Research on intergender attraction is broad and extensive. Studies on personality characteristics (Regan & Joshi, 2003; Sprecher & Regan, 2002), evolutionary forces (Buss, 1989; Cramer & Schaeffer, 1996) and physical appearance (Kalof, 1999) have been used to define those factors which influence attraction. Self-report methods, commonly used to study attraction, have shown support for the subjective nature of attraction formation and the likelihood of dependence upon multiple factors for complete development (Regan & Joshi, 2003; Sprecher & Regan, 2002). Furthermore, different verbal communication styles are stereotypically associated with gender and differ in presentation (Edwards & Hamilton, 2004; MacGeorge, Graves, Feng, Gillihan, & Burleson, 2004; Tannen, 1990). The differences between these stereotypical gender communication patterns are important in understanding communication, but may also have a role in attraction (Feldstein, Dohm, & Crown, 2001; Montgomery, 1986). This study concerns the manipulation of these previously identified stereotypical communication patterns of the genders to find possible differences in attraction.

Intrinsic Values and Attraction

Various personality characteristics and intrinsic values (e.g., social skills, personality) have an impact on attraction between genders. Although there are many differences in attraction factors between the genders, personality characteristics like intelligence, self-esteem, and emotional intelligence have been identified as important factors (Regan & Joshi, 2003; Sprecher & Regan, 2002). Additionally, research has shown that individuals who value social and intellectual compatibility are more likely to attract others (Montgomery, 1986). This study aimed to explore the role of intrinsically valued characteristics in attraction between genders.

Effects of Gender Communication Patterns on Opposite Gender Attraction

Stereotypically female patterns of speech communication, including expression of empathy, sharing similar experiences, and asking further questions were compared to typical male patterns of communication in gender attraction. Following presentation of the two conversations, the Attractive Communication Styles Survey and the Conversation Survey Questionnaire assessed differences in attraction between the two conversation styles, with a convenience sample of 164 university students. Analyses revealed both men and women valuing the stereotypical female pattern of communication, but differing in the intensity of support, with women strongly favoring and men slightly favoring the female pattern, t(72) = 6.35, p < .01; t(90) = 13.81, p < .01. Implications for further research on dyadic interaction effects on attraction are supported.
humor, and intellect are highly valued by both men and women (Regan & Joshi, 2003). However, this was only true when the participants considered partners in a long-term romantic relationship. Other characteristics such as warmth and kindness, expressiveness and openness, and a sense of humor also played a critical role in attraction (Sprecher & Regan, 2002). Especially in romantic relationships, social competence and other socially interactive components of the personality are consistently self-reported as of more importance in determining attraction than other factors (Regan & Joshi; Sprecher & Regan). A possible explanation for this importance linked to interactive components of personality may be that having many friends is socially acceptable, but having more than one romantic partner concurrently is not. The fact of being limited to only one romantic partner implies a lack of social variability for the individual in social situations with that partner and a socially competent partner may be viewed as beneficial. Self-reported high importance assigned for intrinsic characteristics such as social competence may be a direct result from being limited to one partner (Sprecher & Regan).

Certain characteristics of personality are valued more highly depending on other conditions such as length and type of the relationship. Regan and Joshi (2003) found that when adolescents were asked what they valued most in a mate, the length of the relationship influenced the participants’ responses: those who were asked about long-term relationships valued the potential partner’s social interaction ability higher than physical characteristics, while short-term relationships had a much higher rating for physical characteristics over personality. This notable difference in response may be a result of short-term relationships not having extensive social interaction and social competence would be unnecessary in fulfilling the expectations of a successful relationship. Types of relationships are another influence on attraction formation and what is valued most in determining attraction. Across all types of relationships, platonic or romantic, those qualities implying social competence and social support are rated of higher importance in a partner than the physical qualities of an individual (Sprecher & Regan, 2002). This may be a consequence of both genders choosing romantic partners from their existing groups of friends (Sprecher & Regan).

Although no specific gender differences in attraction have surfaced in regards to type and length of the relationship, gender differences do appear when participants are asked to rate the importance of physical attractiveness (Cramer & Schaeffer, 1996; Sprecher & Regan, 2002). Specifically, men rated the attractiveness of women in regards to physical appearance as more important than when women are rating men (Cramer & Schaeffer). In this case, the ideal mate for a male has been identified as one who has “high reproductive value”—young and fertile, active and healthy, and attractive and sexually responsive (Cramer & Schaeffer). This may account for the emphasis that men place on the physical attractiveness of women. In fact, men are more likely to connect physically attractive women with positive and successful relationships (Kalof, 1999). Women, however, rated physical attractiveness important only after satisfying the desire for education and good earning capacity in their prospective partners (Cramer & Schaeffer). Other studies have found other similar results that support these conclusions, but all of these results can only be as accurate as the limitations of self-report methodology (Buss, 1989; Kalof, 1999).

### Evolutionary Perspective of Attraction

Buss (1989) conducted a large cross-cultural gender attraction study and concluded that evolution may be the driving force behind attraction of the genders regardless of other possible confounding variables such as culture. Buss argued that men and women use inherently different mating strategies and have different mate preferences due to evolutionary processes. Thus, those men who did not find a suitable mate to ensure the continuation of their genetics may not have been successful. Likewise, women who did not find a suitable mate for protection and care of the young offspring could not be as successful in their roles of maintaining their genetic line. The evolutionary approach to attraction implies that: men are more attracted to women capable of childbearing and women are attracted to those men who can offer protection and stability. Men may value youthful, fertile, healthy, and physically attractive women because they have higher potential for successful reproduction (Buss; Cramer & Schaeffer, 1996). Women, on the other hand, value high-resource potential in men, possibly because that quality implies a better protective environment. Those men who are seen as ambitious, socially competent, motivated, intelligent, honest, college educated, and who have a high earning capacity are self-reported as much more attractive to women (Buss; Cramer & Schaeffer).

According to Buss (1989), parental investment plays a supportive role in an understanding of attraction. From conception through nurturance of the child to adulthood, women of our ancestral past have had a much longer time of parental investment with their offspring than did men. As a consequence, these women should have looked to men that would be dependable, supportive, protective, and have an ability to
provide for the offspring, and offer protection for the
woman (Buss). Those men who are older and have
more experience may be seen as more attractive than
those who have less experience or who are younger
(Buss). However, women did not self-report the same
strong connections of physical appearance with higher
reproductive capability in men as did the men in their
self-reports. This may be a consequence of men’s fer-
tility not being as distinguishable from physical char-
acteristics as the future fertility of women may be by
their physical appearances (Buss). The varying levels
of importance of physical attraction imply that an issue
of gender difference continues in contemporary soci-
ety (Kalof, 1999; Regan & Joshi, 2003).

Although future fertility, physical appearance, and
and providing capability are ranked high in impor-
tance by this evolutionary perspective, basic social
skills, intrinsic characteristics, and personality factors
are still valued highly in romantic relationships (Regan
& Joshi, 2003; Sprecher & Regan, 2002). The high
importance of these personal qualities suggest that
attraction may be partially determined or influenced
by the socially communicative elements of personal-
ity, not just personality characteristics and evolution-
ary forces. Social qualities can often be discovered
through communication between individuals and,
consequently, may have a substantial effect on attrac-
tion between the genders.

Communication Patterns of the Genders

Communication has been used as a way to separate
the genders even further into their own distinct “cul-
tures” (Edwards & Hamilton, 2004; MacGeorge et al.,
2004; Tannen, 1990). According to Tannen, women
and men are vastly different in their approaches to
communicating with one another, supporting this
“two-cultures theory.” According to this theory, both
genders verbally communicate in entirely different
styles, causing misunderstandings and miscommuni-
cations similar to what may arise between members
different cultures. Women show tendencies to focus
on intimacy and men exhibit preferences towards
independence in their communications. Friction
between the sexes occurs as both attempt to under-
stand one another’s verbal communication patterns
through their own communication contexts (Tannen).

Edwards and Hamilton (2004) found that mis-
derstandings, frustration, and perplexity are all by-
products of this difference in communication styles,
in a self-report study. Furthermore, men may be more
likely than women to view themselves in a hierarchal
society where they are either “one-up” or “one-down”
in comparison to the rest of society (Tannen, 1990).
This serves as an explanation of the stereotype that
men are more aggressive and competitive than women.
Women, however, may tend to view society in a more
communal and intimate way than men. Women gen-
erally displayed an increased desire for intimacy, trust,
and emotional support from those whom they come
in contact with, rather than a desire for competition
with those they come in contact with (Edwards &
Hamilton, 2004; MacGeorge et al., 2004; Tannen,
1990).

Boys, at an early age, are taught that language is
a vehicle for accomplishing instrumental tasks, con-
voying important information, and maintaining sta-

tus and autonomy (MacGeorge et al., 2004). As a result,
this would suggest that boys value close relationships
for their instrumental features and functions. Girls,
who, on the other hand, are socialized to believe that close
relationships serve emotional and expressive func-
tions (MacGeorge et al.). Language and talk are the
vehicles for girls to express themselves, communicate
feelings, and to develop intimacy and trust with oth-
ers (MacGeorge et al.). The gender-dependent beliefs
regarding communication are quite different, but the
outcomes of these communication styles are similar,
implying that one communication pattern is not supe-
rior to the other (MacGeorge et al.).

Although men self-report their verbal communic-

ative efforts with women as nonassuming and
respectful, women interpret their communication

techniques as belittling, dismissive, and as “talk” devoid
of empathy (MacGeorge et al., 2004; Tannen, 1990).

This influences another difference in communication
under the “different cultures” theory. Men are gen-
erally more prone to be problem solvers and see com-
munication as the medium to give advice and help
solve problems. As women express their problems
through their communications with men, men take
their usual role and attempt to aid women with their
problems (Tannen). In contrast, women, who value
intimacy and empathy, focus on listening and under-
standing as men speak to them (Tannen). Therefore,
women show a tendency to tell men their problems
and receive problem-solving solutions. Likewise, as
men express themselves to women, they receive under-
standing and empathy instead of the problem-solving
solutions they may have originally desired (Tannen).
These situations and communication tendencies all
serve to add to the confusion and misunderstandings
between the genders.

Other research (Edwards & Hamilton, 2004),
regarding this “different cultures” theory, however,
reveal positive benefits of different communication
styles (Edwards & Hamilton). One study that attempted
to offer further support to Tannen’s (1990) theories,
regarding gender verbal communication differences,
discovered that when both a supportive, nurturing orientation and an assertive, competitive orientation are present in a relationship, they serve to eliminate possible cross-sex miscommunications (Edwards & Hamilton, 2004). Participants were given several different scenarios were asked to rate cooperativeness of the individuals involved, dominance and nurturance displayed, and cross-sex miscommunication. Edwards and Hamilton (2004) suggests that the two different styles are fully functional and provide support for a protective quality in both types of these communications. When communication is seen as beneficial to both parties and cooperation the goal, miscommunication between the genders was significantly decreased. Likewise, when both stereotypical communication patterns of the sexes are present, regardless of the gender that maintains those patterns, misunderstandings and miscommunications are at a minimum (Edwards & Hamilton, 2004). Edwards and Hamilton (2004) further postulated a more complex model for gender communication, stating that gender role is a better predictor of communication styles rather than biological sex.

Michaud and Warner (1997) further separated gender stereotypical verbal communicative patterns into six categories, four linked to men (solve the problem, change the subject and move on, tell them not to worry, and tell a joke) and two linked to women (express empathy and share a similar experience). With the administration of the Communication Styles Survey, Michaud and Warner (1997) asked participants to rate themselves on the likelihood of responding in a given scenario on each of these six choices. Men were more likely to change the subject or tell a joke than women were, and women preferred offering sympathy and reacted more positively to receiving advice than men. These findings support the general stereotype of men and women, with women being more likely to be supportive and men more likely to be avoidant. However, these statistically significant results had small effect sizes, offering limited support for gender differences in communication styles.

**Gender Verbal Communication and Attraction**

In an attempt to find a socially desirable model of communication, Feldstein and colleagues (2001) asked both genders to rate each other on their speed of speech in relation to social attractiveness. A Likert-type scale was used, where dependent variables of perceived competence and social attractiveness were measured as the perceived rate of speech altered between the participants. Women rated all the speakers as more competent than did the male listeners and all the listeners considered the male speakers to be more socially attractive than the female speakers (Feldstein et al., 2001). The different strategies of verbal presentation of men and women may have influenced this finding. Men generally used the strategy of “status assertive mode” by using language as a vehicle to establish their status in situations and women used more affiliative and interpersonally positive communication (Feldstein et al., 2001). Most importantly, however, Feldstein and colleagues (2001) supports the conclusion that people display a tendency to like others with similar attitudes, interests, and personality characteristics, or at least those whom they perceive to be similar to themselves. Those speakers whose speech rates were the most similar to the listener’s own speech rate were ranked more socially attractive than dissimilar speech rates (Feldstein et al., 2001). Furthermore, these results support the idea that mimicking another person’s speech patterns are, in fact, attractive to the other person in the conversation.

Although typically categorized as a woman-related communication pattern, Montgomery (1986) used open communication, a process by which personal information is inferred from verbal and nonverbal behavior, as an independent variable in relation to attraction. Participants in this study were asked to have a discussion with each other and after completing the discussion, a self-report measure for peer attraction and open communication were administered. When determining attraction, the participants relied upon stylistic communication components rather than content components in the speakers’ speech when rating them (Montgomery, 1986). This lends support that the differences in communication between the genders are different in styles and purpose, but not in outcome (MacGeorge et al., 2004; Tannen, 1990). These results support the general conclusion that open communication can accurately predict interpersonal attraction, more than perceived attraction (Montgomery, 1986).

Although the results of Montgomery (1986) support the belief that open communication has more superiority in attraction formation, this study had several limitations that may cause this conclusion to not be completely generalizable. During the interactions between the individuals in the research discussions, open communication may have been seen as a socially appropriate behavior and, as a result, other behaviors may have been unknowingly suppressed. Participant bias, due to interaction with those whom the participants rated higher for social attractiveness, may have also interfered with the results. The continual actions and reactions in response to one another in the discussions are likely to influence interpersonal attraction and may have confounding possibilities.
(Montgomery, 1986). However, Montgomery (1986) found that those who engage in more open communication are more attractive to others. Perhaps most importantly, the substantial influence that speech style maintained in attraction demonstrated that regardless of the content of the speech, the listeners’ focus is on the stereotypical communication pattern of the opposite gender not on the content of the conversation. The high ratings of attraction to those who employed open communicative techniques associated with women’s style of verbal communication lends support to the theory that women’s verbal communicative patterns are more critical to attraction formation than men’s patterns.

Extensive amounts of research has been devoted to studying attraction and the development of attraction, but the effects that specific communicative methods or styles of the genders have on attraction have not been thoroughly studied in the literature to date. This study further defines the effects of general communication patterns of men and women on attraction between the two genders using a self-report survey similar to that used in Michaud and Warner (1997), and two conversations patterned after each stereotypical gender verbal communicative pattern suggested by Tannen (1990). We hypothesize that both genders will identify with the stereotypical communication patterns of their gender set forth by earlier research. Furthermore, we expect that both genders will display a general tendency to rate those communication techniques linked to the stereotypical woman model (express empathy and concern, share similar experiences, and ask further questions about how they feel) as more important to them individually in attraction than those techniques linked to men (tell a joke and provide humor, change the subject and move on, offer advice to help solve problems).

Method

Participants

Participants (N = 164) were solicited from four lower-level psychology classes on the Utah State University campus, were given optional credit for their psychology class, and entered into a prize drawing for their participation. Ages of participants ranged from 18 to 51 with a mean age of 21.43 years. Male participants numbered 73, female participants 91 and all participants reported to be heterosexual. The majority of participants (n = 154) were of White/EuroAmerican descent and the remaining 10 participants represented Hispanic/Latina(o)/Mexican American, Asian American, Native American/American Indian, Multiracial or Other. Seventy-eight percent indicated they were members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and the other twenty-two percent were spread between other religions equally (one to two percent). Of the participants, 24% were declared psychology majors, 67% had never taken a psychology course previous to their current class, and 53% were college freshman students. Only 35% indicated their current involvement in a committed relationship, either dating or married.

Materials

A survey questionnaire titled “Attractive Communication Styles Survey (ACSS)” was used in data collection. This survey was patterned closely after the Communication Styles Survey that was developed by Michaud and Warner (1997) which used similar questions to ascertain certain styles of communication. An alteration was made by substituting “ask further questions about how they feel” in place of “tell them not to worry,” in accordance with Tannen’s (1990) theories regarding women communication styles and to provide a third component to the women style since three components were identified for the men style by Michaud and Warner (see Appendix A for sample question). Likert-type questions were used in assessing the likelihood of participants responding in certain situations on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = never responding that way and 5 = always responding that way). After reading the situation, participants were asked how they would respond by giving them six choices: change the subject and move on, tell a joke and provide humor, give advice, offer empathy and support, share a similar experience, and ask further questions about feelings. These choices reflect men/women stereotypical response styles (Michaud and Warner). Participants were asked to give a rating on a 1 to 5 scale for each of the six choices. Following the first five questions, another five questions gave similar scenarios and asked participants to indicate on the same scale how they would like those of the opposite gender to respond.

Tannen (1990) supported the notion that men are more likely to use communication as a tool in the societal hierarchy involving problem solving and competition; women, on the other hand, value communication as a means of social networking for support, placing emphasis on intimacy and expression. Based upon this research, two brief conversations tailored to college-age individuals concerning normal life issues and decision making between two people of opposite gender were then distributed to the participants to read on paper. This included one conversation with a stereotypical man’s communicative pattern and another conversation exhibiting typical woman’s communicative patterns. Both conversations had a second person’s narrative that was designed to be gender non-
specific, with stereotypical communication styles of both men and women according to Tannen. Instructions included asking the participant to assume that he/she was the person with the gender nonspecific narrative, so that only one narrative in each conversation varied according to these stereotypical communication styles. In order to hold relative physical attractiveness constant, identical virtually-created pictures were provided for both conversations (Braun & Gruendl, 2001). After the conversations were completely read, the Conversation Survey Questionnaire (CSQ) was administered to participants for assessment of attraction to the conversations. Several questions were asked to assess participant attraction to the conversation (e.g., who would you like to go on a date with, who are you most attracted to romantically?).

**Procedure**

The surveys were administered and completed in university classroom settings on campus. The ACSS, conversations, and CSQ were all placed in packets and administered to participants following an informed consent letter read to all participants. Controlling for possible order effects, the ACSS and the CSQ were evenly distributed in order of appearance in the packet. Also, each conversation was evenly varied in order of appearance in the packets to control for any further possible order effects. Participants were informed that the study was about attraction and communication, but not informed of the hypotheses. Upon completion of the materials in the packet, participants were asked to sign an attendance sheet and a sheet for the prize drawing. All survey materials were kept in a locked cabinet following participation in the study and participants were notified that results of the study would be made available to them via email.

**Results**

**Attractive Communication Styles Survey**

After conducting a series of independent sample $t$ tests, a few significant differences were revealed. Men responded that they were more likely to “tell a joke and provide humor” than women. All other differences in participant responses regarding how they identified themselves were nonsignificant (Table 1). Further significant differences were found when comparing the data asking the participants to rate attractiveness of communicative styles in the opposite gender (Table 2). Women displayed a significant difference, being more likely to want men to “ask further questions about how they feel.” Although mean scores were extremely low for both gender scores, men also exhibited a tendency for “changing the subject and moving on” in prospective partners more than women did. No other responses about attractiveness of the opposite gender’s conversation pattern were found to have significant differences between the genders.

**Communication Survey Questionnaire**

Data collected from the CSQ suggest that participants showed a general inclination and preference toward the female type of communication. Women showed an intensely strong preference for the stereotypical type of communication of their gender with over 75% of the participants choosing a “three” or “four” for the majority of the questions. Although women tended to have an intense desire for their own gender’s style of communication in their prospective partners, men did not prefer the stereotypical men style, but their mean scores were all significantly on the stereotypical women communicative style side of the scale. A single sample $t$ test revealed that both mean scores for the genders for all questions on the CSQ were significantly on the women side of the conversation scale (Table 3). Over 70% of male participants chose a “three” or a “four” on many of the questions in the CSQ. Further statistical analysis with a series of independent samples $t$ tests revealed significant differences between every single question on the CSQ between men and women except for “most attracted to romantically” (Table 4). Although all responses for both genders were distributed on the stereotypical women side of the communication scale, almost all questions displayed a significant difference between the genders.

**Discussion**

The data collected on the ACSS were supportive of some of the expectations of this study and contradictory of others. Men were more likely to “tell a joke and provide humor,” supporting the notion of Tannen (1990) that men are “generators of humor.” Women did not have a stronger preference for “tell a joke and provide humor” in their ratings of prospective partners, however, offering little support to her theory of women being “appreciators of humor.” Given the literature on genders and gender communication, we expected men further to define themselves according to other types of male-typical communicative patterns (i.e., give advice, change the subject), but this was not the case. Men were less likely to define themselves with these communicative patterns than women. This may be explained broadly by the negative connotation that may be attached to these two communicative patterns. Both men and women may not want to be known as selfish by giving their own advice or
by changing the subject when they are uncomfortable regardless of what they may do in reality.

Women displayed a significant preference over men for men to “ask further questions about how they feel,” supporting the earlier research findings of women preferring their own gender style of communication. We further expected to see more differences in women responses, defining themselves according to the stereo-
typical women style of communication than was evident in the results. The free response setup of the ACSS may have contributed to this discrepancy since participants could rate themselves on each of the six communicative patterns, making it possible for all participants to score themselves highly on those qualities they viewed positively. Possibly, college-aged women may not identify themselves with the three

### TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$(SD)$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offer Empathy and Support (Self)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18.60</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19.71</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change the Subject and Move On (Self)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>11.37</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give Advice (Self)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17.59</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18.11</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Similar Experiences (Self)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12.08</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11.96</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell a Joke and Provide Humor (Self)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>16.77</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>13.49</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask More Questions About How They Feel (Self)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19.98</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$(SD)$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offer Empathy and Support (Others)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18.78</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19.87</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change the Subject and Move On (Others)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>10.63</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8.77</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give Advice (Others)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17.99</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Similar Experiences (Others)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18.36</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18.68</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell a Joke and Provide Humor (Others)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18.51</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>17.48</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask More Questions About How They Feel (Others)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17.40</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19.47</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
stereotypical women communication patterns or there may be more patterns other than the identified three (express empathy and concern, share a similar experience, and ask further questions about how they feel). Further research may yield productive results in expanding the stereotypical women pattern of communication to include more than these three patterns.

The original hypotheses were all supported by the collected data on the CSQ. Women expressed a tendency to prefer their own gender’s type of communication pattern in attraction to the opposite gender. Women exhibited a strong preference for men who had verbal communication skills including expressing empathy and concern, sharing similar experiences, 

TABLE 3
One Sample T Tests for Composite CSQ Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composite Scores (M)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2.74 (1.00)</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Scores (W)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3.29 (.89)</td>
<td>13.81</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test Value = 2

TABLE 4
Independent Samples T Tests Statistics for CSQ Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Go on a Date With</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.00 (1.39)</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3.37 (1.03)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk to Again</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.01 (1.27)</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3.54 (1.09)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See Again in the Future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.97 (1.26)</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3.54 (1.05)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Successful Romantic Relation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.00 (1.24)</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3.43 (.92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Attracted to Romantically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.82 (1.27)</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3.18 (1.15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be Friends With</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.53 (1.32)</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3.09 (1.36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a Relationship With</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.01 (1.17)</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3.40 (1.03)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give Phone # or Contact Info to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.88 (1.23)</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3.34 (.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give Phone # or Contact Info to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.33 (1.45)</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3.03 (1.31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell Your Friends About</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.42 (1.48)</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3.14 (1.22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and asking further questions about how they feel. This further supports Tannen’s (1990) hypothesis of women desiring men to understand them and communicate with them on a more open manner. The strong emphasis that women placed on the opposite gender’s ability to “ask further questions about how they feel” on the ACSS also support the findings of Montgomery (1986), suggesting open communication styles, usually associated with stereotypical women patterns of communication, are more desirable to women. The slight preference that men exhibited for stereotypical women patterns in the CSQ questions also supports Montgomery’s finding that open communication preferences did not vary across the gender variable.

Although men and women responses did favor the stereotypical women types of communication on the CSQ, there were still significant differences between the genders on several of the questions. This finding may be the result of differing intensities of attraction the genders have toward the stereotypical communicative patterns of women. Mean scores suggest that women strongly favor the communication patterns associated with their gender and men slightly favor those same verbal patterns. This finding supports the idea that gender differences in attraction may not be as evident in verbal communicative patterns as has been suggested by earlier research, but only differs in the intensity of attraction.

The typical difficulties associated with self-report measures are the principle limitations of this study. The social pressure to “look good” or to conform to local social standards and expectations, regardless of secured anonymity, may have caused participants to bias their responses. In a possible attempt to avoid cognitive dissonance, participants may have responded according to how they hope or believe they will become rather than an objective interpretation of themselves. Furthermore, verbal and written descriptions of how a participant would act or want others to act may be very different from the way the participant does act or want others to act in a similar situation in reality. A research design that circumvents these difficulties (i.e., behavioral observation, dyadic interactions) would be ideal for further research on the influence of gender communicative patterns on attraction formation between the genders. Additionally, a statistically proven measurement for the conversations should be developed and employed with any further study on conversations and their influence on opposite gender attraction. Further research may also be warranted in nonheterosexual, cross-cultural and cross-socioeconomic populations to determine if these populations exhibit differences in levels of attraction according to stereotypical gender communication patterns.
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10. Suppose you relate a negative experience you had with your boss at your job one night to a person of the opposite gender that you know. How would like him/her to respond?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attractive Communication Styles Survey Sample Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offer empathy and support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change the subject and move on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give advice and help him/her solve the problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share a similar experience you have had yourself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell a joke and provide humor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask further questions about how they feel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>