (.78) _{c,x} | -.65 (1.02) _{c,x} | | .38 (.62) _{d,x} |
| Agentic | .68 (.76) _{c,y} | .49 (.83) _{d,y} | | -.64 (.68) _{e,y} |
| (d) Replication 4: International Online Sample (<i>n</i> = 159) | | | | |
| Communal | -.20 (1.03) _{c,x} | -.20 (1.39) _{c,x} | -.04 (1.27) _{c,x} | .61 (.69) _{d,x} |
| Agentic | .46 (.96) _{c,y} | .08 (1.23) _{d,x} | .00 (1.11) _{d,x} | -.79 (.70) _{e,y} |
| (e) Combined Results across Replications (<i>N</i> = 506) | | | | |
| Communal | -.18 (.84) _{c,x} | -.32 (1.14) _{c,x} | | .51 (.63) _{d,x} |
| Agentic | .50 (.83) _{c,y} | .22 (.99) _{d,y} | | -.71 (.67) _{e,y} |

Note. Different subscripts for means across columns (c, d, e comparing contexts) and between means across rows in a replication (x,y comparing types of masculinity) indicate significant differences ($p < .05$ for Sidak corrected MANOVA comparisons across contexts in all replications; and Bonferroni corrected alpha of $p < .0125$ in replication 4 and $p < .017$ in replications 1,2,3 and overall).

^aFamily and Romance are not separated in Replications 1, 2, and 3 and in the combined results.

^bRomance could not be compared in combined results because it was only assessed in replication 4.

Table 3

Qualities of Ideal masculinity in Romance/Family and Work Contexts Compared to Friendship

| In comparison to an ideal friend,... | | | |
|--|--------------|----------|------------|
| Direction | Adjective | <i>p</i> | Odds ratio |
| ...an ideal husband /romantic partner is: | | | |
| Less | easy-going | < .001 | .195 |
| Less | sympathetic | < .001 | .264 |
| Less | friendly | < .001 | .292 |
| Less | helpful | < .001 | .377 |
| Less | self-reliant | .023 | .391 |
| Less | nice | .017 | .494 |
| Less | kind | .024 | .559 |
| More | hardworking | < .001 | 3.613 |
| More | strong | < .001 | 3.962 |
| More | handsome | < .001 | 5.648 |
| More | affectionate | .001 | 10.327 |
| ...an ideal work colleague is: | | | |
| Less | affectionate | .009 | .210 |
| Less | caring | <.001 | .272 |
| Less | outgoing | .012 | .364 |
| Less | sensitive | .018 | .390 |
| Less | Easy-going | .013 | .399 |
| More | ambitious | .022 | 2.397 |
| More | assertive | .040 | 2.537 |
| More | dynamic | <.001 | 4.926 |
| More | driven | <.001 | 9.056 |
| More | powerful | .001 | 9.142 |
| More | hardworking | <.001 | 12.332 |

Online supplement for Quayle, M., Lindegger, G., Brittain, K., Nabee, N., & Cole, C. (2017).

Women's ideals for masculinity across social contexts: Patriarchal agentic masculinity is valued in work, family, and romance but communal masculinity in friendship. *Sex Roles*. Michael Quayle, University of Limerick. E-mail: mike.quayle@ul.ie

Factor Loadings for the "Communal Masculinity" Factor Overall and in Each Replication

| Adjective | Overall (N = 456) | Replication | | | |
|--|----------------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| | | 1 (n = 36) | 2 (n = 100) | 3 (n = 161) | 4 (n = 159) |
| Caring | .819 | .867 | .824 | .834 | .756 |
| Kind | .779 | .920 | .794 | .792 | .685 |
| Understanding | .769 | .876 | .843 | .767 | .720 |
| Respectful | .767 | .824 | .801 | .789 | .615 |
| Helpful | .746 | .871 | .701 | .767 | .699 |
| Sincere | .746 | .796 | .784 | .834 | .467 |
| Reliable | .741 | .820 | .812 | .790 | .397 |
| Sympathetic | .738 | .836 | .817 | .811 | .530 |
| Nice | .721 | .481 | .758 | .741 | .677 |
| Thoughtful | .715 | .937 | .735 | .706 | .728 |
| Affectionate | .664 | .656 | .730 | .675 | .601 |
| Friendly | .652 | .723 | .580 | .662 | .652 |
| Sensitive | .639 | .828 | .715 | .635 | .604 |
| Self-controlled | .638 | .813 | .659 | .667 | .438 |
| Intelligent | .628 | .708 | .592 | .617 | .655 |
| Hardworking | .594 | .624 | .603 | .722 | .279 |
| Self-reliant | .574 | .401 | .616 | .614 | .299 |
| Adaptable | .572 | .614 | .627 | .525 | .456 |
| Easy-going | .505 | .798 | .420 | .511 | .460 |
| Dependable | .496 | .859 | .589 | .372 | .454 |
| Ambitious | .471 | .433 | .495 | .527 | .234 |
| Confident | .423 | .726 | .465 | .417 | .158 |
| Dynamic | .414 | .471 | .418 | .463 | .346 |
| Driven | .394 | .384 | .481 | .538 | .132 |
| Decisive | .381 | .600 | .349 | .499 | .300 |
| Courageous | .364 | .394 | .478 | .497 | .059 |
| Assertive | .288 | .077 | .429 | .533 | -.034 |
| Outgoing | .247 | .443 | .168 | .194 | .298 |
| Protective | .204 | .758 | -.005 | .353 | .059 |
| Powerful | -.004 | .003 | .055 | .076 | .011 |
| Strong | -.053 | .383 | -.103 | .004 | -.119 |
| Handsome | -.127 | -.082 | -.210 | -.032 | .025 |
| Tough | -.171 | -.065 | -.227 | -.190 | .042 |
| Dominant | -.203 | -.080 | -.278 | -.106 | -.166 |
| Masculine | -.219 | .014 | -.252 | -.191 | -.013 |
| Variance accounted for by factor | 32.3% | 50.3% | 34.7% | 35.7% | 25.1% |

Factor Loadings for the “Agentic Masculinity” Factor Overall and in Each Replication

| Adjective | Overall (<i>N</i> = 456) | Replication | | | |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| | | 1 (<i>n</i> = 36) | 2 (<i>n</i> = 100) | 3 (<i>n</i> = 161) | 4 (<i>n</i> = 159) |
| Tough | .762 | .766 | .714 | .774 | .774 |
| Strong | .750 | .544 | .829 | .794 | .612 |
| Masculine | .745 | .643 | .749 | .822 | .592 |
| Powerful | .684 | .537 | .575 | .627 | .778 |
| Dominant | .665 | .648 | .683 | .573 | .680 |
| Protective | .615 | .432 | .592 | .591 | .600 |
| Driven | .585 | .640 | .491 | .463 | .696 |
| Assertive | .574 | .650 | .448 | .349 | .780 |
| Courageous | .553 | .614 | .496 | .346 | .750 |
| Handsome | .513 | .773 | .398 | .336 | .562 |
| Decisive | .455 | .446 | .406 | .316 | .553 |
| Ambitious | .434 | .750 | .551 | .334 | .480 |
| Confident | .431 | .503 | .381 | .408 | .611 |
| Dynamic | .361 | .646 | .310 | .322 | .326 |
| Outgoing | .343 | .563 | .341 | .310 | .516 |
| Hardworking | .333 | .636 | .444 | .186 | .394 |
| Self-reliant | .315 | .751 | .424 | .319 | .437 |
| Adaptable | .292 | .366 | .286 | .395 | .307 |
| Intelligent | .282 | .458 | .468 | .250 | .227 |
| Easy-going | .272 | .119 | .406 | .334 | .258 |
| Dependable | .200 | .282 | .194 | .422 | -.024 |
| Self-controlled | .196 | .019 | .122 | .212 | .339 |
| Reliable | .112 | .318 | .097 | .074 | .241 |
| Affectionate | .111 | .424 | -.079 | .303 | -.062 |
| Helpful | .047 | .217 | .085 | .051 | .172 |
| Understanding | .040 | .167 | -.045 | .012 | .101 |
| Sincere | .021 | .189 | -.075 | -.055 | .164 |
| Thoughtful | .009 | .010 | -.059 | -.013 | .025 |
| Respectful | -.012 | .217 | .094 | .026 | -.069 |
| Friendly | -.037 | .279 | -.172 | -.024 | .071 |
| Kind | -.037 | -.034 | .044 | -.111 | .088 |
| Nice | -.071 | .322 | -.170 | -.138 | .072 |
| Caring | -.074 | -.003 | -.055 | .000 | .052 |
| Sympathetic | -.102 | -.112 | -.164 | -.186 | .009 |
| Sensitive | -.116 | -.030 | -.063 | -.118 | -.240 |
| Variance accounted for by factor | 14.1% | 13.6% | 14.8% | 12.4% | 14.8% |