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Abstract

Current research shows platonic friendships are very rare. This study was designed to determine if individuals who consider themselves androgynous are more likely to report involvement in platonic friendships than individuals who are more masculine or feminine. Ninety introductory psychology students at Carroll College in Helena Montana completed both the Bem Sex Role Inventory, (BSRI) (as cited in Galen, 2003) and a platonic friendships test that was designed for this study. There were statistical differences found between the three groups, F=9.9 (90) 73.10, P=.001. Those with feminine sex role scores had the highest mean on the platonic test (M = 75.72, SD = 8.98), followed by the androgynous subjects with a mean score of 71.89, SD = 10.45. The lowest platonic mean score (M = 60.9, SD = 18.87) was by the masculine group. These results imply that where one falls on the gender scale may play an important role in platonic (non-sexual) compatibility between gendered friendships.
Nearly 30 years ago, a new way of viewing gender was established. Androgyne was conceptualized (Wood, 2001). This word comes from the Greek words andros, which means men and gyne, which means woman (Gershaw, 1995). Androgyne embodies both masculine and feminine traits in one person. The gentle and sensitive, yet still masculine man or the assertive and physically strong, yet still feminine woman are the reasons a new term in gender research needed to be defined. Prior to this new way of viewing gender, masculinity and femininity were the endpoints of a single bipolar dimension (Marsh & Byrne, 1991). In the past, men had traditional masculine roles and women took on traditional feminine roles. Both sexes used to define themselves and their roles in society by either masculinity or femininity, there was no middle point. Today androgyne makes gender roles more blurred, not so dichotomous.

Sandra Bem, one of the researchers responsible for beginning the androgyneous person study, created the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) in 1974. The BSRI asked people to indicate on a 7-point scale how well each of 60 different characteristics describes themselves. A list of words was presented, each with a gender connotation attached and participants rated themselves on each character trait (Bem, 1974). When the results were analyzed, a new category of sex role appeared, the one now labeled androgyne. This androgyneous person can also be described as non-sex typed (Spence, 1993) or as Bem has recently defined, gender aschematic (Bem, 1993).

Characteristics of androgyneous people are not limited by sex typing and they seem to be immune to the influence of gender roles, dictated by societal norms (Marsh & Byrne, 1991). Androgyneous people tend to perform cross-sex behaviors with very little reluctance or discomfort (Bem, 1976). Many people don’t want to be limited by one social prescription of a single gender, and strive to express both masculine and feminine qualities in themselves (Wood, 2001). In a study conducted by Spence (as cited in Bem, 1976) androgyneous people also have been found to have a greater level of self-esteem and adaptability. Non-sex typed people are highly successful in processing information
about themselves and situations they find themselves in. Androgynous people tend to show high emotional intelligence and are empathetic and warm. Where as stereotypical behavior of the masculine man and feminine woman can be limiting, an androgynous person thinks less about societal labels and acts in a way that fits their current situation (Gershaw, 1995).

Various cultural changes have occurred that may have increased the prevalence of the androgynous person. In her book, *Lenses of Gender*, Sandra Bem (1993) alludes to women’s independence and feminism as being big parts of the androgynous movement. Both feminism and the single independent woman are on the rise in society today. Women are joining the workforce like never before in history, and many women chose to raise children alone (Teather, 1995). In the 1970’s 40% of married women with children worked; in the 1990’s this rose to 70%. This 30% increase of women in the workforce caused great changes in gender roles. Women represent about ten percent of the construction work force today. This represents a 16% increase since a 1995 survey (Mitchell, 2001). Other occupations where there are significant increases in women’s involvement since 1985 are; managers, (medicine and health) up by 20.7%, mail carriers, up by 14.7%, and law enforcement, up by 8.1% (Wootton, 1997).

Women’s place in the home is not the only traditional gender characteristic that has changed since the 1970’s (Auster & Ohm, 2000). Men are becoming nurturing caregivers for their children and it is much more acceptable to be a stay-at-home dad in our culture today than it ever has been before (Wood, 2001). The number of men is also increasing in occupations that were once dominated by women. Since 1985 male sales and counter clerks have increased 6.5%, health aides increased 9.6% and male registered nurses have increased 5.4% (Wootton, 1997).

Marketing is another area where gender lines are getting blurred. Research companies have identified “the androgynous consumer”, a luxury oriented, driven by desire male customer. Men want the quality brands that previously were only marketed to
women. Sales at Calvin Klein have shifted to a 60/40 ratio of women to men, a huge shift from women dominating their sales in the past. Unisex marketing is another sign that our society is embracing the androgynous movement. Calvin Klein recently created the perfume line named CK one, which used model Kate Moss to kick off the advertising campaign, “made for a man or a woman” (Teather, 1995).

Almost in sync with the acknowledgment of androgyny in society, has been the growing recognition of platonic cross-sexed friendships. There has been a noticeable shift in culture towards a different type of relationship; cross-sex, platonic friendships. The term platonic is used in this study to define non-sexual, close relationships between opposite sex people. Platonic is also a word commonly used to describe any non-sexual relationship.

Much research has been conducted on the nature of platonic friendships, and some find that these relationships are specifically challenging, as sexual tension, power struggles and societal definitions are a constant battle (Delucia-Waack, Gerrity, Taub, & Baldo, 2001). Wood (2001) noted that even when friendships between men and women are not sexually involved, an undertone of sexuality is often present, which makes platonic cross-sex friendships difficult to maintain.

Conversely, researchers West, Anderson and Duck (as cited in Wood, 2001) found that even though there can be difficulties, men and women can create very rewarding friendships. Men rate their cross-sex friendships as being much higher in overall quality, as women tend to give more emotional support and have greater listening skills then men are used to in their male-male friendships. Women, however, still rate their same-sex friendships as highest in satisfaction (Chatterjee, 2001). Men and women both note friendships with women as being intimate and caring (Wood, 1996). Researcher Duck (as cited in Wood, 1996) explains the sexual activity in a relationship isn’t what is important, as much as the meaning sex has in the relationship. Duck states that married people can be best friends, so including sex in a relationship does not lessen it. Also,
married couples can have people they flirt with outside their relationship that they are not sexually involved with, but do not feel completely platonic about either. In research by Montomory (as cited in Wood, 1996) it was found that women who flirted with men outside their relationship found their flirtations to be a sign of friendship, not sexual interest. The lines were less clear for men who engaged in flirting with women outside their relationships.

The development of cross-sex friendships starts around the sixth grade and continues on to about the tenth grade. Clark (as cited in Wood, 1996) found the time in our lives that most cross-sex friendships begin is during early adolescence. In both sexes girls are the preferred gender for friendships from the eighth to tenth grade. It is a time when self-disclosure talk makes gender less important and interactions with friends become more intimate. Girls give advice and suggestions on complicated teen issues more during this time. The greatest number of cross-sex friendships occurs among college students. This is the time when humor and positive support are important bases for friendships. College age men often state that girls give better support and are more positive in friendships than in their same sex friendships (Wood, 1996).

Werking (1996) writes in her book that many people who have good friends in college of the opposite sex, no longer keep in touch with them because they are now a husband or a wife. They feel it is inappropriate to engage in cross-sex close friendships, and would feel bad if their husband or wife had a close cross-sex friendship. There is a strong cultural belief that a spouse should have the best friend role in a person’s life. An outside marriage cross-sex friendship may be seen as threatening, or not accepted by society (as cited in Wood, 1996). Marriage appears to be the biggest inhibitor of cross-sex friendships.

There are many social barriers against having platonic friendships. There is a belief that one or both parties are lying about sexual feelings. There are also very few role model relationships for strictly platonic cross-sex friendships (Wood, 1996). Look at the
movie when Harry met Sally, (MGM, 1989). Here we clearly see two people who tried to live their lives as cross-sex platonic friends, but due to strain and attraction their friendship first became sexual and had negative connotations. Then the negative feelings turned to positive when the main characters realized they could not live with out each other and came together romantically in the end. So, at least in Hollywood, a cross-sex platonic relationship rarely stays that way.

There is more research being done now then ever before about cross-sex friendships. *Platonic* is becoming more commonly used. People are either involved in or at least know someone who has a non-sexual cross-sex friendship. It is not as taboo to have a good friend of the opposite sex as it once was.

With the shift in society towards more androgynous lifestyles (Teather, 1995) and platonic cross-sex friendships becoming part of our cultural mainstay, it is hard to overlook that there may be a connection between these two characteristics. Therefore this study was conducted to determine if androgyny contributes to high levels of platonic cross-sex friendships.

**Method**

**Participants**

Ninety Carroll College students from an introductory psychology course in Helena, Montana agreed to participate in this study. Each participating student was given five extra credit points towards their final grade. Seventy three percent of the respondents were women, (n=66), and 27 % of the respondents were men, (n=24).

**Materials**

Each participant completed the BEM BSRI test (see Appendix A) and a Platonic friendships test (see Appendix B), both with a 7-point Likert format ranging from one (never or almost never true) to seven (always or almost always true). Scores on the BSRI test ranged from more than 20 to less than negative 20. The BSRI measures the relative amounts of masculinity and femininity that a person includes in their self-description.
The greater the absolute value of the Androgyny score the more a person is sex typed or
sex reversed, high negative scores indicated more masculinity, high positive scores
indicated more femininity. The closer the score to zero, the more the person is
androgynous (Bem, 1974). The Platonic Friendships test contains 14 questions. It
measures the level to which participants view their cross-sex friendships as platonic or
sexual. High scores indicate greater platonic feelings towards cross-sex friendships, low
scores indicate less platonic feelings towards cross-sex friendships. The platonic test
includes operational definitions of key terms, such as platonic, sexual friendships, and
majority. Neither test gave a clear indication of what the hypothesis of this study was.

Procedure

The two surveys were distributed to all students and were completed by 100 % of
the students. Participants were given the option of not taking the test, or leaving the entire
test blank. Basic instructions on test taking processes were given. The participants were
informed that each test was anonymous, with the only identifying characteristic being the
notation of gender. Participants were asked to not calculate their own scores on the two
tests. Each person who completed the test wrote their name on a separate attendance
sheet and was given five extra credit points. The extra credit sheet was kept completely
separate from the surveys and was collected by the professor.

Results

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) indicated a significant main affect for
platonic friendship feelings, F = 9.9 (90) > 3.10. Feminine subjects scored the highest on
platonic friendships with M = 75.72, SD = 8.98, followed by androgynous subjects with
M = 71.88, SD = 10.45. The masculine group scored the lowest with M = 60.9, SD =
18.87, (P=.001) (see Table 1).
Discussion

The findings in this research did not support the original hypothesis. Androgynous people did not have the highest level of platonic friendships. Feminine scorers actually reflected the highest score on platonic friendships. Masculine scorers showed the lowest level of platonic friendship. In fact, two of the masculine testers rated that they had no platonic friendships at all. The largest variance of scores was found in the masculine group with a score 355.98, $M = 71.88$ (see Table 1). This large variance may have been due to two masculine participants whom answered all the platonic friendships survey questions with non-platonic based answers.

The fundamental attribution error was also apparent on the survey’s responses. One question on the platonic test asked the participants to rate whether they thought their friends felt sexual about cross-sex friendships. The majority of participants said that their friends did feel sexual about cross-sex friendships. However, when asked to report on their own sexual feelings, the participants scored themselves as not having sexual feelings for their cross-sex friends. Additional findings on this test included two male testers who rated their masculinity with the one to seven Likert score, rather than indicating their sex as male or female as instructed.

Androgyny is a significant part of our culture. Popular male musicians like David Bowie in the seventies and Steven Tyler in the eighties wore make-up, had long or brightly colored hair, wore dress-like outfits and played rock music that had lyrics such as, “Dude looks like a lady”. Pop culture icons such as Little Richard and Catherine Hepburn dabbled in gender ambiguity long before the seventies influx of androgyny. Androgyny can be viewed as sexual behavior in that, a person doesn’t define her/himself by any sexual model other than being comfortable in any gender role, even ones previously thought to be the role of someone of the opposite sex. With increased self-comfort levels and self-awareness, regardless of sex, becoming a key part of development, we see gender roles less clearly defined in all ages and cultures.
In talking with students at Carroll College, it became clear that gender role definitions are very blurred. There are no traditional boundaries on how men or women felt they should act. Women don’t have a dress code. Men feel comfortable being emotional and nurturing. Women and men are both becoming gentle caregivers while staying assertive and strong. Many people do not want to be limited by one social prescription of a single gender, and strive to have both masculine and feminine qualities in themselves (Wood, 2001). On the BSRI surveys that were given, the largest number of participants scored in the Androgynous category. Of the 90 people that took the test, 41 scored androgynous, 20 scored masculine and 29 scored feminine. This clearly shows that androgyny is common on Carroll College’s campus (see Table 1).

Along with more androgynous people, there are also many more platonic based cross-sex friendships. Some reasons for the rise of cross-sex friendships could be the coed life style of people today. From dorm living, mingling at work and coed social groups, there are just more opportunities for men and women to cross gender lines (Walsh, 1997). Additionally, the range of sexual behavior acceptable for women in gender roles has greatly widened (Lucke, 1998). Women can instigate friendships with men, and not be viewed as being aggressive or looking for a husband. Men can have female friends and not be considered trying to engage in sexual activity.

The aim of any friendship is befriending, encouraging and helping another fulfill their destinies (Scudder & Bishop, 2001). This is something that can be seen in cross-sex friendships just as readily as in same sex friendships. The number of gendered friendships that are strictly platonic rises as people become friends across many diverse spectrums. As men and women learn to interact more together, learn to play more together and basically coexist together, cross-sex friendships move from a possibility to a necessity (Chatterfee, 2001). The goal of opposite sex friendship isn’t to further a relationship to a new level, it is an end onto itself, there is no “better goal” for the relationship (Werking, 1997). Often times being friends with an opposite sex person is clarified to others as, “we
are just friends”. This terminology tends to take value away from the rich friendships that men and women can have together. Because a friendship is cross-sexed and non-sexual doesn’t mean it is any less empowering or real to the participants involved in it. The primary activity in cross-sex friendships has been shown to be talking; simply getting together and sharing. Effective relationships are based on communication, so it is no wonder that cross-sex friendships are on the rise; with the main activity being talking.

It also became apparent in discussion at Carroll College that cross-sex friendships are a common finding on campus. Many women reported having “a great guy friend whom I would never consider sleeping with” and vice versa. A large percentage of the people I interviewed had no idea that cross-sex friendships were ever thought of as difficult to maintain. Students felt that their cross-sex friendships were just as strong and comfortable as their same-sex friendships. However, one person noted that she had to continually define her cross-sex friendship to friends and family. She stated that people usually think that her and her male friend are sleeping together, when in fact both parties are dating other people. She feels no physical attraction to her friend, and states he does not either. She said it can be difficult always saying they are just friends, when in turn, she doesn’t have to defend her relationship with females that are friends. She said she feels just the same about him as she does her girlfriends.

The amount of people on the Carroll College campus that are currently in cross-sex friendships is very high, which agrees with the research done by Clark (as cited in Wood, 1996) that said college age is where most cross-sex friendships are found. Carroll College students reflected this with a mean platonic score of 72 with SD of 8.7. Any score above 55 reflected platonic feelings. With the mean score being 72, it is apparent that participants do have friendships that are strictly platonic based.

Some interesting ways to approach this research and possibly account for false self-reports would be to conduct the platonic rating survey verbally. Additionally, a larger sample size would gather a broader scope of participants, which may enrich the results.
Another interesting fact that was not examined in this research but could be further explored is the fact that there were two people who answered sexually regarding their platonic friendships. The remaining participants answered either neutral or strictly platonic concerning their cross gendered friendships. The reasons behind the sexual responses, and the fact that both responses came from men, could raise a possible gender research question. The two people who answered seven instead of male or female on their test were also men. Could the fact that two men ranked their gender indicate a possible strong affinity for being perceived as masculine?

With the shifts in society towards androgynous thinking and more platonic friendships, later research may be conducted to answer the question, "Just how important is gender when deciding who you want to be friends with, and will this distinction even matter in our future relationships?"
References


(Original work published 1993)


Sturt, G. *The Measurement of Psychological Androgyny* [Data file]. Available from http://www.garysturt.free-online.co.uk/bem.htm


Table 1

Data analysis of Platonic test results

Summary of Platonic test results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2196</td>
<td>75.72</td>
<td>45.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1218</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>355.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2947</td>
<td>71.87</td>
<td>96.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. P-value is .001
Appendix A:

Bem Sex Role Inventory

Answer questions as the term best fits you according to the following scale:

1 = Never or almost never true  
2 = Usually not true  
3 = Sometimes but infrequently true  
4 = Occasionally true  
5 = Often true  
6 = Usually true  
7 = Always or almost always true

Questions:

1. Acts as a Leader  
2. Adaptable  
3. Affectionate  
4. Conceited  
5. Aggressive  
6. Cheerful  
7. Ambitious  
8. Conscientious  
9. Childlike  
10. Conventional  
11. Analytical  
12. Compassionate  
13. Assertive  
14. Friendly  
15. Does not use harsh language  
16. Happy  
17. Athletic  
18. Eager to soothe hurt feelings  
19. Competitive  
20. Helpful  
21. Feminine  
22. Inefficient  
23. Defends own beliefs  
24. Flatterable  
25. Dominant  
26. Jealous  
27. Gentle  
28. Likable  
29. Forceful  
30. Gullible  
31. Has leadership abilities  
32. Moody  
33. Loves children  
34. Reliable  
35. Independent  
36. Loyal  
37. Individualistic  
38. Secretive  
39. Sensitive to the needs of others  
40. Sincere  
41. Makes decisions easily  
42. Shy  
43. Masculine  
44. Solemn  
45. Soft-spoken  
46. Tactful  
47. Self-reliant  
48. Sympathetic  
49. Self-sufficient  
50. Theatrical  
51. Tender  
52. Truthful  
53. Strong personality  
54. Understanding  
55. Willing to take a stand  
56. Unpredictable  
57. Warm  
58. Unsystematic  
59. Willing to take risks  
60. Yielding
Androgyny and platonic friendships

Answers: (these go across)

1. ____  2. ____  3. ____  4. ____  5. ____  6. ____
13. ____  14. ____  15. ____  16. ____  17. ____  18. ____
25. ____  26. ____  27. ____  28. ____  29. ____  30. ____
31. ____  32. ____  33. ____  34. ____  35. ____  36. ____
37. ____  38. ____  39. ____  40. ____  41. ____  42. ____
43. ____  44. ____  45. ____  46. ____  47. ____  48. ____
49. ____  50. ____  51. ____  52. ____  53. ____  54. ____
55. ____  56. ____  57. ____  58. ____  59. ____  60. ____

Column totals:  (Add up the values in each of the six columns.)

1. ____  2. ____  3. ____  4. ____  5. ____  6. ____

Not included in the survey’s given to the participants:

Masculine traits: ____  Add column 1 to column 5.
Feminine traits: ____  Add column 3 to column 6.

score: ____  Subtract Feminine traits from Masculine traits.

Masculine traits - Feminine traits = score.

Compare score to the androgyny scale below.

Androgyne scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>&gt; +20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearly Masculine</td>
<td>+10 to +19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>+9 to -9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearly feminine</td>
<td>-10 to -19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>&lt; -20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Columns 1 and 5 are the "Masculine" traits.
Columns 3 and 6 are the "Feminine" traits.
Columns 2 and 4 are the "Neutral" traits.

Survey from: http://www.velocity.net/~galen/androgyn.html
Appendix B:

**Platonic Test:**
Scale:

1. Never or almost never true
2. Usually not true
3. Sometimes, but infrequently true
4. Occasionally true
5. Often true
6. Usually true
7. Always or almost true

Definitions:

**Platonic:** Close relationship/friendship with someone of the opposite sex (or same sex if homosexual) in which you spend at least 5 hours a week in communication with, but engage in no sexually based contact or thought. There may be physical contact, but with no desire or intent of a sexual nature in any way. Having had a sexual experience (contact physically with sexual interest) with the friend in the last 3 years, constitutes a non-platonic friendship.

**Sexually based friendship:** Feelings, thoughts, ideations or actions that promote sexual arousal through activity or basic desire in regard to a person labeled a friend. Can include fantasy type thought all the way to actual sexual desire or acting on sexual impulses/attraction.

Majority is more than half.

PLEASE note your gender here: Male____ Female_____

1. I have friends that are of the opposite sex______ (Yes or No)

2. I have friends of the opposite sex that I feel 100% platonic about_____

3. I do not struggle to not have sexual feelings about my opposite sex friends____

4. I feel a close opposite sex friend is not a good choice for sexual interest_____

5. Of the friends I have that are 100% platonic, I have never thought of them in a sexual way_____

6. Of the friends I have that are 100% platonic, I have never had sexual contact with them____

7. I feel strictly platonic about the majority of my opposite sex friends____

8. I have opposite sex friends that I like to be with, that I have no intention of ever being sexual with____

9. The majority of the people I know would say that they have opposite sex friendships that are 100% platonic____

10. I am completely comfortable being non sexual with opposite sex friends____

11. I feel it is normal human behavior to have strictly platonic opposite sex friends____
12. The majority of the people I know would say that they are not sexually attracted to their opposite sex friends.

13. It is possible to have a friend of the opposite sex for many years and never have any sexual contact or attraction.

14. I am comfortable being with people of the opposite sex as platonic friends.

Not included on survey given to participants:

Scoring:
Add together all answers

Total of 52 is the exact middle score of feeling both platonic and sexual about friendships. Scoring will count as neutral 4 scores on each side of 52.

Less than 48 will be counted as having non-platonic friendships

More than 56 will be counted as having platonic friendships