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Introduction

Stereotyping is a natural strategy of categorization utilized for efficiency in assessing and classifying new information (Heilman, 1983). Nonetheless, “sex-stereotyping” is loaded with pejorative value and is often associated with the term “discrimination.” Although often the result (Los Angeles Dept. of Water & Power v. Manhart, 1978), stereotyping does not necessarily lead to prejudice-based discrimination (Taylor, 1984).

Contemporary topics of debate in American society have focused on issues pertaining to sex-stereotyping and discrimination. Forums for such issues have included: the sex-based selection procedures of President Clinton in specifically targeting women for cabinet positions, The Citadel and Virginia Military Institute reforming male-only admission policies to include women, and the abundant use of the term “glass ceiling” in magazine articles, book titles, and debates. As is the case in any major reform, changing rules in selection and promotion has led to controversy, in the case of sex-stereotyping going as far as the United States Supreme Court.

The courts are responsible for rendering final decisions regarding an organization’s guilt or innocence in permitting stereotypes to guide selection and promotion decisions. Expert witnesses have been called upon to provide courts insight into relevant issues (Monahan & Walker, 1988). In Price Waterhouse v. Ann B. Hopkins (1989), expert testimony of Susan Fiske, a contemporary researcher of sex-stereotyping, was called into question. The defense attacked Fiske’s ability to post facto detect stereotyping (Hopkins v. Price Waterhouse, 1985).
This case was appealed several times and found its way to the United States Supreme Court. To defend Fiske, and social science in general, the American Psychological Association (APA) interceded. The APA published its opinion in an *amicus* brief which resulted in a thorough review of the literature (Fiske, Bersoff, Borgida, Deaux, & Heilman, 1990). In it, research was cited to show how stereotypes are formed, when they are used, and their resulting effects. In addition, the APA defended the notion that experts could be effective in detecting stereotype-based discrimination through evaluation of evidence within organizations' environments.

Fiske successfully persuaded jurors that stereotyping worked against Hopkins at Price Waterhouse, but deficiencies in the literature were revealed in her testimony. The APA pointed out some of those weaknesses in its brief (Fiske et al., 1990 a). This brief gave rise to the present study. Better assessment measures are needed to aid in determining when stereotyping affects decision rendering. This concern has been expressed in several ways: does the use of gender schema correlate with discrimination, is prejudice tied to discrimination, do trait-based beliefs relate to role-based beliefs? A step toward the goal of answering these questions may be to explore the possibility that certain people are more likely than others to hold stereotypical expectations of others (a precursor to negative discrimination.) It may be that the more stereotypically masculine a man sees himself to be, the more likely he is to expect women to be stereotypically feminine.

The present study examined this proposition. Further is the question of whether more masculine men expect women to be stereotypically feminine and whether those
expectations influence a male’s selection decisions regarding women candidates in the work place. The present study tested the hypothesis that men’s conformity to “sex-appropriate” behavior correlated with their tendency to show bias toward sex-typed female candidates.
Chapter 1

Review of Literature

What is Stereotyping

The word “stereotype” is derived from the Greek word "stereos" meaning “solid” or “firm.” “Stereotyping” was introduced into social psychology by Lippman in 1922 to describe a social phenomenon whereby a set of beliefs (“stereotypes”) are applied to a specific group. In 1948 Rokeach asserted the prominent belief of stereotype impermeability when he said, “It is not necessary to go far beyond common experience to convince ourselves that there is probably nothing more resistant to change than stereotypic attitudes towards out-groups” (p. 259).

Although the term “stereotype” is still used today, much has changed. Stereotypes have recently been described as “natural strategies of categorization utilized for efficiency in assessing and classifying new information” (Heilman, 1983, p. 271). Current mainstream understanding of stereotypes is that they "are not necessarily any more or less inaccurate, biased, or logically faulty than are any other kinds of cognitive generalizations" (Taylor, 1981, p. 503). Such understanding is based upon fairly shaky ground as concerning what differences actually do exist within and between groups, an area of stereotype research common in early experimentation and often called “descriptive stereotyping”- but an area often neglected today (Oakes, Haslam, & Turner, 1994). Fiske & Taylor (1991) refer to stereotypes as the functional equivalent of
schemas and, like schemas, they are arguably very useful; so why all the fuss?

The bottom line is unfair discrimination. The gathering and interpreting of information leading to decisions involves perception, and unsubstantiated perceptions may lead to invalid conclusions. Since our beliefs guide our actions, when talking about stereotyping, a flawed conclusion used in decision making results in discrimination. Given that discrimination is something to be avoided (because it is illegal and ethically despicable), a concerted effort has been made toward defining the circumstances that give rise to it.

**History**

Research on sex-stereotyping has had a popular following. The issues relative to stereotyping permeate almost every occupation and can be found at almost any level in employee selection and promotion. Stereotype research has spanned over five decades (Cauthen, Robinson, & Krauss, 1971). Within this literature base, over 7,900 articles have been published on human sex differences since 1991. At least 1,100 articles have appeared on sex roles generally and more than 700 on sex role attitudes specifically. A computer-assisted bibliographic search found that from 1991 through 1997, over 930 articles were published on stereotypes, with at least 350 pertaining to sex. Furthermore, the debate of sex differences and stereotypes has predated scientific study in psychology and sociology. Perceptions of women were expressed publicly by philosophers which reflected prominent attitudinal dimensions of their time (Ruble, 1983). Public attitude toward the role of women has since become a focal point for stereotype researchers.

The way in which stereotypes are understood has been subject to major change.
Lippman (1922) began research interest in stereotypes when he coined the term to describe a social phenomenon in which stereotypes were viewed as rigid, oversimplified and selective processes used by people to defend their social standing. Katz and Braly (1933) set the research trend by using a checklist to study the content of various stereotypes. Stereotypes were viewed as "unjustified and contradictory fictions" whose use was evidence of "negative and prejudicial views toward targeted groups" (Ashmore & Del Boca, 1981, p. 259). The concept was further cast into pejorative light by Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford (1950) who described stereotypes as "manifestations of pathological personalities." Under this theoretical framework stereotypes were believed to be tools exclusive to certain types of people. Allport (1954) helped researchers see the extent of the stereotype problem. He believed stereotype construction to be based on rational processes of categorization, with rationality contingent on an individual's nature. Allport regarded stereotypes as a basis for "normal prejudgment" that make "orderly living" possible. Sherif (1967) expanded Allport's stance and showed stereotypes to be significantly influenced by intergroup relations. Tajfel (1969) defined stereotypes as processes of categorization common to all; he focused studies on the processes of accentuation and noted the primacy of categorization processes over the exercise of personal prejudice.

Cognitive biases and study of perceptual systems were the focus of Hamilton's work (1981). He viewed stereotypes to be products of generalized and necessary cognitive processes that inadvertently produce error. Contemporary investigators probed these processes with more sophisticated methodologies and showed that stereotypes can
operate automatically, prior to conscious processing (Devine, 1989; Dovidio, Evans, & Tyler, 1986; Gaertner & McLaughlin, 1983). Tajfel (1981) integrated several earlier perspectives to demonstrate the contribution of groups and values to the stereotyping process. Stereotypes were viewed as shared products shaped by group membership and intergroup relations.

Deaux (1995) explained the impact of current definitions of stereotypes as follows:

For those in organizations concerned with the inappropriate exercise of stereotypes, for example, the task is no longer one of locating a relatively small minority of offenders. Rather, the focus needs to shift to the context in which categorical thinking is sustained and to intervention that can disrupt these typical broad based processes. (p. 11)

**Why Stereotyping Occurs**

Lippman pioneered researchers' pursuit of an understanding of the role of stereotyping in the formation of prejudice and discrimination. Lippmann (1922) argued stereotyping occurs because of the existence of "shared belief systems" from which "individual beliefs reflect larger societal views." This perspective is often referred to as the sociocultural perspective. Members of this school of thought refer to "public attitudes" which were regarded as "important as private prejudice in the development of discrimination." Researchers defined "stereotypes" to be beliefs, "prejudice" to be attitudes, and "discrimination" to be the behavioral result of the two. They hypothesized attitudes and beliefs were inextricably linked, the latter providing information about
groups to bolster the prejudice based emotional reaction (or discrimination).

Sociocultural theorists are not so much concerned with why we stereotype but with whether there "are grounds" for stereotyping. In other words, is there consistency to merit grouping?

In explaining why stereotypes exist, sociocultural theorists divide into two camps: cultural and structural. Both understand society to be the source of shared stereotypes. Cultural theorists emphasize early socialization experiences, submitting that social rewards and punishments encourage accordance with cultural expectations. These theorists say we stereotype because certain natural differences really exist, an area of research known as the "kernel of truth debate."

Robinson, Lockard, & Adams (1979) provided some evidence for this perspective. One stereotype of women is that they tend to be more nurturing than men. Robinson et al. (1979) found that of more than 7,000 passers-by in a Seattle shopping mall, teenage and young adult women were more than twice as likely as similar-age men to pause to look at a baby, thus demonstrating women to be more nurturing than men. The above accentuates the argument that sex-stereotypes are a product of real difference. Some have argued, however, that society is the source for such differences, not biology. Alice Rossi (1978) has taken a more biological route to confirming the cultural theorist stance, the position which points to early experience as explanation for gender-role conformity. She has shown that an infant's crying and nursing stimulate the mother's secretion of oxytocin, a hormone also stimulated in sexual activity. This hormonal source for arousal, Rossi and other like-minded researchers have claimed, indicates a
biological disposition for women to be innately nurturing (one of many stereotyped descriptors of women).

Somewhat different from the cultural approach, the structural approach posits that the common positions which certain groups occupy within the social structure generate gender-role expectations both for assessors and those assessed. Social approval, structural theorists argue, is the reason for convergence with stereotypes. Eagly (1987) studied children's imitation behavior of television hero figures. These findings were related to Eron, Husemann, Leftkowitz, and Walder's (1972) longitudinal research to show that girl viewers who regarded programs containing heroines as realistic were more likely to imitate such hero's behavior than viewers less convinced of program realism. In this study, hero behavior was described as stereotypically masculine. Girls convinced of television realism achieved higher Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory Masculinity scores than girls less convinced of television realism. These findings supported the sociocultural belief that people tend to model their behavior after what they perceive to be valued in the real world. Both sociocultural camps, the cultural and the structural, conclude that modeling guides both social perception and resulting social judgment.

Stereotypes, according to a motivational perspective, are maladaptive behavioral results explainable through study of pathologies. Early theorists of this perspective believed dysfunctional people were most likely to use stereotypes. Not as extreme, current researchers believe certain personalities are more likely to rely on stereotype use. Such constructs as tolerance for ambiguity and constructs of authoritarianism have
recently been studied. People less tolerant of ambiguity were more likely to rely on stereotypes (Larsen, 1984) and people preferring dominance over others showed increased negative feelings toward the opposite sex when forced to be less authoritarian (Adorno et al., 1950). This research indicates that not only do environmental conditions affect our belief systems but our attitudes or personalities affect how environmental information is processed. More generally, how we are wired may give some indication of the probability that we will use stereotypes.

Similar to Herek (1987, p. 285) who stated, "people can benefit either from holding an attitude about the attitude object itself or from expressing the attitude," researchers buying the motivational perspective are likely to suggest stereotyping can only be understood through individual analysis. Although often set to the side because of its impractical nature, this perspective has been adopted within recent years. Individual assessment has become key as psychologists have been called to the stand to testify for or against organizations accused of improperly using stereotypes in decision making. Current researchers are attempting to describe types of people likely to stereotype and are differentiating between styles of stereotyping (Fisk and Glick, 1996).

This kind of research is the most current in the field. Susan Fiske recently published, with an associate, the Ambivalent Sex Scale (1996) based upon the belief that actual behaviors may or may not always reflect stereotyping activity. They argue it depends on the personality of the person who engages in stereotyping as to how beliefs affect actions. Fiske is currently working to develop this theory. Such research, although mainstream, is not new. La Pie has recognized that salient bias does not always
result in overt discrimination (LaPiere, 1936). LaPiere traveled with a Chinese couple who stopped at 66 sleeping places and 184 eating places to see the frequency of discrimination for service. They were refused service only once. Afterwards, the proprietors of these places received through the mail questionnaires asking whether they would take "members of the Chinese race as guests in your establishment" (p. 232). Ninety-three percent of the restaurants and 92 percent of the hotels said they would not serve Chinese people. This study is understood to support the notion that negative beliefs and negative attitudes may not necessarily manifest in negative action.

Researchers of the cognitive perspective understand stereotyping as a necessary process for understanding a complex world where similar things are grouped and contrasted to dissimilar things. Efficient as this system may be, it is prone to error. People may see things that are not there while ignoring things that are (Hamilton, 1979; Taylor & Crocker, 1981). This position suggests perceptions may serve to confirm expectancies that a person has about members of stereotyped groups and thus reinforce stereotypes.

**How Stereotyping Occurs**

Base rating, descriptive stereotyping, and cognitive categorization theories are all terms given to the process of pairing a group with a word. The picture coming to mind when cued by a group association is called a schema. In schemas, neutral words (i.e., passive or aggressive) are paired with groups (i.e., female or male). This schema is used to generalize novel situations and provide meaning to otherwise ambiguous stimuli. This is sometimes done as a means of filling in missing information.
Bayes' theorem suggests that in the absence of individuating information, previously developed schemas built from base-rates will be used. Base-rates are the normal behaviors personally observed or generally believed to be displayed by a group in question. This set of behaviors become our criteria for assessment.

Manis, Dovalina, Avis, & Cardoze, (1980) found base-rate information to affect a predictive social judgment task. Fifty-six University of Michigan undergraduate students were divided into two groups. Half the participants were male, the other half were female. Each group was shown 40 photographs of students' faces. With each photograph, participants were informed of that student's intentions to pursue graduate education. One group was told 70% were graduate school bound. The other was told 30% were on their way to graduate school. During a recall phase, new faces were included with old faces. Participants were told to guess if a face was new or old. For all faces, participants were to "guess about that person's plans" (p. 231). Respondents who were assigned to the high-graduate condition were consistently more likely than those in the low-graduate condition to infer that a particular new student had plans for postgraduate education. This study leads to the conclusion that base-rates significantly affect perceptions of others. This seems to be particularly true when base-rates are made relative to an out-group, a group to which, by its nature, an observer cannot belong.

Not wanting to be limited, there is a tendency to accept and expect differences within a person's own group or "in-group." Nevertheless, people tend to maximize perceived differences between groups and overestimate adherence of others to their prescribed roles (Hamilton, 1981; Manis et al., 1980; Zuckerman, 1978 ). In such cases,
extreme polarized evaluations are made (Kanter, 1977; Taylor, 1981; Mullen, 1991).

As early as 1954, the above tendency was recognized by Gordon Allport. The robustness and generality of this effect is rarely questioned today (Simon, 1992). The perceived homogeneity of out-groups, together with the principle of in-group favoritism, is seen as a central cause of negative out-group stereotypes and intergroup conflict (Park & Rothbart, 1982).

Attribution theorists submit that people are relatively insensitive to base-rate information when making individual predictions (Kahneman & Tversky, 1973; Miller, Gillen, Schenker, & Radlove, 1973; Nisbett & Borgida, 1975). Although these researchers emphasize the tendency for assessors to explain social behavior by group membership, they stress an individual-by-individual assessment process. They believe people simply use schemata to fill in missing information. So lack of knowledge of out-group heterogeneity results in use of schemata. Beliefs of out-group homogeneity result and, consequently, individualized assessment is less likely. Stereotypes are likely to be used in such circumstances.

Nelson et al. (1990) have not only shown that base-rates are relied upon in perception, but they are strong and resistant to change. Seventy-five students at the University of Michigan were asked to determine the relative heights of both standing and sitting men and women who were depicted in slides. Standing pictures provide cues of height. Sitting pictures provide fewer such cues. In both cases, but more significantly for the sitting group, participants rated the men to be taller than the women. This response trend persisted in an associated experiment in which subjects were explicitly
told sex would not predict targets’ heights. This finding supports research which has shown base-rates are relied upon more when evaluative information is not available and goes a step farther to state that they may even persist in the face of disconfirming evidence.

Researchers go back and forth supporting and attacking theories on how stereotypes are developed. Not only do individuals use schemata differently but they also differ on how those schemata are constructed. Their reliance on resulting stereotypes may, as a result, differ. Perhaps motivational theorists were onto something suggesting individual-by-individual assessment.

If we are to accept the notion that reliance on stereotypes differs depending on the personality of those who make interpretations, then it would make sense for attributes to be differentially interpreted depending on who displays them. Asch performed several experiments on how people form impressions of others. Asch (1952) gave participants a list of seven traits said to characterize a person. Given those traits, the participant was to create a sketch of that person. To one group, a list containing the word “warm” was given. To another, the same list was presented but with the word "cold" substituted for "warm" (Asch, 1952). With this single difference, consistent significant differences were observed. "Cold" served as a focal point from which all the other words' meanings were altered. The point of this research is that people often focus on "central traits" (Asch's term) in perceiving the whole. The significance of this research is that it suggests two individuals may be characteristically the same (i.e., Asch's list of words) but the presence of a surface difference (i.e., cold or warm) may
trigger drastically different evaluations.

From findings such as those just mentioned, researchers explore the concept of sub-types. Sub-types are groups within groups (Oakes et al., 1994.) Just as Italians may be differentiated from Americans, so too may female Americans be differentiated from male Americans. Furthermore, when discussing female Americans, there are mothers and non-mothers. Finally, but not exhaustively, there are single mothers and married mothers. Depending upon the sub-group thought of, stereotypes may differ. This presents a problem to researchers for such populations as Black Americans or White Americans. Although most people hold a dominating opinion of broad-based groups, it is common for participants to be reluctant in making generalizations (Oakes et al, 1994). In part due to sub-types, stereotype research must be cautiously interpreted. As a first step in understanding stereotypes, however, researchers must decide which groups to explore.

Forms of Stereotyping

The preponderance of current research has been conducted through study of groups protected by equal employment opportunity and affirmative action (EEOC/ AA) laws and related provisions (Age Discrimination in Employment Act, 1967; Executive Order 11246, 1965). Some of the groups protected include those of race, national origin, and sex.

Race. Word, Zanna, and Cooper (1974) set up an experiment in which Princeton University White men interviewed White and Black job applicants. When the applicant was Black, the interviewers sat farther away, ended the interview 25 percent sooner, and
made 50 percent more speech errors than when the applicant was White. In a second experiment, the researchers acted as interviewers to the White Princeton students of the first study who were given the role of interviewee. When videotapes of the interviews were later rated, those treated like the Blacks in the first experiment appeared more nervous and less effective.

The experimenters concluded "that the 'problem' of Black performance resides not entirely within the Blacks, but rather within the interaction setting itself" (p. 109). Like-minded researchers do not deny that differences exist among various demographic groups. However, rather than biology, they claim that social factors dictate differences. Furthermore, they suggest that out-groups are much less homogenous than expected and that differences are more a matter of selective perception than a matter of fact. These, researchers warn assessors that negative evaluations may be as much a reflection of their interaction with candidates as of candidates themselves.

**National origin.** With a work force growing in ethnic diversity, research concerning stereotype use as it pertains to national origin has grown dramatically. The basis for much of this research (and stereotyping in general) has been the work of Katz and Braly (1933) who tested one hundred Princeton students to determine what characteristics were thought "typical" of various members of diverse nationality. Participants were to read through a list of eighty-four adjectives and write down as many as necessary to "characterize these people adequately." They could add adjectives of their own if they found those provided to be insufficient. Participants repeated this procedure ten times, characterizing first Germans, then Italians, Negroes, the Irish, the
English, Jews, Americans, the Chinese, the Japanese, and Turks. Participants were then asked to review their list and choose the five adjectives they thought were the best descriptors (or most typical) of the group in question. They found significant similarity among participants in the assignment of traits both to their national in-group (Americans) and to the various out-groups.

The above results were interpreted by Katz and Braly to indicate the existence of "public attitudes" about racial groups, which were regarded as important as "private prejudice" in the development of racism. They hypothesized attitudes and beliefs were inextricably linked, the latter providing information about groups to bolster the prejudiced-based emotional reaction. In 1935 Katz and Braly replicated their research.

Here, they had sixty-five participants (who had no knowledge of the previous experiment, or the idea that the traits were in any way related to racial groups) rate the 84 traits in terms of the desirability in friends and associates. Using the stereotypes elicited in 1933, the overall favorability of the traits used to characterize each of the ten groups was calculated, and the groups rank ordered accordingly. Sixty more subjects were explicitly asked to rank order the ten groups in terms of "your preference for association with their members" (p. 185). The two rank orderings were very similar. This follow up has been regarded as supporting the sociocultural concept of "public attitude" which has been further applied to gender stereotypes specifically (Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz. 1972; Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman, & Broverman, 1968; Sheriffs & McKee, 1957; Williams & Best, 1982).

Sex. Although the word "sex" identifies biological identification (i.e., male/
female) and the word "gender" refers to a behavioral disposition (masculine/ feminine), "sex-stereotyping" and "gender-stereotyping" are often used interchangeably. The courts use the term "sex-stereotyping" and the preponderance of APA research uses "gender-stereotyping" to describe the process of using stereotypes to differentiate between males and females.

Asch (1952) demonstrated how a central word can serve as a point of reference from which the meaning of identical lists of words can take on different meanings. Many experiments since then have focused on how "male" and "female" can serve as a central trait by which evaluative bias in creating "sketches" of those assessed may result. For example, the word "aggressive" has been shown to be negatively perceived when paired with "woman" and positively viewed when paired with "man" (Lippa, 1978). Just as the words "cold" and "warm" change our perceptions of words like "driven," so too does the word "woman" trigger a schema different from the word "man."

Bem (1974) tested and put into an inventory those attributes found to be descriptive of "male" and "female." Brown Larsen, Rankin, & Ballard (1980) found masculine words tend to be better recalled by males and feminine words by females. These findings were interpreted to mean men are masculine and women are feminine.

Sex-stereotyping research has occurred in many settings including: military, schools, government, and industry. Each setting has had its share of problems in the areas of employee promotion and selection. Probably the most revealing area where effects of stereotype use can be seen is in the work environment.

Sex-Stereotyping in The Work Environment
The qualities most valued in the work setting are those associated with being male (Heilman, Block, Martell, & Simon, 1989); Females are more times than not expected to display feminine traits; that is, traits not equated with work success (Bem, 1974; Heilman et al., 1989; Schein, 1975); When females behave in role-atypical behavior, they are viewed negatively (Brown & Geis, 1984; Costrich, Feinstein, Kidder, Marecek, & Pascale, 1975; Deaux & Lewis, 1983, 1984; Hagen & Kahn, 1975); and women who display masculine traits tend to thrive in the work setting, but only up to a point (Sekaran, Leong, 1992), a phenomenon known as "the glass ceiling."

The situation described above leads to a double bind for women in the work place. They are required to be "masculine" to achieve, but being "masculine" causes them to be viewed negatively. At some point, they are likely to hit the under side of the infamous "glass ceiling" and their professional rise will be halted by perceptions of sex-role deviance. With employment law coming down so heavily on discriminatory selection and promotion policies, the demand for better understanding of the processes supporting such behavior has grown. At the heart of research has been stereotyping. Try as they may to be objective, organizations often find themselves in need of legal counsel because of a discrimination suit.

**Sex-Stereotyping in The Work Place: Discrimination Court Case**

**Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins.** Sex stereotyping research has been specifically applied in the case of Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins, the first Supreme Court case to use psychological research on sex stereotyping. The case was decided in May 1989 and remanded to Judge Gehard Gesell, who rendered his final decision in May 1990. His
verdict was in favor of Hopkins.

Price Waterhouse (PW) is a large accounting firm. Ann Hopkins was recognized as a top-notch performer, bringing in business worth $25 million, more billings than anyone else proposed for partner that year. She was the only woman of 88 candidates proposed for partner that year. Her clients praised her and she was described by co-workers to be "driven, hard working, and exacting." Of 662 partners at PW, only seven were women.

Hopkins was not selected for the position of partner. Suggesting she was not admitted because of her gender, Hopkins filed a discrimination suit against Price Waterhouse. The court heard her case as set forth by Hishon v. King & Spulding (1984) which established partnership decisions as qualified for protection under Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Price Waterhouse claimed it was because of problems in interpersonal relations that she was denied promotion. Criticisms included, this "lady partner candidate" was "macho," she "overcompensated for being a woman," and she needed a "course at charm school."

Hopkins' original complaint was heard in 1985. She won judgment, but PW appealed to the federal district (trial) court. PW lost again and so appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court. The issue before the U.S. Supreme Court was as follows: when the plaintiff has satisfied the trier of fact that intentional discrimination affected the defendants's employment decision (as was done by Hopkins), must the plaintiff also prove that the decision would have been made in her favor absent discrimination? Their decision was that in mixed-motive cases, such as this, it is not permissible for employers
to use discriminatory criteria, and they (not the plaintiff) must bear the burden of persuading the trier of fact that their decision would have been the same if no impermissible discrimination had taken place.

The case was remanded because the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that PW had been held to too high a standard of proof (i.e., clear and convincing proof). In the court's opinion, there was not adequate understanding of stereotypes to support such a requirement.

Although previous sex discrimination litigation has used psychological research in argument, the Price Waterhouse case was the first to apply laboratory and field research to describe antecedent conditions that encourage stereotyping. For the first time in any Title VII case, sex stereotyping was considered to be a form of sex-discrimination.

Susan Fiske was able to provide adequate testimony to convince the court that discrimination resulted from sex-stereotyping. Nonetheless, had a more quantitative evaluative method been available, greater confidence would have been maintained in the court's ruling (even Fiske is prone to attribution bias and schema use.) As stated above, stereotypes are not necessarily flawed and do not necessarily result in observable discrimination. Presently, there is no accepted, reliable method used in determining when discrimination does or does not result from sex-stereotyping. Since Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins (1989) established sex stereotyping as a form of sex discrimination, such a measure is needed. Given the growing trend to use psychological evidence in courts, it makes sense that further steps should be taken within the field of
psychology to apply current research in such a way.

**Impact of Self-Perception to Schematic Processing**

In the tradition of motivational theorists, Sandra Bem has suggested stereotypes are more commonly used by certain personalities than others. Sandra Bem suggests, whether right or wrong, virtually all children acquire the culture’s concepts of masculinity and femininity and throughout socialization are trained to conform, but sex-typed individuals (masculine males and feminine females) are more attuned to these gender schemas and are motivated to comply with them. This theory and the methodology of its measurement have been matters of debate (Bem, 1982; Crane & Markus, 1982; Markus et al., 1982; Mills, 1983; C.J. Mills & Tyrrell, 1983; Spence & Helmreich, 1981; Spence, 1984), but research using the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) has found evidence that sex-typed individuals stereotype more and do so along gender-role related lines (Park & Hahn, 1988). Research using other instruments has not supported the relationship between sex-typed self-descriptors and gender stereotyping (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1975; Spence, 1984). Despite confirming studies, the relationship between sex-typing and discrimination is not entirely clear (Fiske & Taylor, 1991).

Part of Bem’s theory includes a list of adjectives believed to be descriptive of one sex over another. She believes these words have taken on implied gender themselves. Lippa (1978) found that women who were sex-typed were regarded as more feminine, and sex-typed men as more masculine. This research helps to verify Bem’s descriptive typology. Lippa (1978) found as men and women rate themselves along
genderized terms, they type themselves as either masculine or feminine. These same people are viewed by others similarly to how they viewed themselves, thus confirming a general societal view of what constitutes masculinity and femininity.

The present study examined Bem’s gender schema theory, seeking to explore the relationship between men’s self sex-typing and their tendency to sex-type women. A further question dealt with the extent of sex-typed self-assessment in men and the extent of the same men’s preference for a sex-typed woman candidate. If the gender schema theory holds true and a connection between evaluator self-sex-typing and judgments of women job candidates can be established, it may be possible in the future for measures of evaluator personal perception to be used in predicting discrimination. Through such a process, organizations may better enable themselves to prevent discrimination.
Chapter II

Rationale And Hypotheses

The qualities most valued in the work setting are those associated with being male (Heilman. Block, Martell, & Simon, 1989). Females are more times than not expected to display feminine traits, that is, traits not equated with work success (Bem, 1974; Heilman et al., 1989; Schein, 1975). When females behave in role-atypical behavior, they are viewed negatively (Brown & Geis, 1984; Costrich, Feinstein, Kidder, Marecek, & Pascale, 1975; Deaux & Lewis, 1983, 1984; Hagen & Kahn, 1975). Women who display masculine traits tend to thrive in the work setting, but only up to a point (Sekaran, Leong, 1992).

One who converges with gender-typed words in self-description is said to be "sex-typed." A person who assesses others by relying upon such norms is referred to as "schematic." A "base-rate" is the set of behaviors believed to be descriptive or "normal" for a group to which a person belongs (e.g., whites, blacks, men, or women).

In an ideal world, selection and promotion decisions would be made in an unbiased way, but research has shown schematic processing often occurs automatically and sometimes with ambivalent intentions (Fisk & Glick, 1996). Stereotype use is anything but rare; in fact, considering the number of promotion and selection decisions made each year, it is surprising there are not more stereotype-based sex-discrimination court cases. Although methods of detecting and minimizing improper stereotype use
have come a long way, Price Waterhouse and Ann Hopkins may agree not far enough.

Stereotype use is most probable in the absence of individuating information or when individuating information is unclear or irrelevant, when a group is rare in the evaluation setting, and when selection criteria are ambiguous (Fiske et al., 1991). In an effort to avoid sex-discrimination, organizations have utilized stereotype research like that of Fiske to restructure organizational operations. Thanks to research on sex-discrimination, efforts to avoid unfair discrimination have experienced some success, but more times than not, remedies are made after noticeable negative consequences (i.e., law suits or threats of suit) have resulted. The goal of researchers should be to predict, rather than react to, discrimination.

Prediction of discrimination is a difficult task. Those who believe stereotypical perceptions often lead to discrimination have attempted to predict such behavior by assessing decision makers' beliefs about others. Results from such questioning, however, tend to be unreliable. Because of a increased sensitivity to stereotypes, those questioned are likely to hide prejudicial feelings and respond in a socially desirable way. Direct inquiry of decision makers regarding issues of sex differences may push an already difficult-to-detect problem further into hiding; the glass ceiling may become even more difficult for women to penetrate. Bem has proposed that those who sex-type themselves have the tendency to sex-type others (i.e., to be schematic). Thus to the extent men see themselves as highly masculine and simultaneously low in femininity (i.e., sex-typed), they will favor women whom they see as highly feminine and hardly masculine.
If researchers hope to be able to predict when a man might unfairly discriminate against a woman, contributing components must be studied. It may be that certain types of people are more likely than others to use base-rates (Nelson, Biernat, and Manis, 1990). Rather than directly asking men their perceptions of women, researchers may be able to predict whether a man will engage in sex-discrimination simply by assessing the man's self-perception of his masculinity.

The following hypotheses were tested:

Ha 1: There is a statistically significant positive correlation between the extent of sex-typing in men’s perceptions of themselves and the extent to which the same men sex-type women.

The term “sex-typed” refers to a person’s convergence with characteristics stereotypically associated with his or her sex. As a result, sex-typed men choose “masculine” traits in describing themselves and avoid “feminine” traits. Conversely, sex-typed women accept “feminine” traits in describing themselves while avoiding “masculine” traits.

Ha 2: There is a statistically significant positive correlation between the extent of sex-typed self-assessment in men and the extent of the same men’s preference for a sex-typed woman candidate.

As men more strongly adopt "masculine" traits and avoid "feminine" traits in describing themselves, it was predicted they would more greatly prefer a highly "feminine" sex-typed woman job candidate.

The corresponding null hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance.
Chapter III

Method

Participants

Thirty-four Georgetown College and forty-six Xavier University male undergraduate students provided the data for the present study. As compensation some Xavier University participants received extra course credit. Further information describing the sample is shown in Table 1.

Measures

Participant Information. Participant demographic information, gathered on a form shown in Appendix D and reported in Table 1, has not been directly studied in this thesis. Nonetheless, to increase the accuracy of data interpretation and for the purpose of making better suggestions for future research, such variables were probed for response trends.

Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) (Appendices J-K). The BSRI is a scale used to assess perceived masculinity and femininity in men and women. In the development of the scale, 400 personality characteristics were presented to 100 undergraduate students for rating of their social desirability as descriptors of "masculine" and "feminine." A personality characteristic qualified as masculine if it was independently judged by both males and females to be significantly more desirable for a man than for a woman. Similar methodology was used for establishing the feminine construct. Items qualified
Table 1

Demographic Information on 80 College Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Response Choices</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18 years</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19 years</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 years</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥ 21 years</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Georgetown College</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Xavier University</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varsity Athlete</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
as neutral if judged by both males and females to be no more desirable for one sex than for the other. From the 400 characteristics, 20 masculine, 20 feminine, and 20 neutral items were selected for inclusion in the BSRI (Appendix A).

All masculine and feminine items were judged to be socially desirable and positive in tone for the appropriate sex. Neutral items consisted of ten traits positive in tone and ten traits negative in tone. The BSRI yields three scores: Masculinity, Femininity, and Androgyny. Classifications are based on a difference score (Femininity minus Masculinity.) Where difference scores are minimal, this could mean either that both feminine and masculine scores are relatively high, indicating androgyny, or that both feminine and masculine scores are relatively low, producing "undifferentiated" status. Highly positive numbers reflect sex-typed femininity (i.e., convergence to feminine traits and deviance from masculine traits) while highly negative numbers represent sex-typed masculinity (i.e., accepting masculine traits and avoiding feminine traits.) These classifications were not particularly germane to the present study since scores on the Bem were considered on an interval scale. Furthermore, only Masculinity and Femininity scores are relevant to the current study.

To establish reliability and validity, Bem administered the BSRI to 561 male and 366 female undergraduate college students at two California universities (Stanford and Foothill). Test-retest reliability was established by retesting 28 male and 28 female subjects from the above groups four weeks after initial testing. Both Masculinity and Femininity scores proved to be highly reliable over the four-week interval (Masculinity $r = .90$; Femininity $r = .90$). Internal consistency was established using data collected from
the 927 person normative sample. Separate coefficient-alpha computations were made for masculinity, femininity, and androgyny scores. Results showed both scores to be highly reliable, both in the Stanford sample (Masculinity $\alpha = .86$; Femininity $\alpha = .75$) and in the Foothill sample (Masculinity $\alpha = .86$; Femininity $\alpha = .82$).

Construct validity of BSRI items was established through the process of item selection. Items were selected if subjects (male and female) agreed on their gender appropriateness. Participants were also asked to describe themselves on the inventory. They consistently chose sex-appropriate adjectives in describing their own sex and consistently rejected sex-inappropriate terms, indicating Bem's constructs to be valid. Scales of the BSRI have been shown to correlate moderately in a positive direction with corresponding scales of the California Psychological Inventory, but not at all with those of the Guilford-Zimmerman scale. It appears the BSRI is measuring an aspect of sex roles not directly tapped by either of these two scales. Rather than detracting from BSRI validity, these findings actually support Bem’s theory of Masculinity/ Femininity.

While assessing masculinity and femininity, Bem's notion of these constructs differs from other measures of masculinity and femininity. For instance, unlike the above scales, the BSRI allows for the co-existence of masculinity and femininity (i.e., androgony).

Some studies have supported Bem’s constructs (Suhrer-Roussel, & Hertzog, 1991; Wilson, McMaster, Greenspan, & Mboyi, 1991) while others have not (Wilcox & Francis, 1991). Despite continued debate as to the BSRI's validity, research using the questionnaire continues to meet with peer approval and to be published in refereed
journals (e.g., Hart, & Thompson, 1991; Syswensky, Madden, & Treadwell, 1991; Lippa, R., 1991.) Since 1991 alone, over 260 articles using the BSRI as an experimental measure have appeared in recognized psychological journals. Although further research is perhaps needed, the BSRI does appear a well accepted research measure of masculinity and femininity.

Recommendation Letters. Information for use in testing Hypothesis Two was provided in the form of four recommendation letters (Appendices F-I). Letters were constructed based upon sex descriptors included in the BSRI (Appendix A). BSRI descriptors had been determined to be more masculine or feminine based upon male and female judges rating their own sex. “Sex-appropriate” characteristics were found to be more desirable for both males and females than “sex-inappropriate” characteristics (Bem, 1974). Of the four letters, one described a “feminine” female candidate, one described a “masculine” female candidate, and two described “neutral” female candidates. Both the letter masculine in tone (Appendix F) and the letter feminine in tone (Appendix G) were confirmed to be clearly descriptive of the appropriate gender by 100% of 25 undergraduate male judges.

Procedure

To begin, an Introductory Statement (See Appendix B) was read to the participants. Here the experimenter identified himself and explained the session about to take place. A “Consent to Participate In A Research Study" form (See Appendix C) was then distributed for signing. Once signed, consent forms were collected and shuffled to assure anonymity. Next, test materials (stapled together) were distributed. Test
materials included the following: a Participant Information form, a Company Announcement, four letters of recommendation (Stephanie Rose, Alice Marie, Kristen Marie, and Michelle Ann), a Bem Sex-Role Inventory "Self Perceptions," a Bem Sex Role Inventory "Perception of Women," and a Participant Debriefing Form (See Appendices D-L).

Once all materials were distributed, Instructions for Phase I were given (See Appendix B). In these instructions, a company announcement describing the hypothetical situation of Phase I was read (See Appendix E). This announcement asked participants to imagine themselves as members of a selection committee. They were instructed to evaluate, on a nine-point scale, four female candidates for the position based upon her relative interpersonal social desirability. These scores have henceforth been referred to as "Selection Scores." Participants were instructed to use the provided "Letters of Recommendation" (See Appendices F-I) as the bases for their selection decisions. Selection scores were recorded on the "Company Announcement" (See Appendix E). Once they completed the forms, participants were instructed to sit quietly and wait for all participants to complete Phase I.

When all participants finished Phase I, instructions for Phase II were read (See Appendix B). These instructions explained the BSRI "Self-Perception" and "Perception of Women" questionnaires. For the "Self-Perception" questionnaire, participants were instructed to describe themselves on 60 items (1- "Never or almost never true" to 7- "Always or almost always true"). For the "Perception of Women" questionnaire, which in content is identical to the "Self-Perception" form, participants were told to describe
"women in general" (See Appendices J-K).

Participants were instructed to fill in every item "as quickly and as accurately as possible, leaving none blank." Once the second BSRI questionnaire was complete participants were instructed to exit the room quietly, taking the attached Debriefing Form (See Appendix L) with them and leaving behind the test materials. Once all participants had exited, packets were collected.
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Results

The purpose of the present study was to determine the degree to which self-reported sex-typing by men relates to sex-typing of "women in general" by the same men, and to determine the degree to which self-reported sex-typing by men relates to the same men’s evaluation of a feminine sex-typed female job candidate. Thus, do more "masculine" men prefer more "feminine" women? Demographic information on the present sample is contained in Table 1 (Page 28). To test the designated hypotheses, correlations among all variables were calculated using Microsoft Excel.

Both hypotheses were concerned with participants’ sex-type ratings as assessed by the Bem Sex-Role Inventory, used once for self-perceptions and once for perceptions of women. Descriptive information from these two measures is found in Table 2. Unlike Bem’s method of computing results, these scores could range from -140 to +140. Positive numbers for both self-perceptions and perceptions of women were used to indicate extent of sex-typed perceptions, whether for “self” or for “women.” Actual self-perceptions scores in the present study ranged from -20 to +55. Perceptions of women scores ranged from -22 to +70. Mean Masculinity and Femininity scores (Table 3) indicate a tendency for participants to rate both men and women higher on sex “appropriate” dimensions than “inappropriate” dimensions (males are masculine and females are feminine). As Table 3 also indicates, self-description scores from the
Table 2

Distributions of Bem Sex-Typed Scores When Men Described Themselves and When They Described "Women in General"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BSRI Score</th>
<th>Self-Perception</th>
<th>Perception of Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 - -10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-11 - -20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-21 - -30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-31 - -40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-41 - -50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;-50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M    13.8  22.1  
SD   16.4  15.9
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stanford Males Described Themselves (n = 444)</th>
<th>Foothill Males Described Themselves (n = 117)</th>
<th>GC/ XU Males Described Themselves (n = 80)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Masculinity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Femininity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sample of men used here were not much different from those for men in the Stanford and Foothill samples of Bem’s study.

The first hypothesis stated there is a statistically significant positive correlation between the extent of sex-typing in men’s perceptions of themselves and the extent to which the same men sex-typed women. The results showed a statistically significant correlation between sex-typing in men's perceptions of themselves and the extent to which the same men sex-typed women \( (r = .25, p < .05) \). Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected (Table 4). This relationship is graphically represented in Figure 1.

The second hypothesis stated there is a statistically significant positive correlation between the extent of sex-typed self-assessment in men and the extent to which the same men, in using a nine-point rating scale (1- “not at all desirable” to 9-“highly desirable”), preferred a sex-typed woman candidate. The results showed no relationship between the two variables \( (r = .07, p > .05) \). Therefore, the null hypothesis could not be rejected (Table 4).
Table 4

**Intercorrelation Matrix of Main Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BSRIS</th>
<th>BSRIW</th>
<th>SS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BSRIS</td>
<td></td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSRIW</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

BSRIS = Bem Sex-Role Inventory “Self Perceptions”
BSRIW = Bem Sex-Role Inventory “Perception of Women”
SS = Selection Score (Alice Marie)
Figure 1

Graphical Representation Relating Men’s Self-Perceptions to Their Perceptions of Women
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Discussion

The rejection of the first null hypothesis indicates a statistically significant relationship between self-perceived masculinity in men and the extent the same men perceive women in general as feminine, a belief that supports Bem’s (1981) gender schema theory. That is, as men self-report more masculine traits than feminine traits, they tend to see women as possessing more feminine traits than masculine traits.

Whether concerned with interpreting, measuring, or just dealing with discrimination in general, businesses, legislatures, and judicial bodies all share a common interest: the application of valid and reliable stereotype research to the problem of discrimination. One example of a recent attempt to do so is the Civil Rights Act of 1991, Section 107.

This Act has used recent literature to conclude a “causal nexus exists between sex-stereotyped interview questions and [a] hiring decision.” Based on Section 107, courts should find a Title VII violation whenever an employer poses such questions. In response to the 1991 Act and other areas of Title VII litigation, many employers have implemented programs designed to act against discrimination (Stonefield, 1986). One method of detecting stereotypical thinking has been assessing decision makers’ beliefs about others. The thought behind this strategy is that those men most prone to discriminate based on sex are those men who themselves are sex-typed.
However, because of an increased sensitivity to stereotypes, when asked about beliefs of others, those questioned are likely to hide prejudicial feelings and respond in a socially desirable way. Spending time and money in such an assessment venture may prove frivolous. Businesses exist to make money and frivolous spending operates counter to the bottom line. Most employers would agree that supporting anti-discrimination programs is cost effective because when sex-discrimination litigation does occur, significant financial and public relations burdens ensue. With the new standard of Section 107, and given the difficulties in detecting stereotypical thinking, companies may need to find more sophisticated detection methods. If employers would more wisely utilize research findings in developing such programs, they could expect them to be more effective.

Bem's (1989) gender schema theory, which data on Hypothesis One support, is an example of a research finding which may help increase program effectiveness. Using Bem's construct, it may be possible to detect those employees likely to hold stereotypical beliefs about women and focus educational efforts toward such seemingly "high-risk" employees. Similar to the thinking of Resnick and Kausch (1995), who have proposed a risk-assessment model for violence in the workplace, there is a need for risk-assessment tools for the prevention of sex-based discrimination.

The failure to reject the null of Hypothesis Two was not expected. Research has shown that the qualities most valued in the work setting are those associated with being male (Heilman, Block, Martell, & Simon, 1989). Bem (1974) has shown that men self-report higher levels of masculinity and lower levels of femininity than women, while
women self-report higher levels of femininity and lower levels of masculinity than men. Information shown in Table 5 shows that men in the present study believed themselves to be more masculine and less feminine than they believed women to be. When men or women behave in atypical ways (e.g., women behaving masculinely), they are likely to be viewed negatively. All things considered, it seems a logical expectation that men, who believe women in general to be sex-typed as “feminine,” would find a sex-typed female job candidate more desirable than a neutral or opposite sex-typed candidate.

The U.S. Senate and House Committees responsible for Section 107 of The Civil Rights Act of 1991 relied on such a relationship being true. A fundamental assumption to this legislation is that stereotypes are likely a “nexus” to discrimination, meaning to say that stereotypes used in an interview process are believed to lead to a discriminatory decision, based on those stereotypes. The failure to reject the null of Hypothesis Two gives cause to question the basic assumption of Section 107. The present data suggest that, at least some of the time, men who perceive the world according to stereotypes are just as capable of evaluating a sex-typed woman fairly as are men who engage less in stereotypical thinking.

While the findings regarding Hypothesis Two do not support the rationale on which Section 107 stands, the preponderance of research on sex-typing does predict the trend between belief systems and decision making. This poses the question of what accounts for the current findings regarding Hypothesis Two.

Limitations of This Study and Implications for Future Research

A possible explanation for discrepancy between the findings for the test of
Table 5

**Self Perceived Masculinity in Men and Their Perceptions of Femininity in Women**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GC/ XU Males Describing Themselves (n = 80)</th>
<th>GC/ XU Males Describing Females (n = 80)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Masculinity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Femininity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis Two and much of the stereotype research may be revealed through analysis of limitations of this study. For example, all four candidates - Alice, Michelle, Kristen, and Stephanie- were well regarded, thus restricting variability among candidates’ ratings. This limits the probability of finding a significant difference, even if a trend might exist. Figure 2 graphically represents this problem. The figure shows average ratings of the four candidates by men divided into upper, middle, and lower scores on self sex-typing.

While it appears all groups (upper, middle, and lowest third of sex-typed males) preferred the sex-typed candidate, Alice Marie, more than the other three candidates, a closer look reveals a greater preference for Alice Marie on the part of the upper third of sex-typed men. However, ratings of Alice Marie by men in the middle and lower thirds on self-sex typing did not drop as was predicted. Future researchers should use a candidate evaluation system that encourages greater variability among those who are evaluated. One way this could be done would be to provide more information from which evaluators could make their assessments. Some of this information might include negative aspects that accompany both masculine traits and feminine traits.

Other interesting findings include the tendency for males in the present study to describe women as lower on masculinity and higher on femininity than women in Bem’s norms group described themselves (Table 6). The tendency for men to overestimate femininity and underestimate masculinity in women has been well documented in the literature (Katz & Braly, 1933; Simon, 1992; Park & Rothbart, 1982), but some critics have suggested the trend is disappearing. As the role of women in business expands and
Figure 2

Ratings of Four Candidates For Partnership

![Graph showing ratings of four candidates for partnership.](image-url)
their presence becomes more the norm, the need for clarity here rises. Future researchers should focus on this issue.

While data from the present study indicate the trend continues, it is possible women today would rate themselves higher in masculinity and lower in femininity than women did in Bem’s study in 1972. By replicating this study, with women included as participants, such a question could be explored.

Also interesting is to see a high statistically significant difference ($z = 4.60, p<.001$) between upper-classmen and lower-classmen at the two schools in their response trends as applied to the Hypothesis One (Table 7). Findings for Hypothesis One rose to be significant at the .02 level for the upper-classmen group alone and dropped to insignificance for the under-classmen group. Thus the relationship holds for upper-classmen judges but not for under-classmen judges.

One possible explanation for this finding is that as men age, both their self-concept and their perceptions of women in general solidify. More sure of who they are and of what they like in others, older men, more so than younger men, may be more clear in their self-perceptions and their perceptions of women in general. Hypotheses such as this may provide options for future research.

The present study has supported Bem’s gender schema theory, which states that as people become more sex-typed, their tendency to believe others to be sex-typed also increases. This, along with the failure to reject the null of Hypothesis Two, has given rise to several relevant questions.

Bem’s masculinity and femininity constructs seem to hold true today (Men self-
Table 6

Women Describing Themselves Compared To Men Describing Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stanford Females Rated Themselves (n = 279)</th>
<th>Foothill Females Rated Themselves (n = 77)</th>
<th>GC/ XU Males Rated Females (n = 80)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femininity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

Participants Divided Between Upper-Classmen and Lower-Classmen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Total Sample (n = 80)</th>
<th>Upper Classmen (n = 48)</th>
<th>Lower Classmen (n = 32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis One</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis Two</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05; ** p < .02
report higher levels of masculinity than femininity and believe women to show higher levels of femininity than masculinity), yet are the masculine/ feminine items on The Bem Sex Role Inventory still appropriate? Do men continue to over-estimate femininity and under-estimate masculinity in women as compared to women describing themselves? Have women in general actually become more masculine and less feminine since Bem’s study in 1972?

Because of such questions, and since the courts and legislatures have grown to regard psychology as a science worthy of consideration in decision rendering and policy making, further studies in the areas of stereotyping and discrimination are obviously needed.

Since many of those using the research literature of psychology may not be aware of “insignificant" findings, the psychological community needs to make a way for such studies to be made readily available. Furthermore, researchers need to advocate the acceptability of using such research for retorting legal arguments where theories are applied too broadly or from which unwarranted conclusions are drawn (e.g., The Civil Rights Act of 1991, Section 107). The field of psychology can be expected to contribute increasingly to the area of sex-typing both in the courts and in legislatures. It is hoped that the present study will contribute to such efforts.
Summary

Stereotyping: Self-Perceived Masculinity in Men and Men’s Perceptions of Femininity in Women

The qualities most valued in the work setting are those associated with being male (Heilman, Block, Martell, & Simon, 1989). Females are more times than not expected to display feminine traits, that is, traits not equated with work success (Bem, 1974; Heilman et al., 1989; Schein, 1975). When females behave in role-atypical behavior, they are viewed negatively (Brown & Geis, 1984; Costich, Feinstein, Kidder, Marecek, & Pascale, 1975; Deaux & Lewis, 1983, 1984; Hagen & Kahn, 1975). Women who display masculine traits tend to thrive in the work setting, but only up to a point (Sekaran, Leong, 1992).

One who converges with gender-typed words in self-description is said to be "sex-typed." A person who assesses others by relying upon such norms is referred to as "schematic." A "base-rate" is the set of behaviors believed to be descriptive or "normal" for a group to which a person belongs (e.g., whites, blacks, men, or women).

In an ideal world, selection and promotion decisions would be made in an unbiased way, but research has shown schematic processing often occurs automatically and sometimes with ambivalent intentions (Fisk & Glick, 1996). Stereotype use is anything but rare; in fact, considering the number of promotion and selection decisions made each year, it is surprising there are not more stereotype-based sex-discrimination
Stereotype use is most probable in the absence of individuating information or when individuating information is unclear or irrelevant, when a group is rare in the evaluation setting, and when selection criteria are ambiguous (Fiske et al., 1991). In an effort to avoid sex-discrimination, organizations have utilized stereotype research like that of Fiske to restructure organizational operations. Thanks to research on sex-discrimination, efforts to avoid unfair discrimination have experienced some success, but more times than not, remedies are made after noticeable negative consequences (i.e., law suits or threats of suit) have resulted. The goal of researchers should be to predict, rather than react to, discrimination.

Prediction of discrimination is a difficult task. Those who believe stereotypical perceptions often lead to discrimination have attempted to predict such behavior by assessing decision makers’ beliefs about others. Results from such questioning, however, tend to be unreliable. Because of a increased sensitivity to stereotypes, those questioned are likely to hide prejudicial feelings and respond in a socially desirable way. Direct inquiry of decision makers regarding issues of sex differences may push an already difficult-to-detect problem further into hiding; the glass ceiling may become even more difficult for women to penetrate. Bem has proposed that those who sex-type themselves have the tendency to sex-type others (i.e., to be schematic). Thus to the extent men see themselves as highly masculine and simultaneously low in femininity (i.e., sex-typed), they will favor women whom they see as highly feminine and hardly masculine.
If researchers hope to be able to predict when a man might unfairly discriminate against a woman, contributing components must be studied. It may be that certain types of people are more likely than others to use base-rates (Nelson, Biernat, and Manis, 1990). Rather than directly asking men their perceptions of women, researchers may be able to predict whether a man will engage in sex-discrimination simply by assessing the man's self-perception of his masculinity.

The following hypotheses were tested:

Ha 1: There is a statistically significant positive correlation between the extent of sex-typing in men's perceptions of themselves and the extent to which the same men sex-type women.

The term "sex-typed" refers to a person's convergence with characteristics stereotypically associated with his or her sex. As a result, sex-typed men choose "masculine" traits in describing themselves and avoid "feminine" traits. Conversely, sex-typed women accept "feminine" traits in describing themselves while avoiding "masculine" traits.

Ha 2: There is a statistically significant positive correlation between the extent of sex-typed self-assessment in men and the extent of the same men's preference for a sex-typed woman candidate.

As men more strongly adopt "masculine" traits and avoid "feminine" traits in describing themselves, it was predicted they would more greatly prefer a highly "feminine" sex-typed woman job candidate.

The corresponding null hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance.
Method

Participants

Thirty-four Georgetown College and forty-six Xavier University male undergraduate students provided the data for the present study. As compensation some Xavier University participants received extra course credit. Further information describing the sample is shown in Table 1 (Page 28).

Measures

Participant Information. Participant demographic information, gathered on a form shown in Appendix D and reported in Table 1, was not directly studied in this thesis. Nonetheless, to increase the accuracy of data interpretation and for the purpose of making better suggestions for future research, such variables were probed for response trends.

Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) (Appendices J-K). The BSRI is a scale used to assess perceived masculinity and femininity in men and women. In the development of the scale, 400 personality characteristics were presented to 100 undergraduate students for rating of their social desirability as descriptors of "masculine" and "feminine." A personality characteristic qualified as masculine if it was independently judged by both males and females to be significantly more desirable for a man than for a woman. Similar methodology was used for establishing the feminine construct. Items qualified as neutral if judged by both males and females to be no more desirable for one sex than for the other. From the 400 characteristics, 20 masculine, 20 feminine, and 20 neutral items were selected for inclusion in the BSRI (Appendix A).
All masculine and feminine items were judged to be socially desirable and positive in tone for the appropriate sex. Neutral items consisted of ten traits positive in tone and ten traits negative in tone. The BSRI yields three scores: Masculinity, Femininity, and Androgyny. Classifications are based on a difference score (Femininity minus Masculinity.) Where difference scores are minimal, this could mean either that both feminine and masculine scores are relatively high, indicating androgyny, or that both feminine and masculine scores are relatively low, producing “undifferentiated” status. Highly positive numbers reflect sex-typed femininity (i.e., convergence to feminine traits and deviance from masculine traits) while highly negative numbers represent sex-typed masculinity (i.e., accepting masculine traits and avoiding feminine traits.) These classifications were not particularly germane to the present study since scores on the Bem were considered on an interval scale. Furthermore, only Masculinity and Femininity scores are relevant to the current study.

To establish reliability and validity, Bem administered the BSRI to 561 male and 366 female undergraduate college students at two California universities (Stanford and Foothill). Test-retest reliability was established by retesting 28 male and 28 female subjects from the above groups four weeks after initial testing. Both Masculinity and Femininity scores proved to be highly reliable over the four-week interval (Masculinity $r = .90$; Femininity $r = .90$). Internal consistency was established using data collected from the 927 person normative sample. Separate coefficient-alpha computations were made for masculinity, femininity, and androgyny scores. Results showed both scores to be highly reliable, both in the Stanford sample (Masculinity $\alpha = .86$; Femininity $\alpha = .75$).
and in the Foothill sample (Masculinity $\alpha = .86$; Femininity $\alpha = .82$).

Construct validity of BSRI items was established through the process of item selection. Items were selected if subjects (male and female) agreed on their gender appropriateness. Participants were also asked to describe themselves on the inventory. They consistently chose sex-appropriate adjectives in describing their own sex and consistently rejected sex-inappropriate terms, indicating Bem's constructs to be valid.

Scales of the BSRI have been shown to correlate moderately in a positive direction with corresponding scales of the California Psychological Inventory, but not at all with those of the Guilford-Zimmerman scale. It appears the BSRI is measuring an aspect of sex roles not directly tapped by either of these two scales. Rather than detracting from BSRI validity, these findings actually support Bem's theory of Masculinity/ Femininity.

While assessing masculinity and femininity, Bem's notion of these constructs differs from other measures of masculinity and femininity. For instance, unlike the above scales, the BSRI allows for the co-existence of masculinity and femininity (i.e., androgony).

**Recommendation Letters.** Information for use in testing Hypothesis Two was provided in the form of four recommendation letters (Appendices F-I). Letters were constructed based upon sex descriptors included in the BSRI (Appendix A). BSRI descriptors had been determined to be more masculine or feminine based upon male and female judges rating their own sex. "Sex-appropriate" characteristics were found to be more desirable for both males and females than "sex-inappropriate" characteristics (Bem, 1974). Of the four letters, one described a "feminine" female candidate, one described a
"masculine" female candidate, and two described "neutral" female candidates. Both the letter masculine in tone (Appendix F) and the letter feminine in tone (Appendix G) were confirmed to be clearly descriptive of the appropriate gender by 100% of 25 undergraduate male judges.

Procedure

To begin, an Introductory Statement (See Appendix B) was read to the participants. Here the experimenter identified himself and explained the session about to take place. A "Consent to Participate In A Research Study" form (See Appendix C) was then distributed for signing. Once signed, consent forms were collected and shufffed to assure anonymity. Next, test materials (stapled together) were distributed. Test materials included the following: a Participant Information form, a Company Announcement, four letters of recommendation (Stephanie Rose, Alice Marie, Kristen Marie, and Michelle Ann), a Bem Sex-Role Inventory "Self Perceptions," a Bem Sex Role Inventory "Perception of Women," and a Participant Debriefing Form (See Appendices D-L).

Once all materials were distributed, Instructions for Phase I were given (See Appendix B). In these instructions, a company announcement describing the hypothetical situation of Phase I was read (See Appendix E). This announcement asked participants to imagine themselves as members of a selection committee. They were instructed to evaluate, on a nine-point scale, four female candidates for the position based upon their relative interpersonal social desirability. These scores have henceforth been referred to as "Selection Scores." Participants were instructed to use the provided
"Letters of Recommendation" (See Appendices F-I) as the bases for their selection decisions. Selection scores were recorded on the "Company Announcement" (See Appendix E). Once they completed the forms, participants were instructed to sit quietly and wait for all participants to complete Phase I.

When all participants finished Phase I, instructions for Phase II were read (See Appendix B). These instructions explained the BSRI "Self-Perception" and "Perception of Women" questionnaires. For the "Self-Perception" questionnaire, participants were instructed to describe themselves on 60 items (1-"Never or almost never true" to 7-"Always or almost always true"). For the "Perception of Women" questionnaire, which in content is identical to the "Self-Perception" form, participants were told to describe "women in general" (See Appendices J-K).

Participants were instructed to fill in every item "as quickly and as accurately as possible, leaving none blank." Once the second BSRI questionnaire was complete participants were instructed to exit the room quietly, taking the attached Debriefing Form (See Appendix L) with them and leaving behind the test materials. Once all participants had exited, packets were collected.

Results

The purpose of the present study was to determine the degree to which self-reported sex-typing by men relates to sex-typing of "women in general" by the same men, and to determine the degree to which self-reported sex-typing by men relates to the same men's evaluation of a feminine sex-typed female job candidate. Thus, do more "masculine" men prefer more "feminine" women? Demographic information on the
present sample is contained in Table 1 (Page 28). To test the designated hypotheses, correlations among all variables were calculated using Microsoft Excel.

Both hypotheses were concerned with participants’ sex-type ratings as assessed by the Bem Sex-Role Inventory, used once for self-perceptions and once for perceptions of women. Descriptive information from these two measures is found in Table 2 (Page 35). Unlike Bem’s method of computing results, these scores could range from -140 to +140. Positive numbers for both self-perceptions and perceptions of women were used to indicate extent of sex-typed perceptions, whether for “self” or for “women.” Actual self-perception scores in the present study ranged from -20 to +55. Perceptions of women scores ranged from -22 to +70. Mean Masculinity and Femininity scores (Table 3, Page 36) indicate a tendency for participants to rate both men and women higher on sex “appropriate” dimensions than “inappropriate” dimensions (males are masculine and females are feminine). As Table 3 also indicates, self-description scores from the sample of men used here were not much different from those for men in the California samples of Bem’s study.

The first hypothesis stated there is a statistically significant positive correlation between the extent of sex-typing in men’s perceptions of themselves and the extent to which the same men sex-typed women. The results showed a statistically significant correlation between sex-typing in men's perceptions of themselves and the extent to which the same men sex-typed women \( r = .25, p < .05 \). Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected (Table 4, Page 38). This relationship is graphically represented in Figure 1 (Page 39).
The second hypothesis stated there is a statistically significant positive correlation between the extent of sex-typed self-assessment in men and the extent to which the same men, in using a nine-point rating scale (1- "not at all desirable" to 9- "highly desirable"), preferred a sex-typed woman candidate. The results showed no relationship between the two variables ($r = -.07, p > .05$). Therefore, the null hypothesis could not be rejected (Table 4).

Discussion

The rejection of the first null hypothesis indicates a statistically significant relationship between self-perceived masculinity in men and the extent the same men perceive women in general as feminine, a belief that supports Bem’s (1981) gender schema theory. That is, as men self-report more masculine traits than feminine traits, they tend to see women as possessing more feminine traits than masculine traits.

Whether concerned with interpreting, measuring, or just dealing with discrimination in general, businesses, legislatures, and judicial bodies all share a common interest: the application of valid and reliable stereotype research to the problem of discrimination. One example of a recent attempt to do so is the Civil Rights Act of 1991, Section 107.

This Act has used recent literature to conclude a “causal nexus exists between sex-stereotyped interview questions and [a] hiring decision.” Based on Section 107, courts should find a Title VII violation whenever an employer poses such questions. In response to the 1991 Act and other areas of Title VII litigation, many employers have implemented programs designed to act against discrimination (Stonefield, 1986). One
method of detecting stereotypical thinking has been assessing decision makers’ beliefs about others. The thought behind this strategy is that those men most prone to discriminate based on sex are those men who themselves are sex-typed.

However, because of an increased sensitivity to stereotypes, when asked about beliefs of others, those questioned are likely to hide prejudicial feelings and respond in a socially desirable way. Spending time and money in such an assessment venture may prove frivolous. Businesses exist to make money and frivolous spending operates counter to the bottom line. Most employers would agree that supporting anti-discrimination programs is cost effective because when sex-discrimination litigation does occur, significant financial and public relations burdens ensue. With the new standard of Section 107, and given the difficulties in detecting stereotypical thinking, companies may need to find more sophisticated detection methods. If employers would more wisely utilize research findings in developing such programs, they could expect them to be more effective.

Bem’s (1989) gender schema theory, which data on Hypothesis One support, is an example of a research finding which may help increase program effectiveness. Using Bem’s construct, it may be possible to detect those employees likely to hold stereotypical beliefs about women and focus educational efforts toward such seemingly “high-risk” employees. Similar to the thinking of Resnick and Kausch (1995), who have proposed a risk-assessment model for violence in the workplace, there is a need for risk-assessment tools for the prevention of sex-based discrimination.

The failure to reject the null of Hypothesis Two was not expected. Research has
shown that the qualities most valued in the work setting are those associated with being male (Heilman, Block, Martell, & Simon, 1989). Bem (1974) has shown that men self-report higher levels of masculinity and lower levels of femininity than women, while women self-report higher levels of femininity and lower levels of masculinity than men. Information shown in Table 5 (Page 43) shows that men in the present study believed themselves to be more masculine and less feminine than they believed women to be. When men or women behave in atypical ways (e.g., women behaving masculinely), they are likely to be viewed negatively. All things considered, it seems a logical expectation that men, who believe women in general to be sex-typed as “feminine,” would find a sex-typed female job candidate more desirable than a neutral or opposite sex-typed candidate.

The U.S. Senate and House Committees responsible for Section 107 of The Civil Rights Act of 1991 relied on such a relationship being true. A fundamental assumption to this legislation is that stereotypes are likely a “nexus” to discrimination, meaning to say that stereotypes used in an interview process are believed to lead to a discriminatory decision, based on those stereotypes. The failure to reject the null of Hypothesis Two gives cause to question the basic assumption of Section 107. The present data suggest that, at least some of the time, men who perceive the world according to stereotypes are just as capable of evaluating a sex-typed woman fairly as are men who engage less in stereotypical thinking.

While the findings regarding Hypothesis Two do not support the rationale on which Section 107 stands, the preponderance of research on sex-typing does predict the
trend between belief systems and decision making. This poses the question of what accounts for the current findings regarding Hypothesis Two.

Limitations of This Study and Implications for Future Research

A possible explanation for discrepancy between the findings for the test of Hypothesis Two and much of the stereotype research may be revealed through analysis of limitations of this study. For example, all four candidates - Alice, Michelle, Kristen, and Stephanie - were well regarded, thus restricting variability among candidates' ratings. This limits the probability of finding a significant difference, even if a trend might exist. Figure 2 (Page 45) graphically represents this problem. The figure shows average ratings of the four candidates by men divided into upper, middle, and lower scores on self sex-typing.

While it appears all groups (upper, middle, and lowest third of sex-typed males) preferred the sex-typed candidate, Alice Marie, more than the other three candidates, a closer look reveals a greater preference for Alice Marie on the part of the upper third of sex-typed men. However, ratings of Alice Marie by men in the middle and lower thirds on self-sex typing did not drop as was predicted. Future researchers should use a candidate evaluation system that encourages greater variability among those who are evaluated. One way this could be done would be to provide more information from which evaluators could make their assessments. Some of this information might include negative aspects that accompany both masculine traits and feminine traits.

Other interesting findings include the tendency for males in the present study to describe women as lower on masculinity and higher on femininity than women in Bem's
norms group described themselves (Table 6, Page 47). The tendency for men to overestimate femininity and underestimate masculinity in women has been well documented in the literature (Katz & Braly, 1933; Simon, 1992; Park & Rothbart, 1982), but some critics have suggested the trend is disappearing. As the role of women in business expands and their presence becomes more the norm, the need for clarity here rises. Future researchers should focus on this issue.

While data from the present study indicate the trend continues, it is possible women today would rate themselves higher in masculinity and lower in femininity than women did in Bem’s study in 1972. By replicating this study, with women included as participants, such a question could be explored.

Also interesting is to see a high statistically significant difference between upper-classmen and lower-classmen at the two schools in their response trends as applied to the Hypothesis One (Table 7, Page 48). Findings for Hypothesis One rose to be significant at the .02 level for the upper-classmen group alone and dropped to insignificance for the under-classmen group. Thus the relationship holds for upper-classmen judges but not for under-classmen judges.

One possible explanation for this finding is that as men age, both their self-concept and their perceptions of women in general solidify. More sure of who they are and of what they like in others, older men, more so than younger men, may be more clear in their self-perceptions and their perceptions of women in general. Hypotheses such as this may provide options for future research.

The present study has supported Bem’s gender schema theory, which states that
as people become more sex-typed, their tendency to believe others to be sex-typed also increases. This, along with the failure to reject the null of Hypothesis Two, has given rise to several relevant questions.

Bem’s masculinity and femininity constructs seem to hold true today (Men self-report higher levels of masculinity than femininity and believe women to show higher levels of femininity than masculinity), yet are the masculine/feminine items on The Bem Sex Role Inventory still appropriate? Do men continue to over-estimate femininity and under-estimate masculinity in women as compared to women describing themselves?

Have women in general actually become more masculine and less feminine since Bem’s study in 1972?

Because of such questions, and since the courts and legislatures have grown to regard psychology as a science worthy of consideration in decision rendering and policy making, further studies in the areas of stereotyping and discrimination are obviously needed.

Since many of those using the research literature of psychology may not be aware of “insignificant” findings, the psychological community needs to make a way for such studies to be made readily available. Furthermore, researchers need to advocate the acceptability of using such research for retorting legal arguments where theories are applied too broadly or from which unwarranted conclusions are drawn (e.g., The Civil Rights Act of 1991, Section 107). The field of psychology can be expected to contribute increasingly to the area of sex-typing both in the courts and in legislatures. It is hoped
that the present study will contribute to such efforts.
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### Appendix A

**Bem Sex Role Inventory Scale Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masculinity</th>
<th>Femininity</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. Analytical</td>
<td>32. Compassionate</td>
<td>60. Conventional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Athletic</td>
<td>35. Eager to soothe hurt feelings</td>
<td>15. Happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Forceful</td>
<td>47. Gullible</td>
<td>39. Likable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Individualistic</td>
<td>26. Sensitive to the needs of others</td>
<td>30. Secretive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Masculine</td>
<td>38. Soft spoken</td>
<td>42. Sincere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Self-sufficient</td>
<td>44. Tender</td>
<td>12. Theatrical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Strong personality</td>
<td>29. Understanding</td>
<td>27. Truthful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Willing to take a stand</td>
<td>41. Warm</td>
<td>18. Unpredictable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Willing to take risks</td>
<td>2. Yielding</td>
<td>54. Unsystematic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B
Script Used by Experimenter

Introductory Statement

"Hello. My name is Tim Holly and I will be running this session. This experiment is being conducted as part of the degree requirements for Master of Arts in Industrial/Organizational Psychology. Your participation in this project is strictly voluntary and you may discontinue participation at any time without negative consequences. Questionnaires will require about forty minutes to complete. All scores will be identified by a code number and your individual scores will not be revealed to anyone. There are no known risks or benefits involved with your participation in this experiment. There are no requirements for participation. Please read and sign this informed consent sheet (Appendix C)." [Experimenter pauses to let participants read and sign the informed consent form.] To assure anonymity, these forms are being collected and shuffled. They will in no way be linked to the questionnaires soon to be completed [Collect consent forms. Once all consent forms are collected, pass out stapled test materials (Appendices D-L)]. Please take a moment to fill out the Candidate Information page (Appendix D). This information is very important so please answer each question.

Instructions- Phase I

[Once all participants have responded to Participant Information questions say] "In Phase I of this session, you are acting as a selection committee member. Your task is to rate four candidates for a particular position. Follow along as I read the page marked "Company Announcement" [Read Appendix E.] In response to this memo, and appearing on the next four pages, are recommendations from branch executives for each of the four candidates: Kristen Marie, Michelle Ann, Alice Marie, and Stephanie Rose (Appendices F-I). As stated in the memo, numeric credentials of all candidates are pretty much equal. Your task is to read the four letters of recommendation and then provide an evaluation of each candidate on their "interpersonal, social desirability." You are being asked to rank order them. The higher the number, the greater your preference for that candidate. The lower the number, the lesser your preference. You will have more spaces than you do candidates. Only one person can be placed per space. Make your decisions and indicate these on the "Company Announcement" page by writing the name of the candidate in the appropriate space. When finished, stop and wait for further directions. Do not look beyond the page marked "Stop." We will proceed to the second and final phase once everyone has completed Phase I. Your answers are very important to us. If you need assistance, please raise your hand and I will try to help you. It is very important that we get only your opinions on these questionnaires, so please do not discuss the questions with those around you."

Instructions- Phase II

[Once everyone has finished evaluating the four candidates, continue] "Now look at the next page entitled "Self-Perceptions" (Appendix J). There you will see a list of 60 words or phrases. For each, I want you to enter into the box a number from the scale at the top of the sheet how true you feel each item on the list is as a descriptor of yourself. Use any number from the seven point scale to indicate your self-rating. Seven is the highest end of the scale "always or almost always true" and 1 is the low end "never or almost never true." Please be as thoughtful as possible in marking the items. When finished, please wait.

[When all are finished with "Self-Perceptions" say] "Now look at the next page entitled "Perceptions of Women" (Appendix K). This is the last questionnaire. The same 60 items appear here. You are to do the same thing here except rather than describing yourself, you are to describe how true each item on the list is as a descriptor of women in general. Please mark every item, leaving none blank, as quickly and quietly as possible. When you are finished, tear off the last page marked "Participant Debriefing Form" and leave the room as quietly as possible. Leave behind test materials and take with you the debriefing form. Thank you all for your participation."
Appendix C
Consent to Participate In A Research Study

Statement of Research
Timothy Holly is a graduate student in the Department of Industrial/Organizational Psychology at Xavier University, Cincinnati, Ohio. He is completing a thesis as part of the requirements for the Master of Arts Degree. This research is being conducted under the supervision of Don Cosgrove, Ph. D., Professor of Psychology at Xavier University.

The study involves collecting information on a number of personality characteristics associated with perceptions of oneself and others. Participation in this study is strictly voluntary, and you may withdraw your consent and discontinue participation in this research at any time without negative consequences. This experiment will be conducted in one session lasting approximately thirty minutes during which you will simply be asked to complete a number of questionnaires. There are no known risks or benefits involved in your participation in this experiment.

Statement of Participant

I understand that my responses will be kept strictly confidential, that all subjects and their scores will be identified only by a code number, and that my individual responses will not be revealed to anyone without my express permission.

I consent to participate in this study.

X ____________________________   X ________________
Participants Signature            Date

If you have any questions about the study or would like information regarding the results of the study, you should contact Timothy M. Holly, graduate student, at his home number: (513) 861-3187. You may also contact Dr. Don Cosgrove, Xavier University at 745-1945.
Appendix D
Participant Information

1. Sex
   ○ Male
   ○ Female

2. School
   ○ Georgetown College
   ○ Xavier University

3. Race
   ○ American Indian or Alaskan Native
   ○ Hispanic
   ○ African-American, not of Hispanic Origin
   ○ White, not of Hispanic Origin
   ○ Asian or Pacific Islander

4. Age
   ○ 17
   ○ 18
   ○ 19
   ○ 20
   ○ 21
   ○ 22
   ○ Other ______

5. Class
   ○ Freshman
   ○ Sophomore
   ○ Junior
   ○ Senior

6. Varsity Athlete
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
Appendix E
Company Announcement
Senior Partner: National Office

As you all know, the national office is nearing the end of our fiscal year. As a result, and in accordance with company tradition, a new partner will soon be chosen. We thank all who have applied and wish to encourage future involvement. Narrowing highly qualified candidates to finalists has not been an easy task. But upon review of billable hours, tenure with the firm, and other considerations, the candidate pool has been narrowed to four qualified individuals. The national office will select from the following four finalists: Kristen Marie, Columbus Branch; Michelle Ann, Dayton Branch; Alice Marie, Toledo Branch; and Stephanie Rose, Cleveland Branch.

Your recommendation as a branch executive is being solicited for insight into interpersonal style and other personal information regarding the candidate at your branch.

Instructions: Write the name (first name will do) of each of the four candidates on the 9-point scale below to show your judgement of the candidate's interpersonal, social desirability as a new partner in the firm. You may spread the names across all nine positions on the scale as you judge appropriate. Do not write more than one name at any one position on the scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Ranking On Interpersonal, Social Desirability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Anne</td>
<td>Highly Desirable 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Rose</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristen Marie</td>
<td>Relatively Desirable 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Marie</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relatively Undesirable 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all Desirable 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for contributing to this important process!
Appendix F
Letter of Recommendation for Stephanie Rose
"Masculine-Female"

To: Selection Committee
   Timothy M. Holly Mock Candidate Selection
FR: Scott Judd
   Senior Account Mgr., Cleveland Branch
DT: January 30, 1998
RE: Stephanie Rose

It is with great enthusiasm that I write this letter on behalf of Stephanie Rose for senior partner of our firm. I feel I know Stephanie well and can adequately report on aspects of her personality as you requested. Having been with her for just under 14 years, I would like to rave of her credentials but given that she is already a finalist I will dispense with such flattery; I'm sure you are aware of her many achievements.

Stephanie is perhaps best described as a natural leader. She is ambitious and assertive, she takes risks where appropriate and can be counted upon to take a stand on what she feels is right. She is the kind of person who really takes charge. She is independent and self-reliant. Although sometimes described as forceful, I believe she is better described as having a strong personality- she simply makes decisions and sticks to them.

Stephanie's billings may be so high because of her assertive style. The above characteristics not only make her who she is at work but can be seen in her out-of-work behavior as well. For example, her competitiveness and leadership can be seen in her role as captain of our company volleyball team. Not just a facade, Stephanie is truly a leader and a dominant player in our firm.
Appendix G

Letter of Recommendation for Alice Marie

"Feminine-Female"

To: Selection Committee
    Timothy M. Holly Mock Candidate Selection
FR: Douglas Anthony
    Senior Account Mgr., Cincinnati Branch
DT: January 30, 1998
RE: Alice Marie

It is an extreme pleasure to send this letter of recommendation on behalf of Alice Marie for the position of senior partner. I have been in professional association with Alice for just over thirteen years. In that time, I have seen her rise from teller, while in college, to where she is now: a finalist for senior partner. To conform to your request, I will dispense with raving of Alice’s numerical credentials and skip to describing her personally.

Alice is the kind of person who is easy to get to know. She seems always to be cheerful and has a warm nature about her. She is fair and understanding with subordinates yet is aware of her responsibilities in her position. I believe it is this balance of compassion and duty that account for her great billing success. Alice’s clients all seem to enjoy working with her and her subordinates respond well to her interpersonal style. Although not as aggressive or forceful as other members in her position, Alice is effective with her interpersonal style.

It is my belief that Alice’s ability to relate well with people and her tendency to create a superb first impression is what makes her an ideal candidate for final selection for partner. In my thirteen years with Alice, I have known her to be extremely loyal both to this firm and to her friends and family. Her numeric credentials, rightfully so, speak for themselves, as she is now a finalist, but it is her interpersonal skill that is remarkable. She is a team player and is sure to be a joy to associate with.
Appendix H
Letter of Recommendation for Kristen Marie
"Neutral-Female A"

To: Selection Committee
   Timothy M. Holly Mock Candidate Selection
FR: James Peto
   Senior Account Mgr., Columbus Branch
DT: January 30, 1998
RE: Kristen Marie

It is my pleasure to write this letter of recommendation on behalf of Kristen Marie to support her application for the position of senior partner. I have known Kristen since August 1984 when she first began employment as a general accounting clerk within our firm.

It is my understanding that the committee is already aware of Kristen’s credentials as she is a finalist in your selection of senior partner. I have been instructed that you are concerned at this point with peer impressions of her general mannerisms and personality. To that end, I will forego raving of her credentials.

To evaluate Kristen’s many attributes, I looked to the entire department for input. We agree that she engages with clients in a sincere and tactful manner, and remains conscientious in all aspects of her work. She is a pleasure to have here as she seems to be consistently happy and is always friendly. In all, I think it is accurate to say she is well liked.

Kristen’s professionalism cannot be overstated. Both with clients and with the company, she can be regarded as reliable, honest, and truthful. Working closely with Kristen, I can attest to her integrity. Her billing sheets are always accurate and the hours she claims in work related activity are verifiable. Interpersonally, Kristen is adaptable to all sorts of people.
Appendix I
Letter of Recommendation for Michelle Ann
"Neutral-Female B"

To: Selection Committee
    Timothy M. Holly Mock Candidate Selection
FR: Johnathon Charles
    Senior Account Mgr., Dayton Branch
DT: January 30, 1998
RE: Michelle Ann

It is with great pleasure that I submit this letter of recommendation for Michelle Ann. Normally I would wish to include information regarding Michelle's outstanding contributions to the firm as they pertain to billing and such but as I understand your memo, this letter is to be more focused on interpersonal issues concerning Michelle.

Michelle is well liked by everyone she comes in contact with. She is a pleasure to work with and for. Perhaps one of her biggest interpersonal assets is her reliability. Her word is bonding and she can be counted on to deliver what she says. When situations require Michelle to assert herself, she tends to be very tactful and sincere.

In doing business, Michelle is efficient and systematic. Although some regard her to be unpredictable, her track record and honest mentality make her a person who can be regarded as a sure bet. I strongly encourage the review board to consider Michelle Ann. I am certain she will continue to produce and will add a pleasant personality to the mix.
Appendix J
Bern Sex Role Inventory "Self-Perceptions"

Rate the following items on a scale of 1 to 7 depending on how much you feel they are true for you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never or almost never true</td>
<td>Equally true and untrue</td>
<td>Always or almost always true</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Self-reliant</td>
<td>31 Make decisions easily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yielding</td>
<td>32 Compassionate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>33 Sincere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Defends own beliefs</td>
<td>34 Self-Sufficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td>35 Eager to soothe hurt feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Moody</td>
<td>36 Consecuted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>37 Dominate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Shy</td>
<td>38 Soft-spoken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Conscientious</td>
<td>39 Likable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Athletic</td>
<td>40 Masculine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Affectionate</td>
<td>41 Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Theatrical</td>
<td>42 Solemn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td>43 Willing to take a stand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Flatterable</td>
<td>44 Tender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>45 Friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Strong Personality</td>
<td>46 Aggressive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Loyal</td>
<td>47 Gullible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Unpredictable</td>
<td>48 Inefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Forceful</td>
<td>49 Act as a leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>50 Childlike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>51 Adaptable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td>52 Individualistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
<td>53 Do not use harsh language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Jealous</td>
<td>54 Unsystematic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Have leadership abilities</td>
<td>55 Competitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Sensitive to the needs of others</td>
<td>56 Love Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Truthful</td>
<td>57 Tactful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Willing to take risks</td>
<td>58 Ambitious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>59 Gentle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Secretive</td>
<td>60 Conventional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix K
Bem Sex Role Inventory “Perception of Women”

Rate the following items on a scale of 1 to 7 depending on how much you feel they are true for women in general.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never or almost never true</td>
<td>Equally true and untrue</td>
<td>Always or almost always true</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Brief Explanation of the Preceding Experiment

The preceding experiment continues a line of research exploring the relationship between sex-typed perceptions of the opposite sex and self-reported adherence to sex-typed sex roles. Although a vast amount of literature supports the idea that certain attributes tend to be regarded as particularly masculine or particularly feminine, this current research seeks to re-examine this relationship and probe the relationship between self-perceptions of masculinity and subsequent perceptions of the opposite sex's gender roles. We are interested in attempting to clarify the relationship and reveal possible biases in evaluation that result.

Thank you for your participation in this study. We do ask that you not discuss this study with your fellow students since they may participate in the study and prior knowledge of the study may influence their responses. Again, thank you for your cooperation.

If you are interested in additional information about this study, please contact Timothy Holly at his home: (513) 861-3187.
Abstract

Findings are presented from a correlational analysis between the extent of sex-typing in men's perceptions of themselves and the extent to which the same men sex-type women (Hypothesis One). Further, correlational findings between the extent of sex-typed self-assessment in men and the extent of the same men's preference for a sex-typed woman candidate are presented (Hypothesis Two). Eighty college students were used in the current study, 34 Georgetown College men and 46 Xavier University men. Measures of sex-typed self-perception and sex-typed perception of women in general were gathered using the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. Findings suggest a relationship between sex-typed self-perception and sex-typed perception of women in general, but no relationship between sex-typed self-perceptions and the preference for a sex-typed woman candidate. Results are discussed in relation to findings on both hypotheses.