

INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

7913138

JURAN, SHELLEY
STEREOTYPED ATTRIBUTIONS OF OCCUPATIONS,
STATUS AND GENDER OR THE ANOMALY OF THE HIGH
STATUS WOMAN.

CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, PH.D., 1979

University
Microfilms
International 300 N ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

© 1979

SHELLEY JURAN

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Stereotyped Attributions of Occupations, Status and Gender

or

The Anomaly of the High Status Woman

by

Shelley Juran

**A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Psychology
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York**

1979

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty
in Psychology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

January 23, 1979
date

Florence L. Denmark
Chairperson of Examining Committee

January 29, 1979
date

Florence L. Denmark
Executive Officer

Florence L. Denmark

Laurence Gould

Susan Saegert

Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

Abstract

STEREOTYPED ATTRIBUTIONS OF OCCUPATIONS, STATUS AND GENDER

OR

THE ANOMALY OF THE HIGH STATUS WOMAN

by

Shelley Juran

Adviser: Professor Florence L. Denmark

In a series of four separate studies, college students' attributions about high status women were compared with their attributions about high status men. When "high status" was occupationally defined, the results reveal that women and men were perceived quite similarly by the Ss. Contrary to the original hypotheses of this study, there was no direct or indirect evidence of negative connotations associated with high status women. This lack of negative associations occurred even when they were perceived as more powerful than their male counterparts.

When "high status" was undefined, men and women were perceived differently on basic stereotypic dimensions. Evidently, the stereotypes associated with high status occupations overcome older stereotypes associated with gender. These older gender-associated stereotypes themselves, are seen as changing. This study concludes that occupationally defined high status women are perceived as "anomalous" only to the extent that they are perceived as powerful, yet sensitive, bosses.

Acknowledgements

There are several people who were instrumental in guiding this dissertation toward completion. This acknowledgement is but a small measure of my appreciation of their efforts on my behalf.

First, I'd like to thank Florence Denmark, my sponsor, for her guidance and support throughout the many stages of this dissertation; her calm and confidence proved invaluable. The advice and encouragement of my other committee members, Susan Saegert and Laurence Gould, were also quite helpful. Special thanks go to Lou Gerstman, who was "there" with his expert advice during the analysis of this study, and to Carol Gordon, for her thoughtful and caring comments.

Above all, I want to thank my husband, Barry Juran, and my son, Brian, for their remarkable patience and support during the course of this endeavor.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION.....	1-19
Overview of Sex Role Research.....	1-4
Stereotypes.....	1
Division of Labor.....	2
Perpetuation of Sex Roles and Stereotypes.....	3
Status.....	5-7
Sex as a Status Characteristic.....	5
Summary.....	7
High Status Women - Relevant Research.....	8-19
Fear of Success Studies.....	8
Reactions to Women in Power or Authority.....	9
Summary.....	11
Perceptions of Women and High Status Positions.....	12
Summary and Conclusions.....	18
OVERVIEW AND ISSUES OF INQUIRY.....	19-28
Overview of Procedure.....	22
Dependent Measures.....	23
Summary.....	28
Presentation of the Studies.....	28
STUDY ONE.....	29-36
Methods.....	29
Hypotheses.....	29
Procedure.....	30
Results and Discussion.....	31
STUDY TWO.....	36-53
Methods.....	36
Hypotheses.....	36
Procedure.....	37
Results (general).....	38
Results Specific to Hypotheses.....	38
Discussion.....	50
STUDY THREE.....	54-79
Methods - Rating Scales.....	54
Hypotheses.....	54
Procedure.....	55
Results.....	56
Discussion.....	70
Open-Ended Questions (Procedure).....	73
Results.....	74
Discussion.....	77
Summary.....	79
STUDY FOUR.....	80-92
Methods.....	80
Hypotheses.....	80
Procedure.....	80
Results and Discussion.....	81
Summary.....	91
GENERAL DISCUSSION/SUMMARY.....	93-100
Study One.....	93
Study Two.....	93

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
GENERAL DISCUSSION/SUMMARY	
Study Three.....	95
Study Four.....	99
Women, Power and Sensitivity.....	99
APPENDIX.....	101-104
A - Stereotypic Items.....	101
B - Coding Categories for Questions of Study Three.....	102
BIBLIOGRAPHY	105

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 List of Scales Given to Ss in Studies Two and Three.....	27
2 Means of the CAR, WE and Status Ratings of the Occupations in the Booklets.....	31
3 Mean Ratings of the Different Doctor Categories on CAR, WE and Status.....	35
4 Mean Values of Competence, Assertion, Rationality (CAR) by Mark/Sheila, Occupational Condition, and Sex of S.....	39
5 Mean Values of Warmth/Expressiveness (WE) by Mark/Sheila, Occupational Condition, and Sex of S.....	40
6 Mean Values of the Total Stereotypic List (TMF) by Males/ Females and Occupational Condition.....	41
7 Mean Values of Status by Mark/Sheila and Occupational Condition.....	42
8 Mean Values of Potency by Mark/Sheila, Occupational Condition, and Sex of S.....	43
9 Mean Values of Competency by Males/Females and Occupational Condition.....	44
10 Mean Values of Sexuality by Mark/Sheila and Occupational Condition.....	45
11 Mean Values of Evaluation by Mark/Sheila and Occupational Condition.....	46
12 Comparisons of High Status Persons with Assistants, Across Conditions.....	47
13 Differences Between High Status Males and Their Female Assistants.....	57
14 Differences Between High Status Males and their Female Assistants.....	58
15 Differences Between High Status Females and their Male Assistants.....	59
16 Differences Between the High Male x Low Male and High Female x Low Male Conditions (Test of Indirect Denial).....	61
17 Comparison of Ratings of Male Assistants to Female Chemists and Male Assistants to Female Therapists.....	62
18 Comparison of High Status Females with High Status Males Across Conditions.....	63
19 Comparison of Female Chemists with Male Chemists When Sex of Assistant is Unspecified.....	64
20 Mean Potency Ratings of Mark/Sheila Chemists by Type of Assistant.....	66
21 Mean Warmth/Expressiveness(WE) Ratings of Mark/Sheila Chemists by Type of Assistant and Sex of S.....	68
22 Mean Differences Between Cue Ratings of Male and Female Ss, Across Conditions.....	69
23 Chi-Square Analysis of Ss Reponding to the Positive "Sensitive" Qualities of Sheila and Mark in Response to Question A.....	75
24 Chi-Square Analyses of Responses Specifically Denoting Gender of the High Status Person in Question B.....	76
25 Mean Value of Ratings of "High Status Woman" and "High Status Man" on the CAR, WE and TMF Dimensions, and t Scores Comparing Them.....	82

List of Tables

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
26 Mean Values of Ratings of Male and Female Ss on the CAR, WE and TMF Dimensions in Response to Specific Cues, and t Values Comparing Them.....	84
27 Frequencies of Occupations of High Status Women and High Status Men, by Sex of S.....	85
28 Frequency Listing of the Categorization of Why People are Considered to be High Status for the Four Most Frequently Cited Women.....	86
29 Four Most Frequently Mentioned High Status Women and High Status Men, by Sex of S.....	88

OVERVIEW OF SEX ROLE RESEARCH

Stereotypes - Women as "Expressive;" Men as "Competent"

How are women in professionally defined high status positions viewed by others? Professional status often depends upon competence, and in many societies the goals of femininity and of professional competence have been different. Studies of sex-typing and stereotypes (Sheriffs & McKee, 1957; Kagan, 1964; Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman & Broverman, 1968; Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz & Vogel, 1970) have shown that males are expected to be competent, independent, aggressive and dominant, while females are stereotypically associated with affiliation, nurturance, expressiveness, passivity and dependence. Sherman (1976) summarized a variety of other studies and formulations which indicate that the goals of femininity and competence are not the same. These include the Parsonian (Parson & Bales, 1955) dichotomization of instrumental functions for males and expressive functions for females, and cross-cultural research (Barry, Bacon & Child, 1957) which found that the majority of societies surveyed expected girls to become more nurturant than boys, and boys to achieve more and become more self-reliant than girls. Basically, the cultural expectations for men and women differ, and these expectations are part of both the role (behavior and function) and stereotypes (generalized traits and characteristics) commonly associated with men and women.

In the present discussion, "sex-stereotypes" and "sex-role" are technically differentiated by the above definitions, with sex-role basically associated with the division of labor along sex lines. In general usage, however, the terms "sex-stereotype" and "sex-role" are used interchangeably, along with the concept of "sex-role stereotype." Rosenkrantz et al., (1968) define "sex-role stereotypes" as "consensual beliefs about the

differing characteristics of men and women.")

Unfortunately, stereotypes are often assumed to have a biological basis; this, in turn, frequently limits the expectations of, and about individuals to their associated stereotype and consequent role behavior. Furthermore, research has found that, not only are men and women expected to have differing characteristics, but these specific characteristics are also valued more for one sex than for the other (Kagan, 1964; Rosenkrantz et al., 1968; Broverman et al., 1970).

Division of Labor

Sex-role stereotypes and a division of labor (sex-roles) exist in an efficient mutual feedback system. In every society there are male and female domains. The cultural interpretation (women raising children) of a biological dictate (women bear children) has led to a universal structural asymmetry in the activities of women and men (Rosoldo, 1974). Women are associated with child-rearing and domestic activities; while men are freer to become involved with more "public" activities.

The different male and female domains lead to different experiences not only for adult men and women, but also for boys and girls. Girls need to differentiate themselves less from their primary identification with their mothers than do boys (Chodorow, 1974; Stoller, 1975). Boys have to replace their original primary identification with their mother with a positional identification with the "male role" of an often absent, and more distant father. Often, masculine identification is defined as that which is not feminine; frequently, this is done by denying the feminine within one's self and by devaluing femininity in the outside world (Chodorow, 1974).

Boys and girls, as well as mothers and fathers, learn that there

is an aura of authority in the male public domain which, because it is public, is defined as special or superior to the immediate female environment (Rosoldo, 1974). Moreover, male activities almost always include the role of main economic "provider," which is valued more than domestic tasks. Furthermore, there is usually a real power difference between those who control resources and those who depend upon them. Distance from the home and the male role as "provider," therefore, contribute to a perceived (and usually a real) power difference between men and women.

Perpetuation of Sex Roles and Stereotypes

Although the historical roots of a division of labor lie in certain fundamental sex differences (parturition and lactation of the female, greater physical strength and therefore role of hunter and protector for the male), modern society no longer necessitates such a division across sex lines. The bearer of children need no longer feed and raise them; the "provider" is no longer dependent upon physical strength. Yet, these male and female roles exist even in our own highly civilized American society. While there is an ideology of equality between the sexes, in reality the public sphere of activity of the male and the economic power that it entails is culturally valued considerably more than women's private domain of household tasks and childbearing. In societies where there is less of a division of labor, where men are involved in the home and women contribute to the means of production and subsistence, there is less of a status difference between the sexes (Rosoldo, 1974; Sanday, 1974).

One of the most insidious causes of the perpetuation of the unequal treatment and perception of the sexes is the family. It is

here that sex roles are first learned, that identification processes first occur, and that differential evaluation and power perception of male and females first begins.

If a real experiential basis of equality of roles within the family could exist, stereotypes about men and women might indeed be able to change. As it now exists, the division of labor along sex lines fits well with stereotypes which expect women to be nurturant and men to be independent and competent; each feeds upon and reinforces the other. Throw in the derivatives of such stereotypes and male/female role divisions: 1) different socialization processes for boys and girls by the parents (Lewis, 1972), and 2) different expectations by and for girls and boys in the school system, and the result is an almost* self-perpetuating system.

Within this system, women who work are still expected to be primarily responsible for the children. They have, in effect, the dual role of worker and caretaker (Theodore, 1971). This occurs even in the Soviet Union, and is a major reason why Soviet women, while a majority of the professional working force, still do not advance into the hierarchies of their chosen fields (Dodge, 1971). It seems that, almost universally, the "nurturant" stereotype ties women to child-rearing. Perhaps this "nurturant" quality itself is discordant with prestigious work. This will be a focus of this study.

* The word "almost" is used because the system does not indeed allow for change. External factors such as war, economic necessity, or the Women's Movement may effect sex-stereotyping and/or work roles.

STATUS

Definitions

Definitions of status involve differential evaluations and expectations of persons and the distribution of influence and prestige within a group (Berger, Cohen & Zelditch, 1972). "Status" can be formally defined as a particular role relationship in an organizational structure, or less formally defined as a prestige indicator of society in general (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1975). Sociological categorizations of status define it as either achieved (based on performance or roles) or ascribed (a function of age, sex, or class) (Unger, 1975).

Sex as a Status Characteristic - Power

Only recently in psychology, has sex been considered as a status characteristic (Henley, 1970; Unger, 1975; Lockheed & Hall, 1976). Studies of sex-roles and sex-role stereotyping have repeatedly found that there is more cultural valuation of the male, as compared to the female role (McKee & Sheriffs, 1957; Rosenkrantz et al., 1968; Broverman et al., 1970, 1972). However, defining male/female influence in terms of "role" implies complementary aspects of socialized behavior, whereas "status" emphasizes the fact that there is indeed different power and prestige accorded to the male and female domains and stereotypes (Lockheed & Hall, 1976). Women not only have a less valued role, but they are perceived as less powerful also. "Power" is usually defined in relative terms, with one person or group described as more dominant, influential or as stronger than the other. It is this "power" aspect of status which is becoming a focal point in recent interpretations of sex-role research.

While "power" has been an aspect of the theoretical explanations of women as "minority member" (Hochschild, 1973) and "deviant" (Walstedt, 1974; Unger, 1975), it has become the focal point of the newest perspective of sex roles, the "politics of caste" (Hochschild, 1973). Freeman (1971), Acker (1973), and Sherman (1976) explain the relative positions of men and women in our society in terms of caste. Mobility is not possible within the caste system, and the continuation of such a system requires that those in the lower caste (and without much power) believe that their lower status is indeed justified.

Freundl (1977) supports the statement that sex is a status characteristic by citing a number of cross-species status effects delineated by Mazur (1973), which apply to human groups, as follows:

1. Group members are fairly consistently ranked such that higher members have more power, influence and value prerogatives than lower ranked members.
2. Low ranked members show more stress systems than higher ranked members. (Stress, "in application to human groups, is broadly defined as "psychological disturbance.")
3. Over the long run, most members interact more with others of similar rank ("near peers") than with members of dissimilar rank.
4. High ranked members usually participate more than low ranked members in group interaction.
5. An individual's rank depends, in part, on "external" attributes which are not obvious prerequisites for status in the group (such as being) older, or male.
6. Status rank is usually established or maintained without physical fights or overt gestures of threat or submission.

Freundl cites evidence for each point to show that the relationship between men and women does indeed correspond to a relationship between individuals of considerably different status, with men as the higher status individuals.

SUMMARY

In summary, men and women have different role divisions and stereotypes which lead to status differences between the sexes. Stereotypes and sex roles mutually reinforce each other. Males, with their more valued public, occupational role and "competency" stereotype have, as a group, considerably higher status than women, with their domestic role and nurturant, "emotionally expressive" stereotype. Men are also perceived as more powerful than women. Status involves evaluations and expectations (aspects of stereotypes) and influence and prestige (concomitants of power). The anomaly of the high status woman can be looked at from either a stereotype or power perspective. The present study emphasizes the stereotypic contradiction inherent to occupationally defined high status women: that of being both feminine-expressive and masculine-competent. However, the theoretical implications of power are taken into account. Of ultimate interest is: "How are high status women perceived?"

HIGH STATUS WOMEN - RELEVANT RESEARCH

Since occupationally defined high status women have been rare in our society, the idea of studying perceptions about them is relatively new. There are three lines of research and theorizing which bear upon the subject: 1) "fear of success" studies, 2) reactions to women in power and authority situations, and 3) research dealing specifically with perceptions of women and high status positions.

"Fear of Success" Studies

Matina Horner (1968) introduced the concept of "fear of success" as a motivational explanation for the seemingly mutual exclusivity of the concepts of "achievement" and "femininity." It was introduced as an explanation for women's inconsistent responses under arousal conditions related to achievement motivation studies. She found a huge sex difference in fear of success imagery in projectively scored stories when subjects wrote about top medical school students of their own sex. Women wrote stories with a significantly greater amount of this negative achievement imagery than did men, and the themes of their stories dealt primarily with fear of social rejection, concern about their own normality, and denial of the situation. Horner, therefore, theorized that women had internalized a motive that was specifically attuned to the negative - meaning the "unfeminizing" masculine and aggressive - consequences of successful achievement.

Many subsequent researchers (e.g., Juran, 1972; Hoffman, 1974) have either failed to get any sex differences when replicating Horner's studies, or have emphasized the more "cultural," as opposed to "motivational," explanation of her findings. "Cultural" interpreta-

tions refer to the fact that many studies (Feather & Raphelson, 1974; Monahan, Kuhn & Shaver, 1974; Zuckerman & Wheeler, 1975) have shown that: 1) the female cue elicits more fear of success imagery than the male cue, regardless of the sex of the subject, and that 2) the deviance (role-incongruence) of the cue affects responses, at least for males (Lockheed, 1975). Cultural interpretations are also supported by findings that the "content" of fear-of-success stories of men differ from those of women. Men tend to question life styles and the value of achievement, while females deal with loss of femininity and social rejection. Zuckerman and Wheeler (1975), in a review of the literature on fear of success, conclude that: 1) there are no reliable age or sex differences, 2) it is not clear whether it taps a motive or cultural stereotype, and 3) fear of success shows no consistent relationship with any behavioral measures. They do conclude, however, that there is evidence that fear of success taps "appropriate" achievements for men and women.

Reactions to Women in Power or Authority

While Horner (1968) wrote about the negative affect associated with female achievement, other researchers have concerned themselves with negative affect associated with women in authority. Wright (1974) found that, in a mixed-sex self-study group, women consultants were not rated differently from male consultants on a semantic differential asking about items such as "trust," "emotionality" and "closeness," but when these women consultants were also non-reciprocating, (i.e. when they used very distancing behavioral cues), subjects' negative feelings (negative ratings on the semantic differential) were projected onto their other group members. As the present author interprets this,

under very "strong" anomalous conditions (with a woman who is both an authority and distant), this negative reaction appeared, albeit indirectly. The subjects (group participants) also perceived their female consultants (who were "authorities," of higher status than the subjects, in this self-study group), as "stronger" than their male consultants. Nonreciprocating consultants were perceived as stronger than reciprocating consultants. The strength or potency of high status women is revealed in other studies (see page 15); when women take on the roles of men, they are often perceived as overly powerful.

Gould (1976) has written that men respond with a "motivated neutrality" or indifference to women authorities which is exemplified by neutral or middle ratings of these women on a variety of traits. (By contrast, males rate male leaders quite variably). He believes that these "neutralized" ratings on all scales, including "sexual-asexual," reflects a highly charged motivation to deny feelings associated with the power reversal when men are faced with women of higher status than themselves. This seems to be another instance of "indirect" expression of negative affect associated with women authorities.

His analysis is in agreement with the theory that males' masculinity is dependent upon gaining superior power over women (Beauvais, 1977) and that women in a relatively powerful situation threaten the masculinity of many men (Janeway, 1974). Research in support of this theory (Murphy-Berman, 1976) found that males who failed in competition with females estimated that their partners would rate them as less masculine than did males who succeeded in the competition.

SUMMARY

In summary, the strongest statement that can be made about fear-of-success studies are that the results are inconsistent. Sometimes achieving women are seen as different than achieving men: sometimes not. Sometimes men and women respond differently, and sometimes they do not. It seems intuitively obvious that "something" (some type of negative affect) is occurring with the notion of female (as opposed to male) achievement - hence, the popularity of the concept of fear of success and the numerous research studies in this area. However, this "something" does not always show up in the results. It is often concluded that this "something" deals with sex-role incongruence ("appropriate" achievements for men and women).

Studies of women authorities reveal that, sometimes, indirect or more specific analyses pick up the special reaction to high status women. Indeed, sometimes this only occurs under very "strong" conditions. Furthermore, since notions about gender identity may be involved, defensive reactions may interfere with the results of psychological research.

While Horner stressed the motivational aspect of female (fear of) achievement, many subsequent researchers have stressed the "cultural" interpretation of her data. The present author will also. It is a basic assumption of the current proposed study that, when people respond to an achieving or high status woman, they are in fact responding to a person in an anomalous situation, one with contradictory stereotypes and roles. Reactions to such women are overwhelmingly determined by these stereotypic role contradictions. Such reactions might be similar to responses to norm violations (Garfinkle, 1967)

which include anger, shock, or anxiety, or some other type of negative affect. Studies dealing specifically with perceptions of women and high status positions should reveal further information about these reactions.

Perceptions of Women and High Status Positions

Touhey (1974) found that ratings of occupational prestige and desirability decreased when subjects anticipated that much greater proportions of women would enter them. Additionally, rating on adjective-pairs from the semantic differential showed significant increases in "passivity," "insecurity," and "uselessness" in the occupations admitting increased proportions of women. These adjectives reflect the negative view of femininity associated with lack of competence. However, Touhey had no adjective-pairs to check the positive, female-valued traits (warmth-expressiveness) that might be associated with women entering a profession. Furthermore, his sample had 30% more males than females, so that male reactions dominated the measure.

Kantor (1977) discussed perceptual phenomena associated with "token" women in a predominantly male field (industrial sales). All of the perceptual phenomena associated with these women included exaggerated responses to these women on the part of the "dominant" male group. Kantor stressed the fact that, while she was reporting on male/female interactions, the perceptual phenomena associated with these women could apply to other "token" groups as well (e.g. men in the field of nursing).

The phenomena discussed by Kantor included: 1) increased visibility of the tokens, 2) polarization (exaggeration of differences between the tokens and the dominants) and 3) assimilation (a distortion of the tokens attributes to fit stereotypical generalizations about

them). The response to "assimilation" is especially relevant to this current study. It lead to the interactional dynamic of a) status leveling - the women managers were often misperceived or treated as lower status persons than they were and b) stereotypic role induction - they were treated as "mother," "seductress," and other special "female roles."

McKenna and Denmark (1978) carried out a videotape study, without sound, in which Ss viewed two actors interacting with each other in an ambiguous office setting. One actors always used high status, and the other, low status, nonverbal behaviors. Four actors (two female and two male) interacted in all possible combinations of pairings. There were four major conditions: a high status behaving male or female interacting with a lower status behaving (subordinate) male or female. High status behaving persons had more relaxed postures and assymetrical arm and leg positions than did lower status persons. Lower status actors used more positive head nods, arm movements, smiling and eye contact (glances toward the other actor). An additional manipulation consisted of varying the person (high or low status) who entered the office of the other (opposite status) actor, who was sitting at his/her desk. The experimenters were interested in discovering whether sex of the actor or nonverbal behavior affected subjects' judgments about the actor's power and status. "Status" was determined by coding subjects' responses to a question about what kind of job they thought the actors probably had.

Overall, the nonverbal behaviors used, and not the sex of the actor, determined judged relative status. There were, however, two conditions where nonverbal behaviors did not determine implied status.

These were when 1) A (first person in the film, sitting at a desk) was a high status female and B (the person entering) was a lower status male, and 2) A was a low status male and B was a high status female.

Number one is of special interest to this current study. Since lower status people normally enter the office of higher status persons, it can be argued that this situation strengthens (is in accord with) the nonverbal determinants of the film, whereas the other manipulation, (with the high status person entering the office), slightly weakens the status discrepancy. This strong status discrepancy where a woman has a higher relative status than a man proves to be a powerfully anomalous situation. The woman not only behaves in a high status manner, but she interacts in a business setting with a lower status behaving man who had entered her office. In that situation the woman was not perceived as higher in status than the man -- they were perceived as equal in status. According to the present author, it may be that the cue was denied. (It is worth recalling here the projection response found in the strongly anomalous condition in Wright (1974). In situations quite contrary to expected stereotypes, subjects reacted strongly, and, perhaps, defensively (via denial and projection).

A factor analysis done a short list of bi-polar adjectives revealed three factors: potency (influenced--influential, submissive--dominant, guided--autonomous); evaluation (pleasant--unpleasant, good--bad, distant--friendly, polite--impolite); responsiveness (uninterested--seductive, aroused--unaroused). Note, the "responsiveness" factor was unlike the "activity" factor often found in similar studies and which was available from traits in the list (i.e. tense--relaxed, active--

passive, quiet--restless). The responsiveness factor found by McKenna and Denmark seems to have more of a sexual connotation (aroused, seductive) than the traits of a general activity factor.

While high status persons were rated as more "potent" than low status persons, there was an interaction between gender and status on "potency." High status females were rated as more potent than high status males, but low status males were perceived as more potent than low status females (when status was defined by behavior). This point, again, agrees with the results of Wright (1974) which showed that women authorities were perceived as stronger than their male counterparts.

Juran (1976) compared male and female responses to four verbal cues: "Anne (John) is sitting in a chair, smiling" and "After first term finals, Anne (John) finds herself (himself) at the top of her (his) medical school class." The medical school cue was the same as that used by Horner (1968); it can, in retrospect, be considered as a successful, relatively high status situation. Subjects were asked to rate Anne or John on the 38 items of the Rosenkrantz list of stereotypic items (see Appendix Table A) on a scale from 1 to 7. The major dependent measure was the mean of these 38 items, which comprised a general masculinity/femininity scale. An interaction between cue sex and condition was hypothesized and confirmed. An analysis of variance on the mean of these 38 items found that John and Anne were seen as stereotypically different (John was significantly more masculine than Anne) in the neutral condition. However, they were rated quite similarly, the mean of the 38 traits was almost identical, in the medical school condition. Therefore, the mere fact that Anne or John are seen as top medical students (relatively high status) means that certain traits are

attributed to them which override sex stereotypes.

While John was rated as more masculine than Anne in the neutral situation, both Anne and John were seen as masculine in the high status situation. "Masculine" in what way? Inspection of the individual traits which showed a significant difference from the neutral to the high status situation for Anne (combining male and female Ss) revealed that 13 of these 14 traits were in the "competency" (male-valued) cluster of traits with Anne becoming more competent in the high status situation. Anne became more masculine in that she increased in socially-desirable male characteristics (competency, quadrant I) and not because of any loss of socially-desirable female characteristics (warmth-expressiveness), which would have shown up in quadrant II. There was also no significant increase in "aggressiveness" for Anne as she moved from the neutral to the high status situation, as might have been hypothesized from the original theorizing about "fear of success" in women (Horner, 1968). In the medical school setting, as compared with the neutral setting, Anne was seen as significantly more competitive, non-crying, ambitious, self-confident, active, dominant, and as more of a leader. She was seen as significantly less dependent, emotionally hurt, or excitable in a minor crisis. Additionally, she enjoyed math and science more, and art and literature less. This study revealed that an increase in competency is not necessarily associated with a decrease in female-valued (warmth-expressive) traits, when male and female responses to relatively high status women are combined.

A reanalysis of the Juran (1976) study in preparation for this current study revealed that men and women rated a neutral woman (Anne) somewhat differently. Women saw her as significantly warmer

than did men. In the high status situation, men saw Anne as increasing somewhat in warmth-expressiveness (in relation to a neutral Anne), but women saw her as significantly decreasing in these female-valued traits. Women also saw John as increasing somewhat (not quite significantly) in these traits from the neutral to high status situation, while men saw no change at all in these traits. Therefore, while top medical students John and Anne were rated similarly in warmth-expressiveness, males and females reacted differently to changes in this dimension across status conditions. These differences are due chiefly to different perceptions of neutral Anne; females saw her as warmer than did males.

It appears that women responded more to the female-valued items than did men. Both men and women responded more similarly on the "competency" items. They both saw neutral John as significantly more competent than a neutral Anne. Both John and Anne got more competent as top medical students. Their ratings on the mean of the "competency" items were almost identical; since Anne was initially seen as having less of these traits than John, she showed much more of an increase on this dimension.

The major findings of the Juran (1976) study, therefore, were that men and women in the relatively high status medical school condition were seen as remarkably alike, by both male and female subjects. The only "sex" differences that occurred were in relation to the perception of a neutral female. Women rated them as more "warm-expressive" than did men, and as more "warm-expressive" than a high status female. Perhaps women's association with the "expressive" dimension, and the assumed lack of these traits in a high status person, are aspects of the incongruity of high status women.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In summary, studies dealing specifically with women and "high status" positions have yielded different results; direct, indirect, and an absence of negative affect have all been found to be associated with these women. Both Touhey (1974) and Kantor (1977) found strong negative perceptions concerning these women, which can be considered as a direct manifestation of the contradictory roles of high status women. McKenna and Denmark (1976) found that, in general, status overruled attributions about sex differences. A closer analysis of the data, however, found that, at some level, men and women were perceived as having different attributes. Low status men were perceived as of higher occupational status than their female counterparts, and there was an interaction between sex and behavioral status on the potency dimension. Moreover, there was a change in perceptions of status in the strongest anomalous situation. As the present author interprets this, this "denial" response can be considered as an indirect manifestation of the negative affect associated with women in high status positions. Juran (1976) found remarkable similarity between the male and female high status cues in her experiment.

Perhaps some of the inconsistencies in these studies have to do with the nature of the high status occupations chosen for study, and the traits commonly associated with them. Might it be that some high status occupations are less contradictory for women than others? Status, defined by power, prestige, and occupational role, is typically associated with fields that stress only the male-valued dimension of "competency." High status occupations that also are associated with female-valued (expressive, affiliative) traits are rarely considered.

A pilot study by Denmark, McKenna, Juran & Greenberg (1976) concerning nonverbal behavior in office interactions, revealed that higher status men and women in a graduate university setting used remarkably similar nonverbal behaviors, and that these behaviors were more affiliative than were those of their lower status counterparts. It was concluded that not only was status a more important variable than sex in this study, but that "affiliation" may be an integral part of such high status positions. One wonders, if that were the case, whether the high status men and women would have been perceived differently (perception was not a part of that study). Perhaps high status women would be less anomalous, or, indeed, not anomalous at all, if "expressiveness" or affiliative behavior were an integral part of their high status occupations. This present study is concerned with this issue.

OVERVIEW AND ISSUES OF INQUIRY

"Perceptions about high status women" has been a relatively unstudied area. Until recently, the visibility of such women has been low. Therefore, perceptions about them were not considered as an area of concern. Times have changed, and more women are entering fields traditionally reserved for men. Kantor's (1977) field observations, a beginning in a relatively unstudied area, concluded that there were many perceptual distortions in response to token women.

Horner's (1968) study underlies recent psychological investigation on the notion of discordance in relation to female success. However, she emphasized a motivational analysis of the conflict involved in female success, whereas many subsequent researchers have emphasized the culturally determined role-incongruence of the situation.

The current study also emphasizes the cultural aspect of role-incongruity in the form of stereotypes that adhere to specific roles. High status women are considered as culturally anomalous phenomena, since women, as a group, have relatively low status. Certainly, their status is lower than men's. This is because the roles and stereotypes that adhere to women-in-general are not viewed as prerequisite for occupational status and economic self-reliance as are the "competency" and associated stereotypes and roles that adhere to men. Perhaps, even positive female stereotypes are negatively associated with status.

This study is concerned with attributions about high status women. The findings of such a study should help explain "what" it is that is contributing to negative (male and female) reactions concerning high status and successful women, if such reactions exist. The "power" implications of status and gender and the male-valued (competency) and female-valued (warmth-expressiveness) stereotypic domains are studied in detail. While previous studies have emphasized the discordance between global aspects of "femininity" and achievement (and status), this study emphasizes the discordance between the "expressive" aspect of femininity and both competency and status. This study focuses on three separate, but related issues concerning high status women.

1) How does Woman's "expressive" stereotype relate to attributions of status? Are there high status occupations which also emphasize expressive traits?

2) Are attributions about occupationally defined high status women the same or different than those of high status men?

3) When status is undefined, how are high status women and men perceived and categorized?

Issue two is the crux of this dissertation. It is a basic assumption of this study that high status women occupy an anomalous situation in that they incorporate two contradictory stereotypes - that of a high status person and that of a woman. Therefore, it would be expected that perceptions of these women are different than perceptions of the more role-congruent high status men. However, previous research about men and women in achievement, authority and status situations has yielded inconsistent results. Sometimes, high status women are viewed as different from men, and sometimes they are not.

Perhaps some of the differences in these studies have to do with the "strength" of the anomaly involved. This could refer to a combination of anomalous cues in any one situation (see page 14), or the nature of the occupation chosen as high status. Perhaps some high status occupations have more warmth or female-valued associations than others, over and beyond the work-related component of status.

This study compares attributions about high status men and women on a variety of dimensions; it is assumed that differences between them may be due to the special role incongruity of high status women. Decreases in this role incongruity for women (hence, decreases in the attributed differences between them and high status men) as a function of the strength of the cues associated with these women are explored.

Overview of Procedure

This study consisted of four separate studies, all of which were concerned with stereotypic attributions of women and status. The first study was concerned only with high status occupations, and was specifically designed to answer issue one. It resulted in the choice of an occupation with both male and female-valued traits, which was used in the following two studies. The other three studies dealt specifically with high status women. Study two was designed to answer issue two on a relatively simple level. The strength of anomalous cues associated with high status women was dependent solely upon occupational title. Perceptions of neutral persons were compared against perceptions of persons in an occupation with male-valued traits only, as well as with a person in an occupation with both male and female-valued traits.

Study three involved strong anomalous cues beyond occupational title. Both occupational title and interpersonal status differences are manipulated. Occupationally defined high status women are defined as having a male assistant. Perception of a status reversal between the sexes was an integral part of this study, which was designed to explore issue two in a more complex way than did study two. Study four was designed to answer issue three.

In all four studies, undergraduate students were asked to participate in a study involving "impressions of people." They were tested in groups (15 to 40 persons in each group) in large classrooms. Booklets were handed out with identical cover sheets; the conditions within each study varied at the top of the second page. Each condition consisted of a printed statement at the top of the page; when Ss rated more than one condition (as in studies one and four) the conditions were

printed on successive pages and their order was counterbalanced. Ss were asked to look at the statement for a few seconds, and then rate the person in the statement on the dependent measures which appeared underneath the statement.

The dependent measures, bi-polar adjective scales which ranged from one to seven, are explained in the following pages. All booklets asked the subjects' age and sex on the last page.

Dependent Measures

Development of the Original Stereotypic List

Rosenkrantz et al. (1968) developed a list of 41 sex role stereotypic traits by accepting a consensus of 75% agreement by college students, as to which pole of a longer list of bi-polar traits was more representative of one sex than the other. The difference between the means of the masculinity and femininity responses to each of these items was significantly beyond the .001 level of confidence. Once a masculine and feminine pole has been agreed upon, another population of students was asked to indicate which pole represented more socially desirable behavior (sex unspecified). The masculine pole was seen as more socially desirable than the feminine pole on 29 of these traits, while only twelve traits were rated as more desirable on the feminine pole. This led to the formation of a four quadrant listing of stereotypic items (see Appendix Table A). All items have a masculine and a feminine pole separating the left and right quadrants. The top and bottom quadrants are separated by the pole which was rated as socially desirable. Items for which the masculine pole was rated as socially desirable were labelled "male-valued." Those in which the feminine pole was rated as

socially desirable were labelled "female-valued." Masculine items could be considered socially desirable (quadrant I) or socially undesirable (quadrant II). Feminine items could be considered socially desirable (quadrant III) or socially undesirable (quadrant IV). Table A consists of the original 41 stereotypic items minus three which the authors felt represented adolescent concerns about sexuality and which were not included in their subsequent research about adult stereotypes (Broverman et al., 1970).

Further work on the stereotypic list consisted of factor analyzing these responses (or attributions) about an adult male or female separately for male and female respondents (Broverman et al., 1972). Each analysis produced two initial factors which accounted for 61% of the total extractable communality. These factors seemed to basically correspond to 1) male-valued traits, which were labelled as "competency, rationality, assertion," and which will be referred to as CAR in this paper, for convenience, and 2) female-valued traits, which were labelled as "warmth-expressiveness," and which will be referred to as WE in this paper.

Modification of the Stereotypic List for Use in this Current Study

Juran (1976), in research previously cited (Pp. 14-16) used the 38 items in Table A as her dependent measure. Each item was presented to subjects as a bi-polar trait on a 7-point scale. A reanalysis of her data as a pilot for this current study consisted of getting the mean of the total scale and sub-scale (WE) and (CAR) traits. Four traits which showed a low correlation with total scale and sub-scale scores in the Juran (1976) study (items 25, 27, 32, 36) (Appendix Table A) were deleted for this current study.

The overall measure of masculinity/femininity consisted of the mean of all the remaining 34 items. This was referred to as TMF, for convenience. The means of the male-valued (CAR) and female-valued (WE) items were also assessed separately. Items 1 and 23 of Table A, which dealt with aggression, seemed to reflect a factor other than "competency" in the Juran (1976) study. Those items were therefore counted in total scale score, but were not included in the CAR dimension.

Additional Measures Used in this Study

Additional items were added to the list of traits in Table A. Manipulations of status as an independent variable were checked by a status scale. Studies one and four utilized the 34 items mentioned above plus the scale "works in a high status job--works in a low status job."

Studies two and three contained additional items as well. "Potency," an aspect of status associated with the sexual division of labor, was included as a measure. The trait "influential--influenced," from the potency dimension of the McKenna and Denmark (1978) study, was included in this study as well as the trait "weak--strong." The mean of those two items, as well as the trait "very submissive--very dominant" from the original list in Table A and similar to a potency trait of the McKenna and Denmark (1978) study, constituted a "potency" dimension.

Other traits from the factors of the McKenna and Denmark (1978) study were included as dependent measures. "Pleasant--unpleasant," and "distant--friendly" were part of an evaluative dimension. "Warm--cold" was also included, both as the third trait of the "evaluative" dimension (which was calculated as the mean of the three evaluative traits)

and as a check on the meaning of the WE dimension itself. Additionally, traits from the responsiveness factor of the McKenna and Denmark (1978) study, which seemed to have sexual connotations, were also included, with slight modifications to reflect Ss reactions to stimulus cues. "Aroused--unaroused" and "uninteresting--seductive" were changed to "very arousing--very unexciting" and "not at all seductive--very seductive." Additionally, the traits "very sexy--not at all sexy" and "very ugly--very attractive" were included. The mean of these four traits was considered as the "sexuality" dimension. This was included in order to find out if high status women had particular sexual or asexual connotations when compared to high status men.

The original items from Table A and the above additions were all considered as stereotypic dimensions. Several additional individual scales were included as checks on the major stereotypic dimensions. "Very competent--not at all competent" was added as a check on the CAR dimension, and "very sensitive--not at all sensitive" was added as a check on the WE dimension. Included also was a scale which checked the perceived masculinity/femininity of the stimulus cue characters: "very masculine--very feminine" (MF) was added to the list. That brought the total number of traits which Ss in studies two and three were asked to check to 47. The list of traits given to these Ss is presented in Table 1.

Additionally, open-ended questions asking about Ss preferences for working and receiving criticism from the high status person mentioned in the written cue were appended to study 3. These were added to check positive or negative affect at a different level of analysis than is possible in scaled measures.

TABLE 1

List of Scales Given to Ss in Studies 2 & 3

1. Not at all competitive	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Very competitive
2. Very easily influenced	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Not at all easily influenced
3. Very interested in own appearance	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Not at all interested in own appearance
4. Not at all dependent	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Very dependent
5. Cries very easily	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Never cries
6. Not at all talkative	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Very talkative
7. Not at all aware of feelings of others	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Very aware of feelings of others
8. Very direct	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Very sneaky
9. Not at all aggressive	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Very aggressive
10. Very objective	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Very subjective
11. Very worldly	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Very home oriented
12. Easily expresses tender feelings	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Does not express tender feelings at all
13. Very gentle	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Very tough
14. Very ambitious	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Not at all ambitious
15. Very self-confident	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Not at all self-confident
16. Knows the way of the world	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Does not know the way of the world
17. Has difficulty making decisions	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Can make decisions easily
18. Very emotional	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Not at all emotional
19. Very loud	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Very quiet
20. Very tactful	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Very blunt
21. Almost always acts as a leader	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Almost never acts as a leader
22. Very adventurous	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Not at all adventurous
23. Very independent	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Not at all independent
24. Almost always hides emotions	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Does not hide emotions at all
25. Very neat in habits	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Very sloppy in habits
26. Very uncomfortable about being aggressive	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Not at all uncomfortable about being aggressive
27. Does not enjoy art and literature at all	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Enjoys art and literature
28. Feelings easily hurt	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Feelings not easily hurt
29. Not at all skilled in business	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Very skilled in business
30. Very logical	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Very illogical
31. Very active	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Very passive
32. Dislikes math and science very much	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Likes math and science very much
33. Very excitable in a minor crisis	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Not at all excitable in a minor crisis
34. Very dominant	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Very submissive
35. Works in a low status job	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Works in a high status job
36. Weak	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Strong

TABLE 1 - continued

37. Not at all attractive	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Very attractive
38. Pleasant	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Unpleasant
39. Not at all competent	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Very competent
40. Very sexy	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Not at all sexy
41. Influential	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Influenced
42. Very arousing	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Very unexciting
43. Distant	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Friendly
44. Very sensitive	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Not at all sensitive
45. Not at all seductive	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Very seductive
46. Cold	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Warm
47. Very masculine	1.2.3.4.5.6.7	Very feminine

Summary

In summary, the dependent measures in all the studies included all the items of Table A except traits number 1, 23, 25, and 27 in the CAR dimension, and all items except for 32 and 36 for WE, which now seemed to reflect a sensitivity dimension. A status scale was also included. A TMF score for studies two, three and four included all items not deleted from the CAR and WE dimensions, as well as items 1 and 23 in Table A. Studies two and three had additional items. Characteristics referring to "potency," "evaluation" and "sexuality," as well as checks on CAR and WE, and an MF scale, were added (see Table 1 above). Open-ended questions were appended to Study three.

Presentation of the Studies

Since this dissertation consists of four separate studies, each study is presented separately, with a Methods section specific to that study (including aspects not covered in this Overview section), as well as its own Results and Discussion sections. A General Discussion/Summary section, integrating the results of all the studies, follows the individual study presentation.

STUDY ONE

Methods

This pilot study was designed to find out about the stereotyped attributions which pertain to prestigious occupations. It was designed to reveal whether such occupations have similar ratings on male-valued (CAR) traits, and whether any of the chosen occupations is higher than the others on female-valued (WE) traits. Here, a prestigious occupation is the operational definition of "status." This study is, essentially, a search for a high status occupation which also has female-valued connotations. Additionally, it was designed to discover any differences in perceptions of the same occupation when it is worded differently, so that it has more feminine-role connotations in some instances, than in others.

Hypothesis

1. High status occupations should be rated similarly on the status scale and the CAR dimension. They should be rated as high on status and on the masculine side of CAR.
2. Does there exist a high status occupation that has a significantly greater amount of WE traits than other occupations? Specifically, this hypothesis predicts that two high status occupations can be found which are similar in CAR and status and dissimilar in WE, such that one occupation has more WE than most other high status occupations.
3. Any differences between the same general occupation (doctor) worded differently ("physician," "pediatrician," "baby doctor") should be due to the increasing "womanly" role associations of those occupations, respectively. It is predicted that this will lower the status of the

job and increase the femininity of the CAR and WE scales.

Procedure

One-hundred and six college students were given booklets with either of two groups of four prestigious occupations, most of which were in the top 20% of occupations listed in a survey of occupational prestige (Hodge, Siegel & Rossi, 1964). They were given the instructions:

Sometimes we form impressions about people after knowing nothing more about them than their occupations or job titles. This study is interested in such impressions. On the top of the next page you will see the job title of a person. Knowing nothing more than that, please think for a few seconds, form an impression about a person with that job title, and then rate that person on a variety of traits, or characteristics, which appear on the page under that job title.

Each trait or characteristic varies on a 7-point scale. Please circle the number (1,2,3,4,5,6 or 7) that you think best describes the person on each trait.

Afterward, turn the page, think for a few seconds, and form an impression about another person whose occupation is at the top of that page. Then proceed to rate that person on the list of traits which are underneath that occupation.

Continue to do this until you have formed an impression about individuals in four different occupations and have rated each person on the basis of that impression. Please rate every single trait when you come to it, and do not go back to already completed pages.

Are there any questions?

The rating scales were listed under each occupation. For half the traits, the feminine pole, and for half the traits, the masculine pole, was listed first. The order of the stereotypic traits was randomly assigned, although they preceded the status scale. Ss received one of two booklets.

Booklet A, given to 45 Ss, contained the occupations: college professor, chemist, dentist and therapist. The first three occupations were from the Hodge et al. (1964) study: the latter was added as a

possible high status occupation with WE associations.

Booklet B, given to 61 Ss, contained four other occupations, in case two occupations were equal in CAR, one of which with high WE ratings, could not be found in Booklet A. Additionally, this booklet was designed to test the hypothesis about different versions of the same occupation. The occupations in this book were psychologist, lawyer, executive, and one of the "doctor" categories. While all Ss received the first three occupations, one-third received "physician," one-third, "pediatrician," and one-third, "baby-doctor."

Results and Discussion

Means were calculated for the CAR, WE, and status dimensions for each occupation, as shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2

Means of the CAR, WE and Status Ratings of the Occupations in the Booklets

<u>Booklet A</u>	WE ^a Mean SD	CAR ^b Mean SD	STATUS ^c Mean SD	
Therapist	5.14 .82	3.28 .51	5.51 1.50	
College Professor	4.38 .62	3.13 .63	5.80 1.32	
Chemist	3.97 .81	3.14 .58	5.80 1.01	
Dentist	4.73 .66	3.11 .53	6.42 .73	n=45
<u>Booklet B</u>	WE ^a Mean SD	CAR ^b Mean SD	STATUS ^c Mean SD	
Lawyer	4.71 .65	2.78 .63	6.33 .83	
Executive	4.37 .54	2.87 .66	6.08 1.14	
Psychologist	4.74 .62	3.34 .56	5.56 1.07	
Doctor	4.93 .69	3.10 1.07	6.34 .95	n=61

^a 1 refers to the "masculine," and 7 the "feminine" pole of the dimension. Therefore, a higher number (more WE) is a more feminine rating.

^b 1 refers to the "masculine," and 7 the "feminine" pole of the dimension. Therefore, a lower number means an occupation has more (masculine) CAR

^c In this scale 1 refers to lower status and 7 to higher status.

Hypothesis one predicts the direction and the similarity in ratings of the various high status occupations on the CAR and status scales. Generally, the hypothesis is confirmed. The direction of the ratings are on the masculine side of the CAR dimension and high on the status scale. Comparisons of similarity and differences in ratings of the occupations are possible only within specific booklets, since a different group of Ss rated each booklet.

The ratings of the occupations within Booklet A confirms the similarity in CAR traits suggested by hypothesis one. A one-way analysis of variance on repeated measures ($F(3,132)=1.40, p>.05$) reveals no significant differences in ratings of the CAR dimension. The similarity on the status scale is apparent, but more variable. There is a significant effect, $F(3,132)=6.55, p<.01$. T-tests reveal that all the means are similar to each other except for "dentist," which is higher on status than all the other occupations.

The results of the ratings of occupations within booklet B are slightly more complicated, both because several "doctor" categories were used, and because of an artifact of the experiment (to be explained shortly). The direction of ratings on the CAR and status dimensions are as predicted in hypothesis one. All the occupations are rated as masculine in CAR and high on status (see Table 2). One-way analyses of variance, using the mean of the doctor categories¹ reveal significant F's in the status ($F(3,180)=11.08, p<.01$, and CAR ($F(3,180)=17.54, p<.01$) dimensions. T-tests reveal that psychologists are rated as less masculine

¹ Separate analyses of variance were also computed for 1/3 of the Ss, corresponding to each separate "doctor" category rated. However, since t-tests reveal that there are no significant differences in CAR and status ratings between the different physician categories, the combined category is discussed for hypothesis one, for simplification.

in CAR and status than all the other professions.

An artifact of the experiment becomes apparent when the ratings on the status dimension are looked at in conjunction with the results of the CAR dimension. Psychologists are rated as having less status than doctors, executives and lawyers, all of whom are equal in status. They are also, as stated above, rated lower on CAR than these other occupations, even though they have been rated as among the others in a listing of prestigious occupations (Hodge et al., 1964). . . What may have occurred was that the Ss in this study were reacting to the fact that they were all psychology students who were participating in research in psychology as part of their course requirement. As a reaction, in some cases a "grudging" reaction, to their participation, they rated psychologists as lower in CAR and status than the other occupations.

Aside from this artifact, however, booklet B generally confirms hypothesis one in the similarity of ratings. Discounting psychologists, all the occupations are similar in status, and executive and lawyer are similar in CAR. The combined "physician" category was rated as less CAR than executives and lawyers.¹

¹ When analyses of variance were computed for 1/3 of the Ss receiving booklet A so that each S responded to only one of the "doctor" cues as well as the other three occupations, there were significant F scores on the CAR dimension for each separate "doctor" group. T-tests revealed that this was due to the discredited "psychology" category only in the booklets with "physician" and "pediatrician." The booklets with "baby doctor" did show that "baby doctor" was rated as less CAR than the other occupations within the same booklet. An analysis of the means of the occupation within these separate booklets reveals that this is not due to a lesser CAR rating of "baby doctor" (it is almost identical with "pediatrician" and not significantly different than "physician"), but that somehow the occupations in the book with baby doctor were rated as somewhat higher than these same occupations in other booklets. This reaction to baby doctor probably accounts for the lesser CAR ratings of the combined doctor cue.

Hypothesis two predicts that it is possible to find two high status, or prestigious, occupations which are similar in CAR and status, and dissimilar in WE such that one of them has more WE than most high status occupations. A one-way analysis of variance on occupations listed in Booklet A reveals that the occupations do indeed differ in WE, $F(3,132)=21.39$, $p < .01$. T-tests indicate that "therapist" is greater in WE than "college professor," "chemist" and "dentist." (They also reveal that "college professor" is rated as more WE than "chemist" and "dentist," and that dentists are rated as more WE than chemists.) An analysis of the means of all of these occupations on the various dimensions (see Table 2) led to the choice of chemists and therapists as the two high status occupations that are similar in CAR and status ratings, but which are dissimilar in WE (the t-value between "chemist" and "therapist" on the WE dimension is 5.70 (d.f. = 44; $p < .01$)). Therapists are rated as having more WE than chemists and other occupations with similar status.

Hypothesis three predicts a difference between the different doctor categories; specifically, it states that the same occupation, progressively worded so that it has more "womanly" associations, should be rated as higher in WE and therefore lower in status and more feminine (that is, a higher numerical rating) in CAR. T-tests were calculated for the "physician," "pediatrician" and "baby doctor" cues on the CAR, WE and status dimensions. The results show that although the means of the WE dimension do tend to increase in the expected direction (see Table 3), the only significant differences in WE were between "physician" and "baby doctor" ($t=2.01$; $df=39$; $p < .05$)¹, with "baby doctor" rated as more WE. There are no significant differences between the CAR and status

¹ A one-tailed test of significance was used.

dimensions of any of these doctor categories. Therefore, differences in WE ratings do not affect CAR and status ratings of the occupations which differ in WE. Hypothesis three is rejected.

TABLE 3

Mean Ratings of the Different Doctor Categories on CAR, WE, and STATUS

	Physician		Pediatrician		Baby Doctor	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
WE ^a	4.74	.59	4.97	.82	5.12	.63
CAR ^b	3.02	.68	3.15	.66	3.16	.59
STATUS ^c	6.57	.79	6.25	1.17	6.17	.86
	n=23		n=20		n=18	

^a One refers to the "masculine," and 7 the "feminine" pole of the dimension, so a higher number (more WE) is a more feminine rating.

^b One refers to the "masculine," and 7 to the "feminine" pole, so a lower number means a more (masculine) CAR rating.

^c In this scale, 1 refers to a lower status and 7 to higher status.

STUDY TWO

Methods

This study compared perceptions of neutral men and women with perceptions of men and women in a high status occupation with male-valued (CAR) traits. This was, in essence, a replication of the Juran (1976) study with the cue changed to a high status occupation in a professional setting, as opposed to an academic setting with a student achieving high status. For women cue characters, the "anomaly" consists of occupying a high status job which emphasized traditional male values. The present study introduced a "warmth" dimension to the cue: cue characters who occupy a high status job with both male-valued and female-valued (WE) traits was an additional experimental manipulation. Theoretically, this might weaken the perceived anomaly of high status women.

Hypotheses

1. Neutral males, compared to neutral females, will be rated differently on the CAR, WE and TMF dimensions, as well as on the individual competence, status and MF scales. Neutral males will be seen as of higher status, more masculine and more CAR than neutral females.
2. "Status," defined by job title, will differentially affect ratings of men and women. An interaction is predicted between the neutral and high job status (male-valued only) condition. Males and females will be seen as significantly different in the neutral situation, but will be rated similarly in the high job status condition on the CAR, WE and TMF measures.
3. Male and female Ss will respond differently to a neutral female

stimulus cue. Women will see her as more WE than will men.

Questions

1. What are the differences between the responses to high status men and women on the other scales?
2. Looking specifically at high status women, how do they compare with stereotypes of neutral men and women on the CAR and WE dimensions? Are they viewed primarily as: women - high WE and low CAR; men - high CAR and low WE; androgenous - high CAR and high WE; moderate - between men and women on CAR and WE.

Procedure

Eighty-two males and 148 females participated in this study. Ss were presented with a written statement at the top of a page. This consisted of either 1- Sheila (Mark) is sitting on a chair. 2- Sheila (Mark) Smith is a chemist. or 3- Sheila (Mark) Smith is a therapist. The cue with a person sitting on a chair was the neutral condition, and represented men and women in general. Chemist and therapist were the high status occupations chosen from study 1. They were occupations which were rated similarly on CAR and status, and which differed on the WE dimension; therapists were rated as warmer than chemists. "Neutral," "chemist" and "therapist" were the occupational conditions.

Each S received one of the six cues. The next page asked the S to please describe Sheila, or Mark, Smith, with instructions similar to those used in Study 1. Rating scales (Table 1) then followed, upon which Ss rated the cue character.

Statistics

A two (Mark/Sheila) by three (occupational condition) by two (sex of S) analysis of variance was performed on the CAR, WE, TMF,

potency, sexuality and evaluative dimensions, as well as on the status and competency scales. The post hoc test used for comparisons was the LSD range test from the SPSS program library (Nie, 1975).

Results

A review of the analyses of variance for every dependent measure reveals that there are no main effects for Mark/Sheila on any dependent measure except for MF. As expected, Mark is rated as more masculine than Sheila.

There are consistent main effects for occupational conditions. These exist for every dependent variable except for MF. A summary of the main effects and interactions for each measure is presented below. For convenience, each dependent measure is listed separately, followed by a corresponding table (Tables 4 through 12) which lists the means and number of Ss rating Mark and Sheila by occupational condition, and by sex of S, for that measure. When no main effects or interactions exist for a factor, the tables are combined over that factor.

CAR

There is a main effect for occupation, $F(2,218)=58.15$, $p<.001$. Neutral persons are rated as less masculine on CAR traits than are chemists or therapists (who do not significantly differ from each other.¹ (see Table 4). There is also a main effect for sex of S ($F(1,218)=10.65$, $p<.01$): female Ss rate stimulus cue characters as more masculine on CAR than do males. (This is due largely to females' more masculine CAR ratings of Mark chemist and Mark therapist.)

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, when a difference is declared significant it is at the .05 level.

A significant occupation x Mark/Sheila interaction exists, $F(2,218)=3.15$, $p<.05$. While chemists and therapists are not different overall, "Sheila chemists" are more masculine in CAR traits than are "Sheila therapists."

TABLE 4
Mean Values of Competence, Assertion, Rationality (CAR)
by Mark/Sheila, Occupational Condition, and Sex of S¹

		Cue Person					
		Mark			Sheila		
		Male	Female	Combined	Male	Female	Combined
Occupational Condition	Neutral	4.06	4.10	4.09	4.41	4.26	4.33
		(12) ^b	(28)	(40)	(17)	(21)	(38)
	Chemist	3.63	3.06	3.27	3.07	2.97	3.00
		(14)	(23)	(37)	(11)	(27)	(39)
	Therapist	3.05	2.93	3.18	3.59	3.23	3.34
		(16)	(20)	(36)	(12)	(29)	(41)

^a One refers to the "masculine," and seven to the "feminine" pole of a measure. Therefore, lower numbers mean more CAR than higher numbers.

^b Numbers in parentheses refer to the n in each condition.

WE

There is a main effect for occupation, $F(2,218)=16.14$, $p<.001$. Therapists are rated as more WE than neutrals and chemists, who do not significantly differ from each other (see Table 5). A significant

interaction exists between sex of S and Mark/Sheila, $F(1,218)=5.31$, $p<.05$. While Mark/Sheila chemists and neutrals were rated similarly by male and female Ss, therapists are rated differently by the sexes. Males see male therapists as less warm than do females.

TABLE 5
Mean Values of Warmth/Expressiveness (WE)
by Mark/Sheila, Occupational Condition, and Sex of S^a

		Cue Person					
		Mark			Sheila		
		Male	Female	Combined	Male	Female	Combined
Occupational Condition	Neutral	4.24	4.37	4.33	4.61	4.64	4.63
		(12) ^b	(28)	(40)	(17)	(21)	(39)
	Chemist	4.17	4.18	4.18	4.67	4.23	4.35
		(14)	(23)	(37)	(11)	(27)	(39)
	Therapist	4.50	5.26	4.92	4.95	4.88	4.90
		(16)	(20)	(36)	(12)	(29)	(41)

^a One refers to the "masculine," and seven to the "feminine" pole of a measure. Therefore, higher numbers mean more WE than lower numbers.

^b Numbers in parentheses refer to the n in each condition.

TMF

A breakdown of the main effect for occupation ($F(2,218)=55.08$, $p<.001$.) reveals that chemists, therapists and neutrals are more masculine in TMF traits, in that order (see Table 6). Females rate people as more masculine on this trait than do males, $F(1,218)=8.62$, $p<.01$.

TABLE 6

Mean Values of the Total Stereotypic List (TMF)
by Males/Females and Occupational Condition^a

		Sex of S	
		Males	Females
Occupational Condition	Neutral	4.32 (29) ^b	4.25 (49)
	Chemist	3.64 (25)	3.33 (50)
	Therapist	3.85 (28)	3.62 (49)

^a One refers to the "masculine," and seven the "feminine" pole of a measure.

^b Numbers in parentheses refer to the n in each condition.

Status

The occupational effect was significant, $F(2,218)=27.70$, $p < .001$. Chemists have more status than therapists, who have more status than neutrals (see Table 7). This is surprising, since Study One defined therapists and chemists as equal in status.

TABLE 7
Mean Values of STATUS by Mark/Sheila
and Occupational Condition^a

	Cue Person	
	Mark	Sheila
Neutral	3.28 (40) ^b	3.79 (38)
Chemist	1.89 (37)	2.00 (38)
Therapist	2.39 (36)	2.59 (41)

^a One refers to the "masculine," and seven, the "feminine" pole of a measure. Therefore, lower numbers mean more status than higher numbers.

^b Numbers in parentheses refer to the n in each condition.

Potency

There was a main effect for occupation, $F(2,218)=21.53, p<.001$. Neutrals are less potent than either chemists or therapists, (who do not differ from each other) (see Table 8). There is also a main effect for sex of S ($F(1,218)=6.80, p<.01$); females see people as more potent than do males.

A significant interaction exists between Mark/Sheila and occupational condition, $F(2,218)=4.43, p<.05$. Neutral Mark is rated as more potent than neutral Sheila, but Sheila chemists are rated as more potent than Mark chemists. Sheila and Mark therapists are rated similarly.

TABLE 8

Mean Values of POTENCY by Mark/Sheila,
Occupational Condition, and Sex of S^a

		Cue Person						
		Mark			Sheila			
Occupational Condition		Males	Females	Combined	Males	Females	Combined	
	Neutral		3.81	3.93	3.89	4.49	4.41	4.45
			(12) ^b	(28)	(40)	(17)	(21)	(38)
	Chemist		3.81	3.29	3.49	3.45	2.77	2.96
		(14)	(23)	(37)	(11)	(27)	(39)	
Therapist		3.29	2.80	3.02	3.58	3.06	3.21	
		(16)	(20)	(36)	(12)	(29)	(41)	

^a One refers to the "masculine," and seven, the "feminine" pole of a measure. Therefore, lower numbers mean more potency than higher numbers.

^b Numbers in parentheses refer to the n in each condition.

Competency

A breakdown of the main effect for occupation ($F(2,218)=20.32$, $p<.001$.) showed that chemists are rated as most competent, followed by therapists and neutrals, in that order (see Table 9). Neutral males tend to be rated as more competent than their female counterparts, but not significantly so. A significant condition x sex of S interaction does exist, however, $F(2,218)=4.34$, $p<.05$). While male and female Ss generally rate people similarly, females rate chemists as more competent than do males.

TABLE 9

Mean Values of COMPETENCY by
Males/Females and Occupational Condition^a

	Sex of S	
	Males	Females
Neutral	2.97 (29) ^b	3.49 (49)
Chemist	2.44 (25)	1.76 (50)
Therapist	2.71 (28)	2.33 (49)

^a One refers to the "masculine," and seven to the "feminine" pole of a measure. Therefore, lower numbers mean more competency than higher numbers.

^b Numbers in parentheses refer to the n in each condition.

Sexuality

There is only a main effect for occupation, $F(2,218)=4.18$, $p<.01$. Therapists are seen as more sexual than either neutrals or chemists, who do not significantly differ from each other (see Table 10).

TABLE 10

Mean Values of SEXUALITY by
Mark/Sheila and Occupational Condition^a

		Cue Person	
		Mark	Sheila
Occupational Condition	Neutral	3.88 (40) ^b	3.83 (38)
	Chemist	3.38 (37)	3.71 (38)
	Therapist	4.24 (36)	4.01 (41)

^a One refers to the "masculine," and seven to the "feminine" pole of a measure. Therefore, higher numbers mean more sexuality than lower numbers.

^b Numbers in parentheses refer to the n in each condition.

Evaluative

A main effect exists for occupation, $F(2,218)=19.09$, $p < .001$. Therapists are evaluated the highest, then neutrals, and then chemists (see Table 11).

TABLE 11
Mean Values of EVALUATION
by Mark/Sheila and Occupational Condition^a

	Cue Person	
	Mark	Sheila
Neutral	4.21 (40) ^b	4.69 (38)
Chemist	3.85 (37)	4.24 (38)
Therapist	5.26 (36)	5.20 (41)

^a One refers to the "masculine," and seven the "feminine" pole of a measure. Higher numbers, therefore, mean a more positive (higher) evaluation than do lower numbers.

^b Numbers in parentheses refer to the n in each condition.

MF

Here, there is no main effect for condition (see Table 12). This is also the only dependent measure in which Mark/Sheila show a main effect, $F(1,218)=76.95$, $p<.001$. As expected (by definition of his name), Mark is rated as more masculine than Sheila. There is also a main effect for sex of S, $F(1,218)=6.60$, $p<.05$. Females rate people as more masculine than do males.

TABLE 12

Comparisons of High Status Persons with Assistants
Across Conditions^a

	Mark	Sheila
Sex of S		
Male	3.50	5.09
	(42) ^b	(40)
Female	3.07	4.57
	(71)	(77)

^a One refers to the "masculine" and seven, the "feminine" pole of a measure.

^b Numbers in parentheses refer to the n in each condition.

Results pertaining to the specific hypotheses and questions of this study follow.

Hypotheses

1. Hypothesis one predicted that neutral Mark would be rated as more masculine on the CAR, WE TMF, competence, status and MF scales, that is, he would have a lower (more masculine) rating than a neutral Sheila.

The results of the study revealed, however, that neutral males and females do not differ significantly on any of these measures except the MF scale (as expected) and the potency dimension. Neutral Mark is rated as more potent than neutral Sheila. There was a trend for all of the other measures, except for TMF, to differ in the hypothesized direction.

2. Hypothesis two predicted that there would be an interaction between Mark and Sheila in the neutral and chemist condition on the CAR, WE, and TMF measures.

These hypothesized interactions could not take place because of the lack of a significant difference between Mark and Sheila in the neutral condition (see hypothesis one). However, Sheila and Mark do not differ on CAR, WE, or TMF in the chemist condition; this was the essence of hypothesis two, and this was confirmed. There is even a trend for female chemists to be seen as more masculine than male chemists in CAR traits.

3. Hypothesis three suggested that female Ss would rate a neutral Sheila as more WE than would male Ss.

Contrary to this hypothesis, the results reveal that male and female Ss rate neutral Sheila similarly on WE.

Questions

1. Question one asks about the differences between the responses to high status men and women on the other scales.

This study found that female chemists are seen as more potent¹ than male chemists. This is especially interesting since neutral women are rated as less potent than neutral men. Except for the MF scale (on which Mark is rated as more masculine than Sheila), there are no other significant differences between Mark and Sheila chemists, nor are there significant differences between Mark and Sheila therapists. That is, status and competency scales did not differentiate between them. Neither did the sexuality² or the evaluative³ dimensions.

2. Question two asks whether CAR and WE ratings of high status women are more similar to neutral men, neutral women, or some combination of each.

The surprising results of this study, however, are that neutral Mark and Sheila do not significantly differ on the CAR and WE dimensions. Results specifically pertaining to this hypothesis reveal that female chemists do not differ from neutral males or neutral females on the WE dimension. They are seen as much more CAR than both neutral Mark and neutral Sheila.

Female therapists are rated as more CAR than neutral Mark or Sheila, and as more WE than neutral Mark (although not significantly more WE than neutral Sheila).

¹ "Potency" is defined as the mean of ratings on: strong---weak, influential---influenced, dominant---submissive.

² "sexuality" is defined as the mean of ratings on: very unexciting---very arousing, not at all seductive---very seductive, not at all sexy---very sexy, very ugly---very attractive.

³ "evaluative" is defined as the mean of ratings on: unpleasant---pleasant, distant---friendly, cold---warm.

In addition to answering the hypotheses and questions pertaining to this study, certain scales were correlated with the CAR and WE dimensions, as a check on their meanings. The correlation of WE with: "sensitivity" is .62, $p < .001$; "warm" is .68, $p < .001$; and the evaluative dimension is .54, $p < .001$. The correlation of CAR with the competency scale is .64, $p < .001$. The n was 232 in all of these cases.

Discussion

This study reveals that men and women, in general, are perceived as much more alike than different. This occurs when they are just defined by gender (the neutral situation), as well as when they are defined by both job status and gender.

The similarities in perceptions of neutral men and women are indeed surprising. A scale of stereotyped traits developed by questioning college Ss in 1967 (Rosenkrantz et al., 1968) and capable of differentiating neutral men and women in research conducted by the present author in 1975, (Juran, 1976), no longer significantly differentiates them. This is a very strong indication that stereotyped ideas about men and women are diminishing. Perceptions about neutral men and women tend to vary in the old stereotyped direction, but male/female traits are no longer viewed as opposites of each other. It appears that our present college population is tending to view people through a more androgynous perspective than ever before. These Ss were debriefed after completing the booklets; few of them expressed any awareness about the intent of the study or the meaning of the scales. It seems unlikely that a concern with rating women and men in a socially desirable manner would account for the results.

High status men and women are also seen quite similarly.

When occupational status and gender are considered together, one deals with the concepts, not only of stereotypes, but of gender-role associations and anomalies. High status women are considered to be in an anomalous situation, a gender associated with low status in a high status position. Yet, detailed analyses of men and women in comparable high status job positions reveal that, overwhelmingly, these women are perceived as similar to the men. Except for a masculinity/femininity scale, on which they are expected to differ, men and women therapists are rated similarly on all other measures. Male and female chemists differ on only one additional measure - potency.

The potency dimension reveals more differences than any of the other measures in this study. Why? It appears that potency is the one dimension that stereotypically differentiates neutral men and women. Males are still seen as the more potent (strong, influential, dominant) gender, even as other stereotypic attributions are eroding. Part of their potency derives from their gender-role associations as "provider," a person with a good job, money and influence. A traditional high status occupation (chemist), therefore, affects the perceived potency of females much more than it affects the perceived potency of males. Women chemists are perceived as very potent individuals. A high status occupation with WE associations still differentially affects the perceived potency of males and females, but less so than a traditional high status occupation. Men and women therapists are seen as equally potent.

CAR (competence, assertion and rationality) and WE (warmth-expressiveness) are the stereotypic male and female domains which were the original focus of this study. Surprisingly, but explainable from an emerging androgynous perspective, these traits do not differentiate

neutral men from neutral women. Neither do they differentiate male/female chemists, or male/female therapists. Therapists are by definition warmer (associated with more female-valued traits, see Study One) than chemists, but this does not affect their CAR ratings. Overall, chemists and therapists are perceived as equal in CAR. Female therapists are rated as less CAR than female chemists, but they are equal to male chemists on this dimension. The difference in CAR ratings of females in these high status job positions seems to be due to the fact that female chemists tend (although not significantly) to be rated as more CAR than male chemists. This seems to be a reaction similar to that which occurred with the potency dimension, that is, women in traditionally male positions are rated as more potent and tend to be rated as more CAR than men in that same position.

Generally, however, male and female chemists and therapists are perceived as very similar. Their occupational status, and not old stereotypes about gender, determine attributions about them. Overall, attributions about high status persons increase in CAR, TMF (total stereotypic scale), status and potency from the neutral to the high status position, as expected.

Women Ss are not more attuned to the WE of neutral women, as hypothesized. They are, however, attuned to the WE of males in a field associated with this dimension; they rate male therapists as more WE than do males. Women seem to be especially aware of this traditionally female trait in a man. Women Ss also consistently rate people as more masculine in CAR, potency and MF than do men. They seem to respond more to these male stereotypic qualities than do men, and to rate people more excessively on them. Perhaps a growing awareness of the sex/status discrepancy that

has been existing for women has sensitized them to these male-valued and status associated dimensions. It is possible that these college women are more overtly aware of an sensitized to both male and female stereotypic dimensions than are college men.

STUDY THREE

Methods

This study was concerned with perceptions about high status women when "strong" status cues, involving occupational definition plus interaction with a subordinate, are involved. It was especially concerned with the high female x low male situation, and hypothesized "denial" or negative responses associated with her status.

In addition, open-ended questions were appended to this study in order to assess Ss feelings about high status women on a different level than is possible with rating scales. This procedure is discussed separately, after the discussion about the first part of this study.

Hypotheses

1. Overall, across conditions, high and low status persons should be rated differently on the status scale and the CAR dimension, with higher status persons rated as higher on these measures.
2. In the high male x low female condition, which is the prototype of the "typical" situation, there will be a difference in perceived status, masculinity and CAR ratings of the persons in the cue; the male will be rated as higher in status, more masculine in TMF and more masculine in CAR.
3. The high female x low male condition is a situation with two anomalous cues; the woman is both high status and has a higher relative status than her male subordinate. Any negative affect associated with the cue should show up in the results. The cue may be overtly denied (i.e., the woman would be rated as not higher in status or more CAR than the male). Since the status difference is explicitly stated, however, a more indirect indication of a negative reaction to the woman's status is likely to occur. This could consist of a devaluation of her male subordinate; he would be

rated as less masculine (less CAR and more WE) than an assistant to a high status male. In other words, a male subordinate to a woman should be rated as more feminine than other males.

4. Will there be a difference in the ratings of male assistants to high status women in the different occupational conditions? It is predicted that female chemists, since they are a stronger occupational cue, will interact with a more devalued male assistant than will female therapists.

5. High status females will be rated as more potent than high status males.

6. Is there a difference between the two written status cues of studies two and three? It is predicted that there will be differences between having a high job title, and having a high job title plus an assistant.

Questions

1. Overall, how do high status females compare with high status males? Are they similar or different on the CAR, WE and TMF measures, both across conditions and in a similar (assistant sex unspecified) situation?

What are their similarities and differences on the other measures of this study?

2. What are the differences between male and female Ss?

Procedure

There were 203 females and 113 males who participated in this study. The cues given to the Ss were: Sheila (Mark) Smith is a chemist who is talking to her (his) assistant about some work; Sheila (Mark) Smith is a chemist who is talking to Judy, her (his) assistant, about some work; Sheila (Mark) Smith is a chemist who is talking to Tom, her (his) assistant, about some work. Additionally, Ss were given the cues: Sheila (Mark) Smith is a therapist who is talking to Tom, her (his)

assistant about some work.

Each S received only one cue, and was asked to rate first one person, and then the other person in the cue, in a counterbalanced order. Instructions were similar to those used in the other studies. Individual lists of bi-polar traits followed underneath the name of the cue character being rated.

Measures

Since "competency" correlated highly with CAR, only CAR was used in this study. "Sexuality" and "Evaluation" were not used either, since they gave little information in Study Two, and were not related to the specific hypotheses under investigation. The dependent measures calculated for this study were, therefore, CAR, WE, TMF, status, potency and MF.

Statistics

T-tests for dependent means were calculated for within condition comparisons pertaining to hypotheses 1, 2, and part of 3 (Table 15). A series of planned comparisons between specific conditions were used to analyze the remaining data, except for hypothesis 6. Here, analyses of variance were computed (explained under Results), with the LSD range test from the SPSS program library (Nie, 1975) used for post hoc comparisons.

Results

Hypotheses

1. This hypothesis tested the validity of the status scale and the CAR dimension. Across conditions, higher status persons are rated higher than their assistants on the status scale and the CAR dimension (see Table 13) confirming the hypothesis.

TABLE 13

Comparisons of High Status Persons with Assistants,
Across Conditions^a

<u>Variable</u>	<u>High Status</u>		<u>Assistant</u>		<u>t</u>
	<u>\bar{x}</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>\bar{x}</u>	<u>SD</u>	
CAR	3.03	.69	3.63	.74	10.55*
STATUS	1.92	1.28	3.13	1.55	12.51*
					n=316
					df=315

^a Lower numbers refer to the more "masculine" pole

* $p < .01$

2. Ratings of males and females in a traditional role situation (high male x low female) were compared. As predicted, the high status males are rated as more masculine in CAR, WE, TMF, and status than their female assistants (see Table 14).

TABLE 14

Differences Between High Status Males and their Female Assistants^a

Variable	High Status Male		Female Assistant		t
	\bar{x}	SD	\bar{x}	SD	
CAR	3.09	.60	3.52	.65	3.64**
STATUS	2.30	1.56	2.76	1.38	2.44*
TMF	3.42	.44	3.79	.50	3.50**
MF	3.43	1.37	5.03	1.36	4.74**
					n=37
					df=36

^a Lower numbers refer to the more "masculine" pole

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

3. Negative affect was predicted to show up on the strongly anomalous high female x low male condition, in which a woman has both high status and a male assistant. Hypothesized results of this negative affect were 1- Overt denial of the woman's status, with no difference in status and CAR ratings between the high status woman and her male assistant. (This was considered unlikely since the status difference was indeed spelled out), or 2- Indirect indications of a negative reaction to the woman's status; that is, devaluation of her male assistant. He would be rated as less masculine (that is, higher on CAR, WE, TMF and MF) than an assistant

to a high status male.

Neither the hypothesized "denial" nor the indirect negative affect response shows up in the results. High status women are rated as more masculine in CAR and status than their male assistant. They even retain their female valued characteristics, and are rated as higher in WE than their assistants (see Table 15).

TABLE 15

Differences between High Status Females and their Male Assistants
(combined on all HFxLM conditions)

Variable	High Status Female		Male Assistant		t	
	\bar{x}	SD	\bar{x}	SD		
CAR	3.15	.73	3.63	.77	3.74**	
WE	4.71	.69	4.34	.70	3.44**	
TMF	3.56	.59	3.82	.61	2.40*	
STATUS	2.10	1.48	3.53	1.66	6.39**	n=83
						df=82

^a Lower numbers refer to the more "masculine" pole

* p < .05

** p < .01

The indirect negative response to this situation is not apparent, as defined, either. Male assistants to women are not rated as more feminine than male assistants to men (see Table 16-A). The CAR, WE, TMF, MF, potency and status ratings of the male assistants in these two conditions show no significant differences.

The comparison of the high male x low female and high female x low male conditions does reveal certain significant differences

and trends, however, the results are not quite parallel.

Women therapists with male assistants are rated as significantly less masculine in the CAR dimension than comparable male therapists (see Table 16-B). This causes a significant difference, in the same direction, in their TMF ratings, also. Women are also rated as less potent than comparable male therapists. The male assistants to women therapists tend to be seen as less WE than male assistants to comparable males (see Table 16-A). Male assistants to women chemists are rated variably. They tend to be seen as less WE and more masculine in MF than male assistants to male chemists; however, they also tend to be seen as having less status.

TABLE 16

Differences Between the High Male x Low Male and High Female x Low Male
Conditions (Test of Indirect Denial)^a

A) Differences between the Male Assistant to Mark
and Male Assistant to Sheila Conditions

VARIABLE	MALE ASSISTANT TO CHEMIST			MALE ASSISTANT TO THERAPIST		
	\bar{x} Mark	\bar{x} Sheila	t	\bar{x} Mark	\bar{x} Sheila	t
CAR	3.70	3.62	.56	3.56	3.65	.75
WE	4.64	4.31	1.79	4.61	4.37	1.77
STAT	3.34	3.84	1.59	2.93	3.27	.77
MF	3.24	2.76	1.53	3.20	3.13	.01
TMF	3.95	3.80	1.07	3.84	3.83	.24
POTENT	4.16	3.99	.71	3.54	3.69	.29

n=316 df=299

B) Differences between Mark and Sheila
(each with Male Assistants)

	CHEMIST			THERAPIST		
	\bar{x} Mark	\bar{x} Sheila	t	\bar{x} Mark	\bar{x} Sheila	t
CAR	2.82	3.06	1.44	3.05	3.23	2.19*
WE	4.49	4.55	1.11	4.69	4.09	.69
STAT	1.71	1.92	.57	1.83	2.24	1.64
MF	2.63	4.76	6.00**	2.83	4.20	6.88*
TMF	3.26	3.45	1.69	3.49	3.66	2.23*
POTENT	2.64	2.87	.56	2.76	3.09	2.20*

^a Lower numbers mean a more "masculine" rating n=316 df=299

* p < .05

** p < .01

4. This hypothesis predicted that there will be differences between the ratings of male assistants to female chemists and male assistants to female therapists; male assistants to female chemists will be more devalued.

There are no differences in the CAR, WE, or MF ratings of these assistants (see Table 17). However, male assistants to female chemists are rated as having lower status (a higher numerical rating) than male assistants to female therapists (see Table 17). Since female therapists and chemists do not differ significantly in status ($t=1.39$; $df=299$; $p<.05$), this is an indication that men are devalued more when working for a female chemist, than a female therapist.

TABLE 17

Comparison of Ratings of Male Assistants to Female Chemists and Male Assistants to Female Therapists^a

	<u>CAR</u>	<u>WE</u>	<u>TMF</u>	<u>MF</u>	<u>STATUS</u>	<u>POTENCY</u>
Male Assistant to Female Chemist	3.62	4.31	3.80	2.76	3.84	3.99
Male Assistant to Female Therapist	3.64	4.37	3.83	3.13	3.26	3.69
<u>t</u>	.15	.22	.07	1.38	2.16*	1.38
						n=316
						df=299

^a Lower numbers refer to a more "masculine" rating

^b $p<.05$

5. This hypothesis predicted that high status females would be perceived as more potent than high status males. The results of the ratings of the potency dimension (see Tables 18 and 19) cause this hypothesis to be rejected.

Why are female chemists rated as more potent than male chemists in Study Two, when they have only a job title, and not in Study Three, where they also have male assistants? The answer to the next hypothesis clarifies this matter.

TABLE 18
Comparison of High Status Females with High Status Males
Across Conditions^a

	<u>CAR</u>	<u>WE</u>	<u>STATUS</u>	<u>MF</u>	<u>TMF</u>	<u>POTENCY</u>
High Status Female	3.08	4.57	1.92	4.90	3.47	2.97
High Status Male	2.99	4.47	1.93	2.96	3.38	2.81
<u>t</u>	1.33	1.19	.20	10.79*	1.62	1.31
					n = 316	
					df = 299	

^a Lower numbers refer to a more "masculine" rating

* $p < .01$

TABLE 19

Comparison of Female Chemists with Male Chemists

When Sex of Assistant is Unspecified^a

	<u>CAR</u>	<u>WE</u>	<u>STATUS</u>	<u>MF</u>	<u>TMF</u>	<u>POTENCY</u>
High Status Female	3.13	4.45	1.78	4.68	3.45	3.07
High Status Male	3.02	4.31	1.92	3.00	3.36	2.68
<u>t</u>	.62	.56	.16	4.96*	.75	1.45

n = 316

df = 299

^a Lower numbers refer to a more "masculine" rating

* p < .01

6. This hypothesis predicts a difference in the perceptions of the high status cue characters in Studies Two and Three. That is, a difference is predicted between Ss perceptions of a person with a high job title, and a person with a high job title plus an assistant.

Responses to the chemist cues in Studies Two and Three were combined, and several 2(sex of S) by 2(Mark/Sheila) by 4(condition of assistant) analyses of variance were computed. The assistant condition consisted of either: 1-male, 2- female, 3- no sex specified, or 4- no assistant mentioned (job title alone, from Study Two). Comparisons were made on the CAR, WE and potency dimensions, as well as on the status scale. The means of the relevant factors are presented in Tables 20 and 21.

The CAR and Status ratings reveal only a significant sex effect similar to that already mentioned: females rate high status persons as more masculine in CAR ($F(1,288)=7.73$; $p<.01$) and status ($F(1,288)=16.81$; $p<.001$) than do males. There is a similar sex effect for the potency

dimension $F(1,288)=9.63$; $p<.01$), which also reveals a main effect for assistant ($F(3,288)=2.90$; $p<.05$); persons with male assistants and with assistants of unspecified sex are more potent than persons with job titles alone. There are no main effects for WE. The most interesting and relevant results are in the interactions of the Potency and the WE dimensions.

"Potency" shows a double interaction between Mark/Sheila and assistant, ($F(3,288)=3.26$; $p<.05$). Sheila, who is very potent with just the title "chemist," (significantly more so than Mark) does not change in potency ratings with the addition of any type of assistant. Mark, however, is perceived as significantly more potent with the addition of any type of assistant. He is rated as especially potent with the addition of a male assistant. Mark and Sheila within comparable assistant conditions of Study Three are perceived similarly (see Table 20).

TABLE 20

Mean Potency Ratings of Mark/Sheila
Chemists by Type of Assistant^a

		Cue Person	
		Mark	Sheila
Type of Assistant	Male	2.64 (41) ^b	2.87 (38)
	Female	3.20 (37)	2.85 (39)
	No Sex Specified	2.68 (37)	3.07 (37)
	No Assistant (Job Title alone, Study 2)	3.49 (37)	2.97 (38)

^a 1 refers to the "masculine," and 7, the "feminine" pole of a measure. Therefore, lower numbers mean more potency than higher numbers.

^b Numbers in parentheses refer to the n in each condition.

There is a significant triple interaction on WE ($F(3,288) = 3.10$; $p < .05$). WE ratings of Mark do not change much across conditions. WE ratings of Sheila show significant changes when rated by male, but not female, Ss (see Table 21).

Males perceive a woman chemist, without any assistant mentioned, as significantly warmer than a woman chemist with a female assistant. This is the only significant difference between the job title condition of Study Two and the title plus assistant conditions of Study Three. Female Ss tend to rate these situations oppositely to male Ss; females tend to see a woman chemist with a female assistant as warmer than a woman chemist alone, although this doesn't quite reach significance.

Looking within assistant conditions, men perceive a female chemist with a male assistant as warmer than a male chemist with a male assistant. Women don't see this male/female mix as causing any difference in WE.

TABLE 21

Mean Warmth/Expressive (WE) Ratings of Mark/Sheila
Chemists by Type of Assistant and Sex of S^a

		Cue Person			
		Mark		Sheila	
		Male	Female	Male	Female
Type of Assistant	Male	4.44 (15) ^b	4.51 (26)	4.94 (12)	4.38 (26)
	Female	4.27 (16)	4.41 (21)	4.09 (15)	4.60 (24)
	No Sex Specified	4.45 (15)	4.21 (22)	4.36 (12)	4.49 (25)
	No Assistant (Job title alone, Study 2)	4.17 (14)	4.18 (23)	4.67 (11)	4.23 (27)

^a 1 refers to the "masculine," and 7, the "feminine" pole of a measure. Therefore, higher numbers mean more WE than lower numbers.

^b Numbers in parentheses refer to the n in each condition.

Questions

1. Here, comparisons were made between high status men and high status women both across conditions, and within a comparable (chemist, unspecified sex of assistant) condition, on a variety of dimensions. The results are in Tables 18 and 19, respectively. Both tables reveal that high status men and women are rated similarly on all measures, except for MF, which differs in the expected direction.
2. Comparison of responses of male and female Ss, across conditions (see Table 22) reveal that females see high status persons as having more masculine CAR, status, TMF, and as being more potent than do males. Females also see assistants as having more status than do males.

TABLE 22

Mean Differences Between Cue Ratings of Male and Female Ss, Across Conditions^a
Stimulus Cue

	<u>High Status Person</u>			<u>Assistant</u>			
	M	F	t	M	F	t	
CAR	3.17	2.96	2.92**	3.71	3.60	1.40	
WE	4.48	4.54	.36	4.46	4.50	.60	
STATUS	2.32	1.70	4.24**	3.59	2.89	4.36**	
MF	4.01	3.90	1.40	3.71	3.70	.46	
TMF	3.52	3.38	2.53*	3.91	3.83	1.13	
POTENCY	3.11	2.78	2.69*	3.93	3.82	.87	n = 316
							df = 299

^a A lower number refers to a more "masculine" rating

* p < .05

** p < .01

Discussion

High status men and women, with assistants, are perceived as very similar to each other. Overall, they are rated similarly on all the measures of this study. Consistently, they only differ on the MF scale, which is to be expected, since they are defined with male and female names. This study substantiates what was found in the previous study. With stronger status cues than existed in that study, men and women are still perceived similarly across a variety of conditions.

There were no significant differences in the hypothesized "denial" response. Given strong anomalous cues, a high status job and a male assistant, women are rated as higher in status and as more competent than their assistants. They are even seen as retaining their female-valued traits and are viewed as warmer than their male assistants. Furthermore, male assistants to women are not rated as less masculine than male assistants to males. Male assistants to women even tend to be rated more masculinely on certain dimensions than male assistants to males (although this doesn't reach significance).

The lack of any denial response, as it was originally hypothesized, is surprising. It indicates (as does Study Two) that job stereotypes overwhelm any stereotypes that still adhere to gender - and which appear to be eroding. In a job situation with interpersonal status differences which could stereotypically be considered inconsistent, college Ss do not react very strongly by denying the situation. Presumably, the erosion of sex stereotypes (indicated previously in Study Two) has allowed this to occur.

However, this process of eroding sex stereotypes is by no means complete, as an analysis of other comparisons within the high female x low male condition indicates. There are some differences in perceptions of high status men and high status women within this condition; this exists for the therapist, but not the chemist, occupation. Women therapists are viewed as less powerful and less competent, assertive and rational than comparable men. While a woman in a traditionally male field is rated similarly to her male counterpart on every measure, a woman in a field with "womanly" or sensitive characteristics is seen as having less male-valued (CAR) traits than a man in that field. Since chemist and therapist are occupations which are rated similarly in CAR (Study One) and neutral men and women are rated similarly in CAR, as are male and female therapists defined solely by their occupation (Study Two), this finding is of interest. It indicates that, when male assistants are involved, either women therapists are devalued, or male therapists are overvalued, on this dimension.

An analysis of non-significant trends in the high female x low male condition reveals that gender related stereotypes, while diminishing, still have some force. Even though they tend to be rated quite masculinely on CAR and potency, male assistants to women chemists tend to be perceived as having less status than male assistants to men. While they are not devalued on their personality characteristics, the male assistants to women tend to be perceived as having a less important job than assistants to comparable men.

The above findings indicate that sex stereotypes are diminishing but are by no means dead. Overshadowing any of these trends and the

one significant difference in the high female x low male condition, however, is the fact that most of the comparisons in this hypothesized contradictory situation reveal the similarity in perceptions of the cue persons rated.

Certain other relevant conclusions can be drawn by comparing studies two and three. Differences in potency ratings of high status persons in this and the previous study explain the different routes that lead to perceptions of potency in men and women. Women in a traditionally male field (chemists) are perceived as very powerful individuals; they can barely increase in potency given the additional status cue of assistants. Male chemists become only as potent as their female counterparts when they are given assistants. Male chemists are especially potent when they are given male assistants. While male and female therapists are rated similarly in Study Two, this study reveals that male therapists with male assistants are viewed as more potent than comparable females. It appears that men need traditional male symbols (assistants), while women need only to be in a traditionally male field, to be perceived as very powerful. Furthermore, male assistants have a lower perceived status when they work for a female chemist than when working for a female therapist. Men seem to lose status when they work for a very powerful woman.

Male and female Ss show differences in their perception of the warmth-expressiveness of female chemists across the different assistant conditions of studies two and three. While perceptions of male chemists don't change much across conditions, male, but not female Ss, see a lot of variation in the perceived warmth of female chemists. Male Ss believe that a woman chemist is warmer without any assistant

than with an assistant of her same sex. Women tend to rate this oppositely, and see a woman assistant as increasing (although not quite significantly) the WE rating of female chemists. Clearly, women Ss are more attuned to the positive emotional experience of two women working together than are male Ss, who may be mired in some old competitive stereotypes. Men, and not women, however, perceive a female chemist as quite warm when she has a male assistant.

Perhaps these college sophomores identify with the assistant in the cue and rate the high status woman according to their needs. Both men and women Ss see high status females as very warm when their assistants are the same sex as the Ss who rate them. If this is so, rather than stressing any denial or negative affect, both men and women Ss are reacting to a perceived positive (emotionally warm) quality when faced with the prospect of a woman boss. Whether this is due to personal experience or stereotypes, this is a much more positive perception of high status women than was originally predicted.

Open-Ended Questions

Two open-ended questions were asked of Ss after they rated the cue characters. On the last page of the booklet, Ss were asked: "If you were the assistant mentioned in the cue,

- A. How would you feel about working for the other person,
- B. How would you feel about receiving criticism from that person?"

Spaces, approximately a quarter of a page in length, were left open for the responses to these questions.

A coding category was developed by categorizing a sample of 45 responses to each question. Each question was coded according to a simple "evaluative" (positive, neutral, negative) dimension, as well

as either "yes" or "no" to each category. Two coders, with a reliability index of .82 for 20% of additional coded questions, coded the remaining questions. The response categories and frequencies of responses to those categories are presented in the Appendix - Table B. Responses to these questions were seen as tapping more "covert" reactions to high status women than the rating scales, and could also be used as a check on the findings resulting from these scales.

Results

The evaluative dimension reveals that most Ss are either neutral or positive about working for a boss, and almost three-quarters of the Ss report feeling neutral about receiving criticism from that person (See Appendix Y). There are many coded ambivalent responses to the questions.

A chi-square analysis for each comparison of Mark/Sheila within specific chemist/therapist conditions as rated by male/female Ss, however, proved insignificant for every category except one (see Table 24-C). In most instances, the number of responses within specific categories is small. Even when there is a large frequency of responses within a category, however, people still respond similarly to Sheila and Mark.

Chi-square analyses were then performed on Mark/Sheila across the other factors. There are four significant results. In responses to question A, which asks about feelings about work for Sheila or Mark, more Ss respond with positive personal qualities of the boss are referring

to Sheila, as opposed to Mark (see Table 23). In response to question B, which asked about feelings about receiving criticism from Sheila or Mark, more pronouns denoting gender are used for Mark, than are used for Sheila. This is significant for male Ss alone, but not for female Ss. It is also significant for male Ss in the chemist condition (see Table 24).

TABLE 23

Chi-Square Analysis of Ss Responding to the Postive "Sensitive" Qualities of Sheila and Mark in Response to Question A

	Mark	Sheila	
No Response	145	136	281
Response	11	24	35
	156	160	316

$$\chi^2 = 4.29^*$$

$$df = 1$$

*
p < .05

TABLE 24

Chi-Square Analyses of Responses Specifically Denoting Gender of the
High Status Person in Question B
(Feelings about Receiving Criticism) Under Different Conditions

A - For all Ss

	Mark	Sheila	
No Response	89	119	208
Response	67	41	108
	156	160	316

$\chi^2 = 9.78^{**}$ df = 1

B - For Male and Female Ss Separately

	Males			Females		
	Mark	Sheila		Mark	Sheila	
No Response	30	39	69	59	79	138
Response	31	13	44	36	29	65
	61	52	113	95	108	203

$\chi^2 = 6.82^{**}$ df = 1

$\chi^2 = 2.35$ df = 1

C - For Males in the Chemist Condition

	Mark	Sheila	
No Response	23	29	52
Response	23	10	33
	46	39	85

$\chi^2 = 4.30^*$ df = 1

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Further, responses coded specifically for sex stereotyping are significant in response to a female, as opposed to a male, boss. All responses coded as denying sex stereotyping for the boss were written in response to Sheila, not to Mark. The chi-square analysis of responses denying sex stereotyping for the boss is 6.10 (with 1 d.f. $p < .01$). In the category which specifically denied sex stereotyping for the respondent, a chi-square of 9.05 was computed (with 1 d.f., $p < .01$). All the responses in this category are to the Sheila cue. When these two denial of stereotyping categories, all of which were mentioned in response to Sheila, were combined, the proportion of responses to the therapist and chemist occupations, and by male and female Ss, are similar.

Responses categorized as reacting sensitively to or being hurt by the boss' criticism were also specifically looked at. In the chemist condition, over twice as many of the male Ss who so responded are responding to a male, as opposed to a female, cue. The numbers, however, are too small for this finding to reach significance; there are fifteen responses to a male, and seven responses to a female, boss. The few responses to the therapist cue do not significantly differentiate Mark from Sheila.

Discussion

The lack of a number of significant differences between responses to Mark and Sheila in the categorization of responses to these open-ended questions validates the consistent finding that men and women are perceived as relatively alike both across, and within, particular situations. The significant differences in the categories coded for overt denial of stereotyping is to be expected. People often

deny specific stereotypes, (whether this can be taken at face value, or is indicative of a "denial" type of response), in a situation where they sense a contradiction. In this case, the contradiction is with a woman in only a small minority of the responses, and is not specific to any particular breakdown of variables other than to Mark or Sheila.

The other significant findings can be combined to validate points suggested earlier, in the discussion of the first part of this study. When asked to identify with the assistants mentioned in the cue and to state how they would feel when working for a high status person, more Ss mentioned the positive "sensitive" qualities of a female, as opposed to a male, boss. This validates the previous suggestion that Ss perceive women bosses with subordinates of the same sex as the S as generally warmer and more sensitive than comparable male bosses. Far from showing strong negative reactions to female authorities, Ss either show no reaction, or else they seem to sense that women might indeed be more understanding of them, as bosses, than would men.

When asked about receiving criticism from their bosses, more Ss, especially males, used pronouns denoting gender for male, as opposed to female, bosses. This could be simply explained by stating that people are more used to using male, as opposed to female, pronouns, when talking about bosses, and that men are less likely to be conscious of this, and therefore do it more, than are women. An additional explanation for this result, however, may be that this more frequent use of male pronouns indicates that these Ss are indirectly indicating that they would be hurt more by criticism of a male, as opposed to a female, boss. People tend to dwell on more (as opposed to less) painful experiences. This suggestion is substantiated by the finding that, in the chemist condition, over

twice as many of the male Ss who admitted to being hurt by criticisms were responding to a male, as opposed to a female, cue. Another explanation for this finding, which easily coincides with the above explanations, is that males are responding to a very "powerful" cue (male chemists with male assistants, as defined in the first part of this study). Powerful people are thought about, spoken about, and written about more than are others. Males may use the male pronoun more as an indication of the power, to them, of their boss in this situation.

Summary

In summary, open-ended questions were appended to this study in order to tap Ss feelings about working for and being criticized by male and female bosses. Overall, the responses to these questions indicate that Ss respond similarly to male and female bosses both across and within specific conditions. Far from indicating a strong negative reaction to a female boss, the Ss who respond in terms of "sensitivity" seem to define women bosses as more understanding than comparable men.

STUDY FOUR

Methods

This study is concerned with Ss definitions and perceptions of "high status man" and "high status woman" when "status" is not specifically defined by job title or anything else. The major focus of this study is upon Ss own categorization of what constitutes high status women and men.

Question

1. Are high status men and women rated differently when "status" is undefined?

Hypothesis

1. Are high status men and women categorized differently? It is hypothesized that men will be defined more by their occupation, and women by their mates, when "status" is ambiguously defined.

Procedure

Thirty-six male and thirty-six female college students participated in this study. They were given booklets with the cues "high status woman" and "high status man," (in a counterbalanced order), on the top of two separate pages, with the rating scales containing the 34 stereotypic traits and the status scale below each page. Instructions were similar to those in the previous studies.

On the following page, each S was asked to name three high status women and three high status men (or three high status men and three high status women). Spaces of about a quarter of a page in length were left in the spots where the names were to appear. After naming these six high status persons spontaneously, Ss were asked, on the following page, to go back to the previous page and, underneath the

spot where the high status persons were named, to state why they thought that each person named was a high status individual. Finally, on the last page, Ss were asked to state the occupation of the persons named.

Ss responses about high status persons were categorized in two ways:

1- Persons mentioned by a S were categorized according to their occupations, as the S had written it, and for all responses,

2- High status persons were categorized according to the Ss own definitions of status. A coding category was developed based upon all the responses from 20% of the Ss. All relevant responses were then coded according to that categorization by two coders with a reliability index of .82.

Results and Discussion

Question

1. In order to answer question one, t-tests for dependent means were calculated from the mean CAR, WE and TMF ratings of high status women and high status men. The results show that: 1- High status women are rated as more WE than high status men, 2- High status men are rated as more masculine in CAR than are high status women, and 3- Because of 1 and 2, high status men are rated as more masculine in TMF than are high status women (see Table 25). That is, on every dimension, high status men are rated as significantly more masculine than their female counterparts, when Ss provide their own internal meanings for "status."

TABLE 25
 Mean Values of Ratings of "High Status Woman" and
 "High Status Man" on the CAR, WE and TMF Dimensions,^a
 and t Scores Comparing Them

	High Status Woman		High Status Man		t
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
WE	4.93	.67	4.56	.72	5.48*
CAR	2.94	.71	2.45	.69	5.44*
TMF	3.47	.54	3.01	.49	6.56*

n = 72
df = 71

^a 1 refers to the "masculine," and 7, the "feminine" pole of a measure.

* p < .01

There are two explanations for these results, which are quite different than the results of studies two and three, where occupationally defined high status women and men were rated similarly on these dimensions. The first explanation concerns the fact that in this study, unlike studies two and three, Ss rated both the male and female cues. The only difference between these cues were the words "male" and "female;" this makes sex of the cue S a very salient feature and increases traditional sex stereotyped associations in the ratings.

The second explanation for these results, which in no way precludes the first, is that the meaning of "status," when left to the judgment of the Ss, differs somewhat when the high status individuals are men than when they are women. Concepts of traits associated with

masculinity and with high status are in many ways similar; the more status that a man has, the more he can be defined by the masculine pole of the traits used as a measure in this study. High status women are defined more variably. No one concept or cluster of traits easily defines them when they are not "given" a definition of status such as was done in studies two and three. Since no clear-cut definitions are associated with them, high status women are rated more stereotypically feminine.

A comparison was also made between the mean ratings of responses of male and female Ss to both the high status male and the high status female cues. The only significant differences that were obtained were in response to the female cue. Women see high status females as more masculine in CAR and therefore in TMF than do men (see Table 26). Women, therefore, perceive the status of women more in terms of male-oriented competence associated traits than do men. In both the CAR and TMF measures, male Ss rate women more variably than do female Ss. Men seem to have more difficulty in reaching a consensus in defining high status women in terms of male-valued traits. Male and female Ss do not differ significantly in their ratings of high status men.

TABLE 26

Mean Values of Ratings of Male and Female Ss on the
CAR, WE and TMF Dimensions in Response to Specific
Cues, and t Values Comparing Them^a

Cue:	High Status Woman				t	High Status Man				
	Male S		Female S			Male S		Female S		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
WE	4.92	.72	4.94	.62	.09	4.41	.72	4.73	.70	1.93
CAR	3.12	.81	2.75	.54	2.27*	2.42	.59	2.49	.79	.38
TMF	3.60	.62	3.33	.41	2.16*	2.95	.44	3.08	.54	1.12
					n = 72	df = 70				

^a One refers to the "masculine," and seven the "feminine" pole of a measure.

^b $p < .05$

Hypothesis

Hypothesis one predicted that men and women will be categorized differently. Specifically, it stated that high status men would be defined primarily by their occupations, and that high status women would be defined primarily by their mates, when "status" is undefined. Both systems of categorization, occupational and Ss own definitions, were used. First, Ss were grouped according to broad occupational classifications (see Table 27), and then relevant responses within occupational classifications were coded as to why the S considered that person to be a high status individual (see Table 28).

TABLE 27

Frequencies of Occupations of High Status Women and
High Status Men, by Sex of S

Occupational Classification	High Status Women			High Status Men		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Mate of famous person (wife of politician)	37	18	55	-	--	-
Politicians	30	24	54	65	48	113
Actresses & Actors	16	14	30	10	4	14
Newscasters	8	14	22	1	3	4
Business People		5	5	13	10	23
Sportspersons	2	1	3	9	2	11
Writers, Designers & Others Other "Arts" people (non-acting)	3	3	6	1	2	3
Academics & Educators	3	3	6	1	1	2
Doctors		1	1	1	6	7
Others	7	19	26	6	19	25
	n = 208 ^a			n = 202		

^a Each S was asked to give six responses, 3 for HSM and 3 fore HSW.

Not all Ss could think of six persons, therefore, there are unequal n's

TABLE 28

Frequency Listing of the Categorization of
Why People are Considered to be High Status for the
Four Most Frequently Cited Women

Categorization	High Status Women							
	Barbara Walters		Bella Abzug		Jacqueline Onassis		Rosalyn Carter	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Rich	3	5	1	1	9	3	1	-
Power/Important Job	1	5	1	4	2	1	1	1
Popular/Famous	3	2	7	2	6	3	1	1
Intelligent/Educated	-	5	1	1	1	1	-	-
Helping/Serves Others	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
Courage/Integrity	-	1	3	2	1	-	-	2
Aggressive/Assertive	1	2	2	2	2	-	1	1
Savoir Faire/ Good Personality	1	2	-	-	6	4	-	1
Competent/Excellent	-	3	2	-	-	-	-	-
Royalty/Heritage	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Married to a High Status Person	-	-	-	-	4	3	12	-
Hard Working/Self Made	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
First (Major) Contributor to a Field	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Beauty/Appearance	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-
Woman Doing Well in a Man's Field	-	2	4	3	-	-	-	-

Using occupational classifications, the results show that men are defined totally by their occupations, (none are defined by their mates), and twice as many women are defined by their occupations than by their mates (Table 27). While men's definition of status is totally intertwined with their occupations, as suggested by the hypothesis, women are defined more by their occupations than was originally predicted. A more specific analysis of the results follows.

Using occupational categorizations, the majority of the responses listing high status women fall into the two categories of Politician and Wife of Famous Person (Table 27). Twice as many male Ss list wife of a famous person as high status than do females. Men, it seems, can more easily define the status of women as a function of their husbands than can women. The male/female S ratio listing women in the Politician category is more evenly balanced (5:4). Men and women are fairly even in defining high status women as politicians. Other frequently mentioned occupational categories for high status women are Actress (14.4% of the responses) and Newscaster (10.6% of the responses).

The four most frequently mentioned individual women are: Jacqueline Onassis (22 responses), Bella Abzug (22 responses), Rosalynn Carter (21 responses) and Barbara Walters (20 responses); each one is mentioned by between 30.1% and 27.8% of the Ss (see Table 29). No other specific women are mentioned nearly as frequently. Note, two of these women are known primarily through their husbands, and two through their own occupations.

TABLE 29

Four Most Frequently Mentioned High Status Women
and High Status Men, by Sex of S

High Status Women	Number of Responses		
	M	F	Combined
Jacqueline Onnasis	15	7	22
Bella Abzug	12	10	22
Rosalyn Carter	13	8	21
Barbara Walters	7	13	20
High Status Men	Number of Responses		
Jimmy Carter	23	22	45
Henry Kissinger	6	9	15
Nelson Rockefeller	8	5	13
Abraham Beame	9	2	11
n = 72 Ss (each capable of giving six responses)			

Over twice as many men list Jacqueline Onnasis as high status than do women (15:7), and more men list Rosalynn Carter than do women (13:8). Responses to Bella Abzug are more evenly divided (12 men and 10 women), and almost twice as many women (13) list Barbara Walters than do men (7). A self-made female millionaire is remembered more by women than by men.

High status women are also categorized by Ss own definitions as to "why" these women are considered to be high status individuals. The most frequent reasons the four more frequently mentioned women

are categorized as high status are because they are famous (25 responses), rich (23 responses), the wife of a famous male politician (19 responses), or have power via an important job (16 responses) (see Table 28).

When Ss own definitions of high status women are broken down by sex of S, some interesting differences become apparent. Counting all ten "wives" mentioned, (all of whom are wives of politicians), 21 of the 57, or 36.8% of the male responses listing such women also defined them as high status because they were married to their husbands. Only four of the 28 female responses (or 14.2%) listing a woman who was occupationally defined as a "wife" actually defined that person as a wife. Therefore, even when they mention a wife of a famous person, women are likely to define these people as high status for reasons other than their marriage.

Women Ss categorize high status women much more variably than do men. They have difficulty in agreeing "why" such women have high status. An examination of the four most frequently listed high status women reveals this pattern (see Table 28). Rosalynn Carter is defined by most male respondents as married to a high status person. No women define her according to that categorization, and no two women agree on how to define her. Jacqueline Onassis is defined by most male Ss as a high status person because she is rich. They also agree that she is famous and has a good personality. While many women list Jacqueline Onassis as a high status person, no more than four of them can agree as to why this is so. They see her as having a good personality, rich, famous, or as having been married to a high status person; no one category predominates.

Men agree that Bella Abzug is high status because she is famous or popular. They also perceive her as doing well in man's field. Women define her variably. Most of them (although no more than four) mention the power or importance of her position. Women rate Barbara Walters across ten different categories. However, possibly because more women mention her than any other woman, they are able to reach a consensus as to why she is so defined. They view her as rich, powerful, and intelligent (five responses for each item). Fewer men list her than the other frequently mentioned high status women, and most of them list her as rich and famous.

Even though females define high status women more variably than do males, males still define them variably. The variability in Ss definitions of high status women validates the suggestion made earlier in this study that the lack of a consensus as to the definition of what constitutes a high status woman led subjects to rate them as more stereotypically feminine, compared to high status men, than they were rated in the two previous studies. Men are defined less variably.

High status men are totally categorized by their jobs (Table 27). The occupational category listed most frequently, by far, for such men as that of Politician; this constitutes over half of all the responses. The next most frequently listed occupational category is that of businessperson, which includes over 10% of the responses.

Jimmy Carter is, by far, mentioned most frequently; he is mentioned by two-thirds of the respondents. The next most frequently mentioned high status men are Henry Kissinger, Nelson Rockefeller, and Abe Beame: politicians, all (see Table 29). While businesspeople constitute the second largest occupational category (Table 27) for

high status men, no one businessman is mentioned over four times, (Howard Hughes and J. Paul Getty are mentioned four times each).

The most frequent category that Ss state as defining the four most frequently listed high status individuals are that they have power - granted to them through an important job. This category is mentioned 24 times by males and 18 times by females, for a total of 42 responses. The fact that these men are rich is mentioned 18 times, and their fame is listed 12 times. There seems to be no question for these Ss that the high status of men is dependent upon their power, while the status of women includes a variety of dimensions (see above and Table 28).

Why are high status women defined more variably than are high status men? Probably it is due to the fact that high status women (unlike high status men), have, until recently, been anomalies. The results of this and the two previous studies indicates that this is indeed changing!

Summary

Men and women rate high status men as stereotypically more masculine than high status women when "status" is undefined. This is unlike the similarity in ratings of high status men and women which occurred in the previous studies. Some of the differences in the results between this and the previous two studies may be due to the fact that the Ss in this study (unlike studies two and three) were asked to define both high status males and high status females. In those other studies, Ss responded to only one cue. When sex is obviously spelled out as a difference, Ss probably think more stereotypically. The variability of the meanings of high status women also affects their ratings in a more stereotypic direction.

High status men are defined totally by their jobs; high status women are defined more by their jobs than by their mates. Occupationally, Ss list women politicians as high status as frequently as they list wives of famous men (who are also politicians). Men are more likely than women to list and define wives of high status men as high status because of their marriage. Women tend to define wives of high status men as having status due to factors other than their husbands.

Women rate high status women more variably than do men. Additionally, high status women are rated more variably than are their male counterparts. The power and importance of the job of male politicians are consensually agreed upon reasons that these men are considered to have status; high status women are defined by a variety of categories. This could indicate that a consistent image of a high status woman is yet to be formed by the populace. Or, perhaps their image will remain variable, and women can be perceived as high status individuals for a variety of reasons.

GENERAL DISCUSSION/SUMMARY

Each study, viewed separately, reveals information about male-valued traits, female-valued traits, and their relationship to perceptions about status and gender. These studies provide information about perceptions of status and gender on a variety of dimensions. The dimensions of competence, assertion, rationality (CAR), warmth-expressiveness (WE), and potency are discussed in detail. These studies provide information about attributions concerning occupations, neutral men and women, high status men and women (occupationally defined alone as well as in an interpersonal boss x subordinate situation), and high status men and women when Ss provide their own definitions as to the meaning of "status." A summary of the highlights of each study will be presented in order, as well as conclusions based upon the results of all of these studies.

Study One

Prestigious jobs are rated as high on (the masculine side of) CAR and the status scale. WE is not usually associated with high status (prestigious) jobs, but there are prestigious jobs which include it (e.g. therapist). Female-valued (WE) associations to an occupation do not necessarily decrease the male-valued (CAR) and status associations to it.

Study Two

Men and women with similar occupational titles are perceived as similar to each other on CAR, WE and most of the other measures of this study. Surprisingly, neutral women and men are also perceived as not significantly different on CAR and WE, and most other measures. High status persons are rated as more CAR and potent than neutral persons.

Therapists, but not chemists, are rated as more WE than neutral persons.

Perhaps an increased awareness of the arbitrary qualities of sex-linked stereotypes has led to the situation in which perceptions of neutral men and women (while tending to vary along old stereotypic lines), are no longer significantly different on the major (CAR and WE) stereotypic dimensions of this study. They are also alike on most of the other stereotyped measures on which they are compared. The one dimension which still differentiates them is "potency." Why? Men as hunters and providers have age-old associations; their modern counterparts are working men. Traditionally, they have power because they provide economic sustenance for their families. The physical differences between men and women generally in body-build and strength probably adds to this perceived difference in "potency" between neutral men and women.

Regardless of the original determinants of the perceived differences in potency between neutral men and women (that is, men and women in general), women need only to be in a prestigious occupation to be considered at least as equally potent as men. The influence, importance, money and stereotypes associated with these occupations overcome old stereotypes about gender. When women are in a traditionally male high status occupation, (one without female-valued associations), they are perceived as more powerful than their male counterparts.

Potency is the only stereotypic measure which reveals significant differences between high status men and women. There was also a non-significant tendency for women in a traditionally male field to be viewed as more CAR than men in that same field. It seems that Ss must believe that these women are more powerful and tend to be more competent, assertive and rational because they have overcome gender-related prescriptions and proscriptions in order to achieve their occupational status. There are no

negative evaluations associated with these powerful high status women.

Basically, however, this study finds that men and women with similar occupations are perceived as quite similar to each other. This confirms the findings of the Juran (1976) study in which male and female potentially high status (medical student) cue characters were also perceived as similar to each other.

Study Three

This study searched for direct or indirect evidence of a negative reaction to high status women. Ss responded to what were considered as "strong" status cues; cue characters with both occupational titles and assistants. This study reveals that, even in this more complicated situation, high status women and men are perceived as very similar to each other.

There is no direct or indirect "denial" or negative connotations associated with high status women, as this concept had been originally defined. In almost every instance, high status men and women within similar occupations are rated similarly on all the measures of this study. (The one exception involves ratings of male and female therapists with male assistants, which will be discussed shortly.) In many respects, this study confirms the overall conclusions of the McKenna and Denmark (1978) study which found that perceptions about status which accrue to gender can be overwhelmed by other status-related cues. In that study those status-related cues were nonverbal behaviors; in this study it is occupational titles. (Both studies involve interactions with a subordinate.) In the present study, ratings of the male assistants to high status men and women in the same occupation were compared in order to ascertain "indirect" evidence of a differential reaction

to male and female high status persons; there are no significant differences. The results of studies two and three indicate that the college students who served as Ss do not feel that high status women are in a particularly contradictory situation which would increase negative attributions about them.

The possibility exists that there was no devaluation of these high status women for reasons other than a lack of perceived contradiction between women and high status persons. The Ss in this study might have cognitively decreased the anomaly of a high status woman by reducing the dissonant elements associated with her. Cognitive dissonance theory would predict this as a reality distorting reaction meant to bring one's cognitions into harmony. That is, if women are low status persons generally and a high status woman exists, then this cognitive contradiction is so unusual that Ss resolve it by denying cues or associations which would label her as an anomaly.

It is unlikely, however, that this is the case. Such an unequivocal and consistent reduction of dissonance assumes a very strong motivating force, and it is unlikely that the booklets administered to these students affected them that centrally. Additionally, these Ss did rate high status women and men differently in certain very specific situations. Furthermore, it is unlikely that a desire to rate high status women in a socially desirable manner affected the results of these studies, since practically none of the Ss claimed to have any idea about either the stereotypic quality of the bi-polar traits or of the purpose of the study itself, when questioned during a debriefing period immediately following the experimental session.

Moreover, when "high status" was indeed undefined (as in

Study Four), Ss did rate men and women differently. It appears, therefore; that it is the stereotypes accruing to jobs which are overriding older stereotypes accruing to gender for this particular subject population, and not the fact that these Ss were so affected that they had to change either their cognitions or their rating behavior.

The two dimensions that reveal the most interesting and consistent reactions across all the studies are WE and potency. These dimensions will be discussed separately. Ratings on the CAR dimension tend to move in a direction similar to potency, but they are less reactive. It is not at all difficult for these Ss to rate women as competent, assertive and rational. With increasing androgyny, CAR traits are no longer the strongest measure or association of "masculinity" and male-values, nor are they viewed as contradictory to females or "femininity." "Potency," however, retains its strength as a measure of masculinely associated attributes.

Potency, or power, not only differentiates neutral men and women (Study Two), but it is an integral aspect of perceptions about status, and high status people. Different status manipulations often show up in the potency dimension. A combination of studies two and three reveals that male and female chemists are associated with different "symbols" when they are perceived as very powerful. Men need to have assistants (preferably male assistants) in order to be viewed as very powerful: women need only to be in a traditionally male field.

Male chemists are rated as most powerful when they have male assistants. This helps explain why male therapists with male assistants are rated as more powerful (and more CAR) than comparable female therapists. Male therapists in this situation not only have traditional male symbols

of status, but they are in an occupation that stresses not only CAR but also female-valued (WE) traits. In Study Two, women chemists are rated as more powerful and almost more CAR than comparable males. It is assumed that they are seen as overcoming gender-related role requirements in order to achieve their occupational status, and that this leads to their stronger potency and CAR ratings when compared to male chemists. Likewise, male therapists are seen as overcoming gender-role requirements; they have a certain sensitivity without any loss of male-valued qualities. This, plus the addition of male assistants, causes them to be perceived as more powerful and more CAR than comparable females.

The sensitivity, or warmth-expressiveness dimension reveals an interesting pattern when studies two and three are combined. When male and female Ss identify with cue assistants, they reveal, via both rating scales and open-ended questions, that women bosses are perceived as warmer and more sensitive than their male counterparts. This may be indicative of personal experiences (these college students are in contact with both male and female "authorities" in the form of professors), stereotypes about women and their interpersonal sensitivity, or early parent-child experiences. Whether it is due to one or a combination of the above mentioned factors, these studies lead to an important conclusion. These Ss, who overwhelmingly view high status men and women as similar to each other, not only do not react negatively to high status women, but they do, on occasion, perceive more positive qualities in high status women than in their male counterparts. Perhaps, women are perceived as more "sensitive" bosses more often than are males because they are perceived as not using their power in a potentially negative, hurtful or insensitive way to the same extent that males are perceived as

using it, at least in relation to their subordinates. (Responses by Ss to the open-ended questions tended to substantiate this.)

Study Four

When status is not precisely defined by occupation, there are still some traditional stereotypic differences in the perceptions of high status men and high status women. However, even in this study (where the ambiguous meaning of "status" and the method of presentation increased the chances of stereotypic responding) high status men and women are not viewed from a purely traditional perspective.

Women are defined as high status twice as often on the basis of their own, rather than their husbands', jobs. There is also a notable lack of "beauty" or "sexy" definitions of high status women. High status women are defined more variably than are high status men. Unequivocally, the most frequently mentioned high status men are politicians, and they are defined primarily by their power. Power is just one of the defining characteristics of high status women; they are also defined as having high status because they are famous, rich, or married to a high status man.

Women, Power and Sensitivity

What is "power," this construct that is repeatedly mentioned in these studies of perceptions of high status persons? In the rating scales used in these studies, it was defined as strength, influence and dominance. In categorizations of Ss own definitions of high status people, it was related to the importance of one's job. In psychological literature, power can be defined simply as "the ability to get people to do what one wants, or to influence people in that direction" (Denmark, Tangri & McCandless, in press).

Power may, apparently, be a double-edged sword. It can mean that a person is able to control and influence others for their own (or organizational) ends - an ability that is often admired and which is associated with prestige and status. However, as suggested above, power may also be associated with a lack of sensitivity; at least subordinates to powerful people may often perceive this.

This dissertation reveals that the presumed contradictory situation of a woman in a high status position is no longer an anomaly in the manner often assumed. Generally, high status women and men are viewed quite similarly and there is no evidence of negative effect associated with the perceptions of these women. The only "anomalous" aspect of high status women, as perceived by Ss of their study, lies in their ability to combine power, male-valued traits and sensitivity as bosses, even in an occupation without female-valued attributes.

If high status women are able to combine the positive aspects of power with the sensitivity traditionally associated with women, they may indeed be preferred authorities by those who work with or for them. Perhaps, as more women reach positions of high status, they might subtly change the definitions of power - for both men and women. It might then include not only aspects of controlling or influencing others, but the willingness of others to work for their "bosses" because of the pleasantness of the situation.

Appendix - TABLE A
Male-Valued and Female-Valued Stereotypic Items

Feminine pole		Masculine pole	
IV	Male-valued items	Competency, assertion, rationality	I
1.	Not at all aggressive	Very aggressive	
2.	Not at all independent	Very independent	
3.	Very emotional	Not at all emotional	
4.	Does not hide emotions at all	Almost always hides emotions	
5.	Very subjective	Very objective	
6.	Very easily influenced	Not at all easily influenced	
7.	Very submissive	Very dominant	
8.	Dislikes math and science very much	Likes math and science very much	
9.	Very excitable in a minor crisis	Not at all excitable in a minor crisis	
10.	Very passive	Very active	
11.	Not at all competitive	Very competitive	
12.	Very illogical	Very logical	
13.	Very home oriented	Very worldly	
14.	Not at all skilled in business	Very skilled in business	
15.	Very sneaky	Very direct	
16.	Does not know the way of the world	Knows the way of the world	
17.	Feelings easily hurt	Feelings not easily hurt	
18.	Not at all adventurous	Very adventurous	
19.	Has difficulty making decisions	Can make decisions easily	
20.	Cries very easily	Never cries	
21.	Almost never acts as a leader	Almost always acts as a leader	
22.	Not at all self-confident	Very self-confident	
23.	Very uncomfortable about being aggressive	Not at all uncomfortable about being aggressive	
24.	Not at all ambitious	Very ambitious	
25.	Unable to separate feelings from ideas	Easily able to separate feelings from ideas	
26.	Very dependent	Not at all dependent	
27.	Very conceited about appearance	Never conceited about appearance	
III	Warmth-expressiveness	Female-valued items	II
28.	Very talkative	Not at all talkative	
29.	Very tactful	Very blunt	
30.	Very gentle	Very rough	
31.	Very aware of feelings of others	Not at all aware of feelings of others	
32.	Very religious	Not at all religious	
33.	Very interested in own appearance	Not at all interested in own appearance	
34.	Very neat in habits	Very sloppy in habits	
35.	Very quiet	Very loud	
36.	Very strong need for security	Very little need for security	
37.	Enjoys art and literature very much	Does not enjoy art and literature at all	
38.	Easily expresses tender feelings	Does not express tender feelings at all	

APPENDIX - TABLE B

Coding Categories for the Question Concerning Ss Feelings

About A) Working for, and B) Receiving Criticism from a High Status Person, with Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Across Categories

Question A - How would you feel about working for that person?

<u>Evaluation:</u>	Uncomf/Negative	Neutral/Ambiv	Comf/Positive
	42 (13.3%)	164 (51.9%)	108 (34.2%)

<u>Categories:</u>	<u>Frequency of Response</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
1. Ambivalence in statement (Any mention of if, but, however, depends-elaborated	110	34.8
2. Don't know enough about the person	15	4.7
3. No mention of a feeling or thought	--	---
4. Learning (from the boss, the job) experience	56	17.7
5. Status striving (I want to be boss, help me achieve goals) - only	27	8.5
6. Status striving with conflict or competition (includes envy, not like being subordinate)	37	11.7
7. Equalizer (helping boss, both help each other, I would contribute too) boss had been where I am	47	14.9
8. Submissive (grateful for working for a master, positive view of subordinate status - without any mention of status striving or equalizing)	17	5.4
9. Worry about performing well, concern	3	.9
10. Threatened - devalue own competence (stupid, foolish) (inferior/subordinate)	27	8.5
11. Threatened - re socializing with other, or personal qualities of self (hurt, sensitive, angry)	26	8.2
12. Personal qualities of boss mentioned - positive, sensitive (friendly, pleasant, understanding, tactful, interesting)	35	11.1
13. Personal qualities of boss mentioned - insensitive (bossy, doesn't give a damn about others)	13	4.1

APPENDIX - TABLE B - continued

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Frequency of Response</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
14. Competency qualities of the boss mentioned - (confident in boss' abilities, knows work, aggressive in a positive sense like assertive, knows work, very educated in the field) (non-condescending)	77	24.4
15. Competency qualities of the boss mentioned - negative (doesn't really know their stuff, abuse their authority)	17	5.4
16. Personal qualities of self mentioned - positive, sensitive (friendly, see #12 above)	21	6.6
17. Competent qualities of self mentioned	32	10.1
18. Prefers other gender as boss	11	3.5
19. Denies sex stereotyping for boss (women can be intelligent, competent, assertive, aggressive, objective; men can be sensitive, understanding) - with <u>specific</u> mention of men or women	8	2.5
20. Denies sex stereotyping for self - specifically (I wouldn't mind working for a woman; I like aggressive women; I'm not the type who feels that females are inferior)	11	3.5
21. Confusion or denial of gender (writes him for her, or he/she in answer)	7	2.2
22. Pronouns denoting <u>gender specifically used</u> (him, her; he/she), or/and the <u>specific name</u> of the boss mentioned (as opposed to they, the boss, or no mention of the boss).	143	45.3
23. Rejection of the job (I don't like chemistry)	14	4.4

Question B - How would you feel about receiving criticism from that person?

<u>Evaluation:</u>	Uncomf/Negative	Neutral/Ambiv	Comf/Positive
	45 (14.2%)	233 (73.7%)	35 (11.1%)

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Frequency of Responses</u>	<u>Percentages</u>
1. Ambivalence in statement (Any mention of if, but, depends, however, elaborated)	110	53.8

APPENDIX - TABLE B - continued

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Frequency of Response</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
2. Don't know (enough)	10	3.2
3. No feeling or thought mentioned	3	.9
4. Accept constructive, not destructive criticism	88	27.8
5. General acceptance (understand reasoning of boss, different than above, no other specifics)	18	5.7
6. Other person is more knowledgeable	14	4.4
7. Learning is helpful, correct oneself, motivated to improve)	94	29.7
8. Equalizer (help boss, help each other through criticism)	8	2.5
9. Personal, sensitive qualities of boss, <u>positive</u>	15	4.7
10. Personal, sensitive qualities of boss, <u>negative</u>	12	3.8
11. Competency qualities of boss, <u>positive</u>	48	15.2
12. Competency qualities of boss, <u>negative</u>	13	4.1
13. Personal, sensitive qualities of self, <u>positive</u>	8	2.5
14. Competence (confidence) qualities of self, <u>pos</u>	16	5.1
15. Personal, sensitive qualities of self, <u>negative</u> (Angry, hurt, annoyed, sensitive) (Negative interaction with boss)	60	19.0
16. Competency qualities of self, <u>negative</u> (feel foolish, stupid)	8	2.5
17. Part of the role	29	9.2
18. Distance self from boss, not show feelings to boss	4	1.3
19. Different feelings with other gender as boss	3	.9
20. Submissive, grateful	15	4.7
21. Ambition, achieve, get to be boss	5	1.6
22. Denial, confusion of the sexes	12	3.8
23. <u>Pronouns denoting gender</u> specifically used	108	34.2
24. Accept professional, not personal criticism	46	14.6

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acker, J. Women and social stratification: A case of intellectual sexism. American Journal of Sociology, 1974, 78, 936-945.
- Barry, H., Bacon, M. K., & Child, I. L. A cross-cultural survey of some sex differences in socialization. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. 1957, 55, 327-332.
- Beauvais, C. The family and the work group: Dilemmas for women and authority. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, City University of New York, 1977.
- Bem, S. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 155-162.
- Berger, J., Cohen, B. P., & Zelditch Jr., M. Status characteristics and social interaction. American Sociological Review, 1972, 37, 241-255.
- Broverman, I. K., Vogel, S. R., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., & Rosenkrantz, P. S. Sex-role stereotypes: A current appraisal. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 59-78.
- Chodorow, N. Family structure and feminine personality. In M. Z. Rosaldo and L. Lamphere (Eds.) Women, culture and society. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1974.
- Denmark, F. L., McKenna, W., Juran, S., & Greenberg, H. Status and sex differences in nonverbal behavior, Unpublished research, 1976.
- Denmark, F. L., Tangri, S., & McCandless, S. Affiliation, achievement, and power: A new look. In J. A. Sherman and F. L. Denmark (Eds.) The psychology of women: Future directions in research, in press.
- Dodge, N. Women in the Soviet economy. In A. Theodore (Ed.) The professional women, Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing Co., 1971.

- Feather, N. T. & Raphelson, A. C. Fear of success in Australia and American student groups: Motive or sex-role stereotype? Journal of Personality, 1974, 42, 190-201.
- Freeman, J. The legal basis of the sexual caste system. Valparaiso University Law Review, 1971, 5, 203-236.
- Freundl, P. C. When is assertion aggressive? Perception of assertion as a function of the sex and status of the speaker, the sex of the target of communication, and the sex of the observer of the interaction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1977.
- Garfinkle, H. Studies in ethnomethodology. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1967.
- Gould, L. Attitudes toward women in authority. In E. L. Zuckerman (Ed.) Women and men: Roles, attitudes and power relationships. New York: The Radcliffe Club, 1975.
- Henley, N. M. The politics of touch. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association, 1970.
- Henley, N. M. Power, sex and nonverbal communication. Berkeley Journal of Sociology, 1973, 1-22.
- Hochschild, A. R. A review of sex role research. American Journal of Sociology, 1973, 78, 1011-1023.
- Hodge, R. W., Siegel, P. M., & Rossi, P. H. Occupational prestige in the United States, 1925-1963. American Journal of Sociology, 1964, 70, 286-302.
- Hoffman, L. W. Fear of success in males and females: 1965 and 1971. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 353-358.

- Janeway, E. Between myth and morning: Women awakening. New York: William Morrow & Co., 1974.
- Juran, S. A measure of stereotyping in fear of success cues. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C., 1976. (Paper currently in press in Sex Roles: A Journal of Research)
- Juran, S. Sex differences in negative achievement motivation. Unpublished master's thesis, Brooklyn College, 1972.
- Kagan, J. Acquisition and significance of sex typing and sex-role identity. In M. L. Hoffman & L. W. Hoffman (Eds.) Review of child development and research, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964.
- Kantor, R. Some effects of proportions on group life; skewed sex ratios and responses to token women. American Journal of Sociology, 1977, 965-990.
- Lewis, M. Parents and children; sex role-development. School Review, 1972, 80(2), 229-240.
- Lockheed, M. E. Female motive to avoid success: A psychological barrier or a response to deviancy? Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 1975, 1, 41-50.
- Lockheed, M. E., & Hall, K. P. Conceptualizing sex as a status characteristic: Applications to leadership training strategies. Journal of Social Issues, 1976, 2, 111-124.
- Maccoby, E. E. & Jacklin, C. N. The psychology of sex differences. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1974, 255-265.
- Mazur, A. A cross-species comparison of status in small established groups. American Sociological Review, 1973, 38, 513-530.
- McKee, J. P. & Sherriffs, A. C. The differential evaluation of males and females, Journal of Personality, 1957, 25, 356-371.

- McKenna, W. & Denmark, F. L. Gender and nonverbal behavior as cues to status and power. Talk at the New York Academy of Sciences, April 1978.
- Monahan, L., Kuhn, D., & Shaver, P. Intrapsychic versus cultural explanations of the "fear of success" motive. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 29, 60-64.
- Murphy-Berman, V. Effects of status and failure on perceptions of gender identity. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 1976, 2, 267-374.
- Parson, T., & Bales, R. Family socialization and interaction process. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1955.
- Robbins, L. & Robbins, E. Comment on "toward an understanding of achievement related conflicts in women." Journal of Social Issues, 1973, 29, 133-137.
- Rosenkrantz, P. S., Vogel, S. R., Bee, H., Broverman, I. K., & Broverman, D. M. Sex-role stereotypes and self-concepts in college students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32, 187-195.
- Rosaldo, M. Z. Woman, culture and society: A theoretical overview. In M. Z. Rosaldo and L. Lamphere (Eds.) Women, culture and society. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1974.
- Sanday, I. R. Female status in the public and private domain. In M. Z. Rosaldo and L. Lamphere (Eds.) Women, culture and society. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1974.
- Sherman, J. A. Social values, femininity, and the development of female competence. Journal of Social Issues, 1976, 32, 181-195.
- Sherriffs, A. C. & McKee, J. P. Qualitative aspects of beliefs about men and women. Journal of Personality, 1957, 451-464.

- Stoller, R. J. Sex and gender, Volume II. New York: Jason Aronson, 1975.
- Touhey, J. C. Effects of additional women professionals on ratings of occupational prestige and desirability. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 29, 86-89.
- Unger, R. Status, power and gender: An examination of parallelisms. Paper presented at the conference on "New Directions for Research on Women," Madison, May 1975.
- Walstedt, J. J. Women as marginals. Psychological Reports, 1974, 34, 639-646.
- Wright, F. The effects of style and sex of consultants, and sex of members of in self-study groups. Paper based upon author's unpublished doctoral dissertation, 1974.
- Zuckerman, M. & Wheeler, L. To dispel fantasies about the fantasy-based measure of fear of success. Psychological Bulletin, 1975, 82, 932-946.