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ABSTRACT

The present study examined the effects of sex (male or female), status (manager or non-manager), and form completed (whether rating themselves, the typical male manager, or the typical female manager) on subjects' scores on two variables, masculinity—a competence dimension, and femininity—a warmth dimension, as determined by the Rosenkrantz Sex Role Stereotype Questionnaire. The hypothesis was investigated that women managers incorporate masculine, or competent, attributes into their self identities no less than male managers, as well as retaining feminine, or warmth, characteristics as much as other women. Self ratings on the masculinity and femininity of the four groups of subjects, female managers, male managers, female non-managers and male non-managers were compared. Perceptions of the masculinity and femininity of the stereotypic male manager and the stereotypic female manager were also investigated. A stereotype of the male manager was hypothesized which exaggerated the masculinity and minimized the femininity which male managers see themselves as having. Self perceptions of male managers and female managers were also compared to the stereotypic ratings of the male manager and the female manager for both variables of masculinity and femininity.

Subjects consisted of 30 female managers, 30 male managers, 30 female non-managers, and 30 male non-managers drawn from four agencies of the state of Louisiana. Male and female managers were
classified as middle level and were matched on organizational level. Managers were matched with non-managers on the basis of 1) age and 2) educational level.

Results showed that for the masculinity variable, sex, status and form were all found to be significant main effects. The joint interaction effect was also significant. For the femininity variable, only form was found to be a significant main effect. The joint interaction effect for femininity was not significant. In self ratings, female managers did not see themselves as significantly less masculine than male managers, nor as significantly less feminine than female non-managers. However, female managers were also not significantly different from any of the other groups in terms of femininity.

Significant differences were found between groups in their ratings of the masculinity of the female manager, but not in ratings of femininity. Males, both managers and non-managers, rated her as significantly less masculine than the typical male manager. Female managers, on the other hand, rated her as significantly more masculine than the typical male manager. Female managers themselves were the only group of subjects who did not perceive any significant difference between the typical male manager and the typical female manager.

As predicted, a stereotypic image of the male manager was found which exaggerated the masculine attributes and minimized the feminine attributes male managers see themselves as having. The male manager was rated highest in terms of masculinity, the female manager
was rated as next highest in terms of masculinity, and self-ratings were lowest. Conversely, self ratings were highest in terms of femininity, the female manager was next highest, and the male manager was lowest on femininity.

Although there were significant differences between groups on the masculinity variable, the subjects did not show any significant differences on the femininity variable. Subjects' self perceptions did not differ significantly, nor did their ratings of the male manager or of the female manager differ. The results lend support to the hypothesis that masculinity and femininity are not opposite ends of the same bipolar continuum, but may consist of at least two separate dimensions.
INTRODUCTION

Women in the Work Force

During the nineteenth century, the economic status of all workers, particularly women, changed greatly. With the advent of the Industrial Revolution, the center of production moved from the home to the factory and many women, as well as other lesser educated groups, such as immigrants and children, provided an inexpensive source of unskilled labor for growing American industries. By the first decade of the twentieth century, the number of women working for pay in the labor force doubled from four million in 1890 to eight million in 1910. By 1910, women made up 20.6% of all the labor force (Hooks 1948). At that time, women were largely employed in unskilled and semiskilled factory jobs. Teaching at the elementary level was the only profession employing women in great numbers. Whether in the professions or in the factories, most employed women were young and single. Very few of the women employed during this period were married or older women. Older women were in the labor force only when forced to become wage earners due to the death or disablement of their spouses (Smuts 1959).

The number of employed women continued to grow during the early twentieth century. However, it was not until World War II that the combination of a tight labor market and an active campaign to encourage participation in the war industries attracted a sub-
stantial number of married and older women in the labor force (EEOC, 1971). Many women were employed during these years in heavy industry, such as the steel industry (Gilmer, 1957). The popular image of "Rosie the Riveter" became a symbol of women's contribution to the economy and war effort in an essential capacity. After World War II, many women remained in the labor force; since that time, married and older women have produced the largest yearly increases in available workers for the work force of any group (Lyle, 1971). By 1974, women constituted 38% of the labor force, and 40% of all the women in the population were employed outside the home.

Many factors have contributed to the increase in the number of employed women (Basil, 1972):

1. Technological advances have created jobs which require little physical effort or professional training.
2. Development of labor saving devices and products for the home permitted women to work both in a paid job and to meet the demands of homemaking.
3. Economic growth of the nation has created new job opportunities and a need for a larger pool of employable workers.
4. Recently, federal legislation has created equal employment opportunities for women.
5. Increasing inflation and rising expectations have required incomes from both husband and wife in order to maintain
an expected higher standard of living for the family.

The biggest factor contributing to the employment of women in jobs other than semiskilled and clerical ones has been the recent action taken by government agencies and the courts. With the inclusion of sex in Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, women were given the opportunity to seek redress for job discrimination and to apply for positions previously closed to them. Title VII states that in only a few jobs in the American economy is sex a bona fide occupational qualification. Several cases have come to court under Title VII, and landmark decisions such as that in Weeks vs. Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Co. (1967) have held that there is no justification for sex as a bona fide occupational qualification in most jobs.

In addition to court decisions, other government action has been instrumental in increasing the hiring and promotion of women. In 1971, companies doing business with the government—approximately 250,000 firms in all—were ordered to establish affirmative action programs for the hiring and promotion of all minorities, including women. In 1972, the Equal Pay Act was expanded to include management jobs in its jurisdiction. In one major settlement under that law, American Telephone and Telegraph paid $30 million in back pay and pledged future raises to 25,000 of its management employees who had been unfairly discriminated against, most of whom were women (U.S. News and World Report, September 30, 1974).
Women as Managers

In spite of the fact that women are entering the labor force in increasing numbers, the proportion of women holding management positions has been and continues to be quite small. The American Society for Personnel Administrators and the Bureau of National Affairs made an extensive study in 1970 on the employment of women in private industry (Kyle, 1971). Based on responses of 150 executives across the country, this study reported that in nearly 3/5 of the companies involved, women were barred from certain jobs in their company.

It is reported also that, although nearly 1/3 of the American companies have more than 50% women employees, 70% of these women employees were in clerical positions. Women in 3/4 of the companies comprised less than 5% of the technical and professional personnel of the company. Over a quarter of the companies had no women as first line supervisors, and nearly nine tenths of the firms had 5% or fewer women in this category. Nine percent of all firms employed no women as managers in any position.

Basil (1972), in his survey of over 300 male and female executives in private companies and government agencies, also found that the proportion of women in managerial positions was quite small. In this study Basil reports:

1. More than 70% of the companies responding had only 3% of managerial positions staffed by women.
2. In staff and professional managerial positions, women tended toward governmental positions: for example, the percentage of women lawyers in government was three times greater than the national average of female to male lawyers.

3. Women rarely held managerial positions in production or marketing. The only exception to this rule was in merchandising.

4. Women rarely held top managerial positions: for example, less than one firm in four had any women in their upper levels of management.

Thus, Basil found that government, merchandising, and additionally, banking offered the greatest opportunities for women with 14%, 8%, and 6% of these economic sectors, respectively, employing women in more than 20% of their managerial positions. Seventy-five percent of the other private companies employed women mainly in office managerial positions or personnel management. These types of management positions seem to be, then, the most common types of management positions held by women. In addition, women often are employed as staff specialists or professionals, but they are rarely in policy making executive positions. As indicated before, government agencies lead private companies in the employment of women at a management level. In 83% of the government agencies, women are employed in staff or professional managerial positions, whereas only 50% of the firms in the private sector employed women in such positions.

As illustrated by Basil and others, women rarely reach the highest levels of management except in government agencies. Seventy-
five percent of government agencies reported having women in policy making positions. Of the private companies, fewer than one firm in four employed women in upper management positions.

Further evidence that women are not reaching the higher levels of management is found in the discrepancy between the average salaries of American men and the average salaries of American women. Nationally, women earn only 58% of what an equally qualified man would make (Levitan, et al., 1973). In 1971, 38.3% of male salaried non-farm managers and administrators earned $15,000 or more a year (Kahne, 1974). Only 6.5% of women in the same category earned this amount. Median income of full time salaried female managers was $7,539, about half the amount received by men ($13,629). Most of the discrepancy can be accounted for by the concentration of women in lower level positions.

**Factors Influencing the Employment of Women as Managers**

There are undoubtedly many reasons for the lack of women in management positions. McCord (1971) points out that women may not be hired for management because women generally do not receive the same business education directed toward a management career as men do. Most companies also have done little research concentrating on the identification and selection of women who will be "successful" managers.

Moreover, most women are hired into specific positions rather than into training programs that would lead to management positions. In this manner, companies have not provided for the same kind of
cultivation of the management talent of their women employees as they have for their men employees. In addition, companies may not provide for female managers any non-supervisory training before the female assumes a supervisory role. Koff (1973), in a study of successful and unsuccessful women managers, found that age and lack of prior non-supervisory experience were major factors in determining the success or failure of a female manager. Many of the unsuccessful managers were young women who had no prior training or experience in business and majored in areas other than business in college. In addition, whether single or married, women in business have been hampered by the male oriented corporate life style.

Additional reasons for the lack of employment of women managers have been found by other researchers. For example, Basil (1972) found that a high proportion of firms consider women to be "unsuitable" for management. One reason given by these organizational executives is that often when women are ready to re-enter the labor market after raising children, they are too old to be considered for management training. Some companies refuse to hire women on the grounds that women are not as geographically mobile as men.

Another argument advanced by employers is their feeling that women are just not as competent as men. Women themselves, even very competent women, will rate themselves as less competent than males (Goldberg 1968, Sumner and Johnson 1940, Ryan 1974). Yet over 1/2 of the executives in Schwartz's study felt that women employees
were as capable as men employees. Moreover, Day and Stogdill (1972) found that women supervisors were rated by subordinates as equally effective as men in comparable positions. It was also found that women and men supervisors did not differ in their supervisory style.

Much of the work in the area of women as managers has been directed toward the examination of attitudes toward women managers. Probably a critical factor related to the few women hired as managers is related to the attitudes held toward women managers by company executives. For example, the Harvard Business Review, in its study of male executive attitudes toward female executives (Bowman, Wortney, and Greyser, 1965), found that only 9% of the managers sampled felt very favorable to women in management, whereas fifty-one percent of the male executives felt that women were temperamentally unfit for management. Although the executives felt that women in management had no appreciable negative effects on efficiency and production, one third of the male executives felt that females in managerial positions had a "bad" effect on employee morale. Eighty-one percent felt that men were uncomfortable with a woman boss and only 27% felt that they would feel comfortable working for a woman. Interestingly, older men were found to accept women in management ranks somewhat more favorably than younger men.

In a similar study, Schwartz (1971) surveyed the attitudes of male and female executives in large and small businesses toward women managers. The executives felt that although women were as
capable as men, they were too emotional, have less career motivation, do not provide as great a return on the investment, prefer not to work for another woman, and are not as dedicated to management as men. Over 1/2 felt that women are as capable as men, can make management decisions, do not use their femininity to gain their objectives, are not absent more, and are not overly sensitive to contradiction.

Two other studies have found negative attitudes expressed toward women managers. A survey of 30,000 federal service employees reported that seventy-five percent of both men and women believed that men make better supervisors than women (Changing Times 1967). Gilmer (1961) similarly found that over 63% of male managers believe women to be inferior to men in supervisory positions. In this study, Gilmer also found that male managers also believe women to be more neurotic, have more work-related problems, and experience a higher level of absenteeism.

Many of the attitudes expressed toward women in management are similar to the attitudes toward women in general. These attitudes are determined by what is perceived as appropriate or inappropriate behavior for women in our society. Several attitudes which influence men's ability to accept women on an equal basis in a work situation were found in a study by Bass, Krusell, and Alexander (1971). They found that managers believe that certain norms define interaction between the sexes, most notably, rules of etiquette and politeness in public. They felt that women should defer to men's ability and initiative and men should defer to the needs of the weaker sex.
This indicates that the problem of acceptance of women managers seems to be that societal norms do not sanction the placement of women in dominant positions.

Thus, many of the attitudes toward women in management may be due to the view that the managerial role is not an appropriate role for women— that is, the stereotypically appropriate role for managers includes behavior that conflicts with the stereotypically appropriate role for women.

Every society defines for its members what it considers to be sex-appropriate behavior, patterns, or roles. As part of the acculturation process, people learn their expected roles. Men and women in our society are likewise assigned standard traits and behaviors that differentiate the two. Moreover, there is wide agreement across society as what these appropriate behaviors are. Several investigators (McKee and Sherriffs 1957, Sherriffs and Jarrett 1953, Lunneborg 1970, Rosenkrantz, et al. 1968) have found that there is great general agreement between the sexes as to what are considered to be masculine and feminine ways of behavior. Males are seen as aggressive, active, independent, dominant, logical, and not at all emotional. Females are seen as tactful, gentle, aware of the feelings of others, neat, and tender (Rosenkrantz, et al. 1968). McKee and Sherriffs (1957) similarly found that the masculine stereotypic image is one which includes: (1) rational competence and ability; (2) vigor, action and effectiveness. The feminine stereotype consists of (1) social skills and graces and (2) warmth and emotional support.
Additionally, men and masculine characteristics are more highly valued in our society than are women and feminine characteristics. Rosenkrantz found that when questionnaire items were arranged in a bipolar fashion, with masculinity at one end and femininity at the other end, more of the masculine than feminine items were considered to be socially desirable for the population at large.

Masculine characteristics are not only seen as more desirable in our society, but also more mentally healthy. Clinician's judgments (Broverman, et al. 1972) of the healthy man and the healthy woman indicate that those traits consensually viewed as healthy are more often ascribed to men than to women. Moreover, healthy women were seen as significantly less healthy than the general standard of health for an adult. The authors suggest that this is a powerful negative assessment of women's mental health--that women are perceived as less healthy than men.

Although there is great agreement across society as to what "typical" masculinity and "typical" femininity are, it seems that these stereotypes are an exaggeration of the way individuals rate themselves on the same dimensions. Lunneborg (1970) found that when males and females were asked to predict how the average man and the average woman would rate themselves on masculinity and femininity, their responses were an exaggeration of the sex differences found when males and females rate themselves on masculinity and femininity. Moreover, there were some items which did not actually discriminate between the self-ratings of men and women, yet both men and women thought the
average man and woman would differ on these items. Additional data are provided by Rosenkrantz, et al. (1968), who found that women's self concepts are significantly less feminine than their perceptions of women in general. Males also rated themselves as significantly less masculine than men in general.

Factors Influencing the Measurement of Sex Appropriate Behavior

When attempting to measure any aspect of personality such as masculinity or femininity, an investigator inevitably is confronted with the problem of defining what it is he intends to measure and of determining how to measure it most precisely. Whether one is measuring how one perceives himself to possess these characteristics or how he perceives the stereotypic male or female to possess them, the issue of defining the construct is crucial. Masculinity and femininity may be defined in several ways. For example, one may define masculinity and femininity as two opposite ends of a continuum representing one particular quality, (in this case, sex-appropriate behavior) or as two or more separate sets of factors which are not necessarily opposite from one another, each set characterizing one population more than the other. Of course, there may be many more definitions, but every definition will determine a set of assumptions which underlie the measurement of such characteristics.

There have been a wide variety of techniques used to measure "masculinity" and "femininity." In a recent article reviewing this whole area, Constantinople (1973) reviews both the objective and
projective measures which are used. She reports that the most frequently used tests of masculinity and femininity include: the Terman-Miles Attitude and Interest Analysis Test; the Strong Vocational Interest Blank (M-F scale); the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (M-F scale); the California Psychological Inventory (Fe scale); the Guilford M scale; adjective check lists; word association tests; semantic differentials; and projective tests of masculinity and femininity. Constantinople found that all these measures are inadequate because each measure is based on a couple of untested assumptions. She points out that the major questionable assumption underlying most current measures of masculinity and femininity is that the quality to be measured is unidimensional, that is, it is a unitary trait that must be measured using only one score, instead of a set of traits which may be represented by many scores and which may be displayed by each individual in varying amounts.

The assumption that masculinity and femininity are opposite aspects of one dimension is also challenged by Webster (1956), who found developmental changes in the self-perceptions of college coeds from the freshman year to the senior year when measured on various factors. He concluded that women over the college years become more "masculine" in the sense of becoming less conventional and less passive, but more "feminine" in having a greater awareness of their inner life.
Constantinople concludes, in reviewing the correlations between the various tests of masculinity and femininity, that although these tests seem to measure to some extent common qualities, a great proportion of the variance associated with any two tests is not held in common. Correlations between these tests range from .26-.70, indicating that the present tests are measuring different dimensions, as well as common ones. Additional support for the concept of multidimensionality is seen by Constantinople in factor analytic studies. One of these studies has been done by Abott (1969). He developed a measure of 150 self report items from previous M-F tests which discriminated the sexes at the .05 level or better. In factor analyzing 13 clusters from each group of male and female high school students, three factors were extracted for males: (a) tough, self-assertive; (b) impersonal, self-sufficient; (c) enterprising, realistic. Four factors were extracted for females: (a) self-concerned, timid; (b) insecure, dependent; (c) considerate of others; and (d) interests.

The multidimensionality of masculinity and femininity was also suggested by Reany and Ferguson (1974) after they examined items which differentiated the sexes on a scale developed to measure a cold-warm dimension. The authors concluded that masculinity and femininity differences are, in all probability and in their totality, multidimensional in nature.
Goodenough also concluded that these two dimensions must be measured separately. In attempting to develop a scoring key for masculinity and femininity in both men and women using the Terman-Miles weighting procedure, she concluded that a "feminine" woman is not the same as a "feminine" man. Consequently, she developed separate scoring keys for the two sexes. Thus it appears that masculinity and femininity involve different dimensions and these might well be measured separately.

Related to the problem of dimensionality is the problem of bipolarity. Most tests of masculinity and femininity assume that it is a bipolar construct, ranging from extreme masculinity at one end to extreme femininity at the other end. However, if we question the assumption that the concept is comprised of different dimensions, then we must also question whether these dimensions are each bipolar. Constantinople suggests that there is enough evidence to separate masculinity and femininity dimensions to warrant empirical tests of the bipolarity issue before final judgment is reached. Jenkins and Vroegh (1969) studied the issue of bipolarity of masculinity and femininity measurement and found that the relationships between least and most masculine and feminine persons on an adjective check list indicated that masculinity and femininity are not opposite ends of a bipolar variable: most masculine and most feminine people have shared traits as well as differentiating ones. Most masculine and most feminine persons were more similar than they were different.
In a separate study Jenkins and Vroegh found that some of the items shared by the ideal most masculine man and the ideal most feminine woman were the following: they were active, affectionate, attractive, cooperative, emotionally stable, good natured, healthy, intelligent, sexually attractive, and well-groomed. Although both most masculine men and least feminine women had qualities of dominance and strength in common, there was still a significant difference in their overall descriptions. That is, a very masculine man is not described in the same way as a very masculine woman would be described.

Jenkin and Vroegh observe that:

masculinity appears to vary between a type of male who is strong, confident, energetic, ambitious, personable, and courteous, and one who is emotionally unstable, insecure, cowardly, immature, whiny, and affected. Femininity appears to vary between a type of female who is affectionate, charming, graceful, sociable, understanding, thoughtful, and good natured, and one who is argumentative, arrogant, crude, coarse, and hard. The two continua are related in that most masculine and most feminine types have socially desirable qualities, and least masculine and least feminine types have socially undesirable qualities.

It seems to be very significant that Jenkins and Vroegh found that most masculine and most feminine persons were more similar than they were different. Similar results were found by Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp (1975) in a comprehensive study of the issue of masculinity and femininity based on a version of the Rosenkrantz Sex Role Stereotype Questionnaire. Their results suggest that "far from being bipolar and negatively correlated, masculinity and femininity are, if not orthogonal, actually positively related."
The authors gave 248 males and 282 females the Personal Attributes Questionnaire, an extended version of the Rosenkrantz Sex Role Stereotype Questionnaire, consisting of 55 bipolar attributes. The students were asked to rate themselves and to compare directly the typical male and female college student, rather than asking for independent ratings of each sex, as Rosenkrantz did in the development of the questionnaire. Students were asked to rate themselves on each of the 55 bipolar items by a 5-point scale. They were then given an abbreviated description of one pole of each item (e.g. "independent") and asked to compare directly the typical male and female college student. These comparisons were also made on a 5-point scale, one endpoint labeled "much more characteristic of the male," the midpoint labeled "equally characteristic of both sexes," and the other endpoint labeled "much more characteristic of the female." If the mean ratings of both the ideal male and ideal female were toward the feminine end of the bipolar scale, that is, the end consistently rated to be characteristic of females rather than males, the item was classified as female-valued. If the mean ratings of both the ideal male and the ideal female were toward the male end, the item was classified as male-valued. If the mean of the ideal female and the ideal male differed in direction for the two sexes the item was classified as sex specific.

Results indicated that, as judged by significant items, students perceived more differences between the typical male and female college student than are revealed by their self perceptions.
However, they found that the self ratings more often than not confirm the stereotype data. That is, the stereotyped perceptions of the typical male and female college student reflected more differences between the two than were found in self perceptions. Yet the self ratings were mostly found to be in the direction of the stereotype.

The authors further found that in both sexes, masculinity, as tapped by the male valued scale, was positively and significantly correlated not only with masculinity on the sex-specific scale, but also with femininity on the female valued scale. This finding led them to also suggest that masculinity and femininity are indeed, "if not orthogonal, actually positively related." Consistent with these results, Spence also found significant, positive correlations between masculinity and self esteem in both sexes. Similarly significant positive correlations between femininity and self esteem were found in both men and women.

Bem (1974) also criticized the sex-role dichotomy of masculinity and femininity being bipolar ends of a single continuum. She points out that this assumption obscures two plausible hypotheses. The first is that individuals may be androgynous, i.e. may be both masculine and feminine, both assertive and yielding, depending on the situational appropriateness of these various behaviors. The second is that strongly sex-typed individuals may be seriously limited in the range of behaviors available to them as they move from situation to situation. She developed the Bem Sex-Role Inventory
to include a measure of androgyny as well as measures of masculinity and femininity. The androgyny score is computed by the t ratio for the difference between a person's masculinity and femininity self-rating. This score on the androgyny scale not only denotes the endorsement of masculine attributes but also the rejection of feminine attributes. Spence et al. (1975), however, criticize her method of determining androgyny, which results in a kind of bipolar scale ranging from feminine through androgynous to masculine. To deal with the problem of whether or not persons who were low on both masculinity and also on femininity would be considered androgynous, since the differences between the two would be small, Spence developed a four-point androgyny index. This index differentiates among those possessing few characteristics of either sex, those having predominantly the characteristics of one sex or the other, and those with a high proportion of the characteristics typical of both sexes. This last category is termed androgynous. For both sexes, subjects classified as androgynous showed highest self-esteem scores, followed by those high in masculinity and low in femininity. Those who were high in both characteristics were found to be highest in self-esteem, received more honors and awards, dated more, and had a lower incidence of childhood illness.

This data supports the concept that masculinity and femininity consist of at least two separate, socially desirable components which are present in both sexes, though typically in different degrees.
Background for the Present Study

Since attitudes toward sex-appropriate behavior are so pervasive in our culture, one would expect that the perception of male and female managers would be similarly affected by such attitudes. Indeed, Schein (1973) found that there is a significant resemblance between the mean ratings of men and managers on her Descriptive Index, whereas there was little resemblance between women and managers. On 60 of the 86 items, ratings of managers were more similar to ratings of men than to ratings of women. Both men and managers were seen as: emotionally stable, aggressive, self-reliant, (not) uncertain, vigorous, objective, and desiring of responsibility. Yet on 8 of the items, ratings of managers were seen to be more similar to ratings of women than to ratings of men. These were: understanding, helpful, sophisticated, aware of feelings of others, intuitive, neat, not vulgar, and holding humanitarian values. Schein concludes that if a woman's self-image incorporates the female sex role stereotype, then she may not display those "masculine" characteristics that managers are seen as having.

Similarly, Jurgenson (1966) found that executives and personnel managers describe the type of person most likely to succeed as a member of top management as: decisive, aggressive, productive, enterprising, energetic, self-starting, responsible, determined, creative, intelligent, well-informed and clear-thinking. Most of these adjectives denote characteristics included in the
male-valued items delineated by Rosenkrantz et al. (1968).

It may seem that the possession of a feminine self-image and the possession of the attributes necessary for managerial performance are mutually exclusive states. Indeed, the Harvard Business Review study referred to above (Bowman, et al. 1965) found that 51% of the questioned male executives felt that women were temperamentally unfit for management. Schwartz (1971) similarly found that male executives felt women were too emotional, have less career motivation, and are not as dedicated to management as men.

Thus, the woman who aspires to a position in management may be caught in a double bind. If she possesses or acquires those characteristics which are expected of typical managers, that is, masculine characteristics such as ambition, assertiveness, and the ability to make logical decisions, then she must consider the possibility that she will be perceived as unfeminine, a "pushy broad" (Barbara Kirkland, "60 Minutes" April 27, 1975). Such a description may be incompatible with her own identity as a female. However, if she does not possess these assertive characteristics and her behavior conforms to a female stereotype, then she may be perceived as incompetent for a managerial job, lacking the drive and motivation necessary for such managerial performance. As Schein (1973) stated: "If a woman's self image incorporates aspects of the stereotypical feminine role, she may be less inclined to acquire the job characteristics or engage in the job behaviors associated with the masculine
managerial position since such characteristics are inconsistent with her self image."

As mentioned previously, there is some evidence to suggest that women, once they are placed in a management situation, are as effective as men managers and use the same managerial style that men do. Day and Stogdill (1972) asked subordinates of male and female managers to rate their supervisors on the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire. Male and female supervisors were matched on organizational level, civil service grade, and kind of work engaged in. The authors found that subordinates rated women supervisors as equally effective as male supervisors. Moreover, they found that males and females did not differ in patterns of leader behavior, although females were described as slightly higher than males in their use of consideration and emphasis on production. This study found then that in ratings of actual work performance rather than attitudes, women supervisors when rated on overall effectiveness do not differ from men supervisors.

Bartol and Wortman (1975) found similar results when comparing male and female supervisors as rated by their subordinates. The authors gave the Ohio State Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire--Form XII (Stogdill 1963) to civil service workers and asked them to rate their immediate supervisor. Results indicated that only one of the 12 subscales of the questionnaire differentiated between males and females. Female supervisors were perceived as
higher in initiating structure than their male counterparts. (However, the sex of the subordinate was significant for 5 of the subscales. Female subordinates described their supervisors, regardless of supervisor's sex, significantly higher than did male subordinates on: Demand Reconciliation, Persuasiveness, Initiating Structure, Consideration, and Predictive Accuracy.) In general, the results of the study indicate that, from the point of view of subordinates, the sex of the leader has little effect on perceived leader behavior, job satisfaction, or the relationship between perceived leader behavior and satisfaction with supervisors.

But does the display of certain behavior necessary for management mean that the women managers are different in some way from women who are not managers? Morrision and Sebald (1974) have explored this question in a study of executive and nonexecutive women matched on age, education, work site, and length of employment. Personality data were obtained with the Edwards Personality Preference Schedule and biographical data. The authors hypothesized that female executives would have experienced a significantly different early socialization process than the female nonexecutives. They also hypothesized that current marital environments of the two groups would differ. Additional hypotheses were that the female executives would have: a) a higher need for achievement; b) a higher need for power; c) a lower need for affiliation; and d) a higher level of mental ability than do female nonexecutives.
The authors, however, found that female executives and female non-executives did not differ in terms of their early socialization process or current marital environments. Neither were the two groups found to differ on the need for affiliation and nurturance. Some of the items concerning social skills, such as "others contact her with problems" also did not differentiate between the two. Yet female executives did differ from female nonexecutives in having a greater need for power, higher self-esteem, and greater intellectual capabilities. The authors conclude that female executives are similar in motivation and ability to male executives, but this does not make them "masculine." For, as well as having masculine characteristics, the female executive also may have characteristics which are feminine, i.e. are similar to women in general.

Like women executives, women in the professions also may incorporate masculine and feminine aspects in their personalities. Additional support for the notion that women may be both achievement oriented—a stereotypically masculine trait—and nurturing—a stereotypically feminine trait—may be found in a study by Gross and Crovitz (1975.) The authors compared medical students' attitudes toward women and women medical students on 8 factors of Jackson's Personality Research Form. They found that medical students generally see women medical students as significantly more aggressive, exacting, enduring, achievement oriented, intellectual, and dominant than they see women in general. Women medical students were per-
ceived as needing significantly less social recognition than women in general. Of particular interest here is that no significant difference was found in the perceived nurturance of the two groups. Women medical students were not seen, then, as the harsh, cold stereotype of the professional woman. If it is assumed that women who enter the medical profession must possess some of the same characteristics of women in management, including the drive to succeed in a profession, then one might reason that women in management also might possess both achievement oriented and nurturing characteristics at the same time.

On the basis of the few studies available concerning women managers, it was suggested here that women managers, although possessing more of those stereotypically "masculine" characteristics than women who are not managers, also possess those characteristics such as warmth and expressiveness, traits commonly described as "feminine," no less than women who are not managers. These women are expected to perceive themselves as "masculine" as men managers see themselves, having incorporated into their identities qualities of assertiveness, independence, and competence, yet are expected to perceive themselves as more feminine than men perceive themselves to be.

It was expected that men, who perceive themselves to be more masculine than women, would also perceive managers, whether male or female, to be more masculine than women perceive them. Since the manager stereotype is a typically masculine image, men
were expected to have higher overall masculinity ratings than women, whether they were rating themselves, the typical male manager, or the typical female manager. Managers, who were expected to perceive themselves as more masculine than non-managers, should also perceive the typical male and female manager as more masculine than the non-manager perceives them. Thus they make their self-perceptions consistent with their perceptions of others who hold the same position, while non-managers do not have as much self esteem at stake in seeing managers as very masculine. Therefore, managers were expected to have higher overall masculinity ratings than non-managers, whether they were rating themselves, the typical male manager or the typical female manager.

On these same bases, it was also expected that a stereotypic perception of the male manager would emerge as one in which the masculine aspects are exaggerated and the feminine aspects are minimized. The perception of the woman manager was expected to be somewhat similar to the male manager, incorporating exaggerated masculine aspects and minimized feminine aspects. These aspects would not be as exaggerated or minimized as in the perception of the male manager, since women are generally not perceived to be as similar to managers as men are. Self perceptions of masculinity and femininity, whether of men or of women, were expected to be closer together than for either the male manager stereotype of the female manager stereotype. That is, people in general see themselves as much less
masculine and much more feminine than either of these two managerial stereotypes are perceived.

In order to examine these possibilities, a scale which would be able to identify an individual's standing on both traits was necessary, rather than the present unidimensional, bipolar scales. The Rosenkrantz Sex-Role Stereotype Questionnaire, more than any other available instrument, lends itself to the measurement of masculinity and femininity on separate dimensions. After factor analyzing the 41 stereotypic items of the questionnaire found to discriminate between males and females, the authors extracted two factors which accounted for 61% of the total extractable commonality. These were termed the "competency" cluster and the "warmth—expressiveness" cluster. (See Table 1) The stereotypic image of men was reflected by the "competency" cluster which included attributes such as being independent, objective, active, competent, and ambitious. A relative absence of these traits characterize the stereotypic perceptions of women. On the other hand, the female stereotypic traits reflected in the warmth—expressiveness cluster consist of attributes such as gentle, sensitive to the feelings of others, tactful, religious, neat, interested in art and literature, and able to express tender feelings. Relative to women, men are stereotypically perceived to lack these characteristics, and vice versa. The competency cluster seems to reflect a fairly unitary group of items. Odd/even reliability reported for the competency
## Table 1

**STEREOTYPIC SEX ROLE ITEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence Scale (Masculinity)</th>
<th>Warmth Scale (Femininity)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 very aggressive</td>
<td>14 very talkative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 very independent</td>
<td>26 very tactful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 not at all emotional</td>
<td>27 very gentle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 almost always hides emotions</td>
<td>40 very aware of the feelings of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 very objective</td>
<td>41 very religious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 not at all easily influenced</td>
<td>43 very interested in own appearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 very dominant</td>
<td>51 very neat in habits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 likes math and science very much</td>
<td>52 very quiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 not at all excitable in a minor crisis</td>
<td>63 very strong need for security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 very active</td>
<td>68 enjoys art &amp; literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 very competitive</td>
<td>72 easily expresses tender feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 very logical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 very worldly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 very skilled in business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 very direct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 knows the way of the world</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 feelings not easily hurt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 very adventurous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 can make decisions easily</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 never cries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 almost always acts as a leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 very self-confident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 not at all uncomfortable about being aggressive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 very ambitious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 easily able to separate feelings from ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 not at all dependent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 never conceited about appearance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 thinks men are always superior to women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
cluster is .81 for the male response, .83 for the female response, and .89 for the self response. There is somewhat more variation in the warmth expressiveness items. Correlation is .80, .58, and .72 for the male, female, and self responses respectively.

Thus the Rosenkrantz scale measures male-valued traits and female-valued traits along two separate orthogonal dimensions. Yet when the self-concepts of women are measured on both these clusters, the correlation between the self-concept scores based on the competency cluster and the self-concept scores based on the warmth--expressiveness cluster is low and not significant. That is, women may incorporate masculine stereotypic traits into their self-concepts, but this is not to be interpreted as a shift away from the characteristics of the feminine stereotype (Clarkson, et al. 1970). Women, then, may show both characteristics commonly attributed to males and characteristics commonly attributed to females.

This study used a variation of the Rosenkrantz Sex-Role Stereotype Questionnaire in which a mean score for the masculinity items and a mean score for the femininity items was obtained for each subject, rather than obtaining one mean score for the entire continuum, as Rosenkrantz did when developing the original scale. It examined the effects of sex, status, and form completed on the subjects' scores on two variables--masculinity and femininity--as determined by the Rosenkrantz questionnaire. There were two levels of the status variable--manager and non-manager, and three
levels of form completed—whether the subject rated himself, the male manager stereotype, or the female manager stereotype.

Hypotheses
A. Main Effects
   1. Sex
      a. Based on the work of Rosenkrantz et al. (1968), Spence (1975), Goldberg (1968), Sumner and Johnson (1940), and Ryan (1974) it was hypothesized that males would have higher masculinity ratings than females, whether they were rating themselves, the typical female manager, or the typical male manager.
      b. Based on the work of Rosenkrantz et al. (1968), Spence (1975), McKee and Sherriffs (1957) and Lunneborg (1970) it was hypothesized that females would have higher femininity ratings than males, whether they were rating themselves, the typical male manager, or the typical female manager.

   2. Status
      Based on the work of Schein (1973), it was hypothesized that managers would have higher masculinity ratings than non-managers, whether they were rating themselves, the typical male manager, or the typical female manager.

   3. Form
      a. Based on the work of Lunneborg (1970), Spence (1975), and
Schein (1973) it was hypothesized that there would be a difference between the three forms on femininity. More specifically, the self rating would be highest, the female manager stereotype would be next highest, and the male manager stereotype would be lowest on warmth.

B. Joint Interaction Effect

1. Based on the work of Schein (1973), Morrison and Sebald (1974), and Lunneborg (1970), it was hypothesized that there would be a joint interaction effect of sex, status, and form for the masculinity scale.

2. Also based on the work of Schein (1973), Morrison and Sebald (1974), and Lunneborg (1970), it was hypothesized that there would be a joint interaction effect of sex, status, and form for the femininity scale.

C. Specific Comparisons of Means (LSD test)

1. Based on the work of Gilmer (1961), Schwartz (1971), Spence (1975), Rosenkrantz (1968) and McKee and Sherriffs (1957), it was hypothesized that male managers would rate themselves higher on masculinity than female managers would rate themselves.

2. Based on the work of Morrison and Sebald (1974), Gross and Crovitz (1975), and Schein (1973), it was hypothesized that female managers would be higher than female non-managers on self ratings of masculinity.
3. Based on the work of Schein (1973) the hypothesis was tested that female non-managers would rate themselves higher on femininity than female managers would rate themselves.

4. Based on the work of Rosenkrantz (1968), Lunneborg (1970), and McKee and Sherriffs (1957), it was hypothesized that female managers would be higher than male managers on self-ratings of femininity.

5. Based on the work of Rosenkrantz (1968), Lunneborg (1970), and McKee and Sherriffs (1957), it was hypothesized that male non-managers would rate themselves as higher on masculinity than female managers rate themselves.

6. Also based on the work of Rosenkrantz (1968), Lunneborg (1970), and McKee and Sherriffs (1957), it was hypothesized that female managers would be higher on self-ratings of femininity than male non-managers.

7. Based on the work of Jurgenson (1966, in Siegel and Lane 1974), it was hypothesized that male managers would be higher on masculinity than male non-managers.

8. Based on the work of Jurgenson (1966, in Siegel and Lane 1974), it was hypothesized that male non-managers would rate themselves higher on femininity than male managers rate themselves.

Statistics

The results of the study were analyzed by performing a 2x2x3 analysis of variance on each of the two dependent variables, one on
the masculinity items and one on the femininity items. The independent variables in each analysis were sex of the respondent (male or female), status of the respondent (manager or non-manager), and form completed (whether the respondent rated himself, the male manager stereotype, or the female manager stereotype.) (See Table 2.) In each analysis, the dependent variable consisted of only one score, the masculinity score in one analysis, and the femininity score in the other. Moreover, pre-planned comparisons of particular means were made. The method used for the comparisons was the Least Significant Difference (LSD) test (Snedecor and Cochran 1967). The .05 level of confidence was the level chosen as that below which a finding would be considered significant.

The pre-planned comparisons were made on the following pairs of means for the masculinity items and the femininity items separately:

A. Self Ratings

1. Female managers' rating of themselves vs. male managers' ratings of themselves on masculinity and femininity.

2. Female managers' rating of themselves vs. female non-managers' ratings of themselves on masculinity and femininity.

3. Female managers' ratings of themselves vs. male non-managers' ratings of themselves on masculinity and femininity.

4. Male managers' ratings of themselves vs. male non-managers' ratings of themselves on masculinity and femininity.
B. Stereotype Ratings

5. Female managers' ratings of the male manager stereotype vs. the female manager stereotype on masculinity and femininity.

6. Male managers' ratings of the male manager stereotype vs. the female manager stereotype on masculinity and femininity.

7. Female non-managers' ratings of the male manager stereotype vs. the female manager stereotype on masculinity and femininity.

8. Male non-managers' ratings of the male manager stereotype vs. the female manager stereotype on masculinity and femininity.

C. Self Ratings vs. Stereotype Ratings

9. Female managers' ratings of themselves vs. the female manager stereotype on masculinity and femininity.

10. Female managers' ratings of themselves vs. the male manager stereotype on masculinity and femininity.

11. Male managers' ratings of themselves vs. the female manager stereotype on masculinity and femininity.

12. Male managers' ratings of themselves vs. the male manager stereotype on masculinity and femininity.

Subjects

The subjects were 30 male managers, 30 female managers, 30 male non-managers, and 30 female non-managers drawn from four agencies of the state of Louisiana. As is typical of most governmental agencies in this country, Louisiana has a greater proportion of women in management than the national average of private industry. A
Table 2
Experimental Design for Each Dependent Variable—Masculinity and Femininity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>MMS</th>
<th>FMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self = Self
MMS = Male Manager Stereotype
FMS = Female Manager Stereotype
1975 study (Report of the Division of Human Services) shows that in 1973, 50% of the classified Louisiana labor force were women, an increase of 3% since 1968. Forty-percent of all classified state officials and administrators were female, and 51% of all classified professionals were women. Nevertheless, women still comprise the vast majority of the lower level jobs. For example, women also comprise more than 99% of the category of stenographers. It is evident that women are not reaching the upper level positions in state government, although they are in some management positions. Salary may be one index of this fact: male administrators and officials receive an average monthly salary of $1,099, compared to $810 for females.

Subjects for this study were chosen in the following manner. Those subjects identified as managers met the following criteria: a) they were accountable for a functional portion of the organization, and b) they were responsible for the development and/or approval of organization-wide policy. Male and female managers were matched on organizational level.

Those subjects identified as non-managers were individuals who have no supervisory responsibility. They were matched as closely as possible with the manager sample on a) age and b) educational level.
METHODOLOGY

Subjects were identified by the personnel manager in each agency. They were contacted by the experimenter and given the opportunity to participate in a study of people in government service. If the subject agreed to participate in the study he was asked to complete one form of the Rosenkrantz Sex-Role Stereotype Questionnaire (see appendix). The subject was asked to indicate on a 7-point Likert-type scale the extent to which each item characterizes either (1) the typical male manager, (2) the typical female manager, or (3) him/herself. Each subject was given only one of the three possible forms of the sex-role questionnaire. The questionnaire was completed by the individual at his/her leisure and was picked up by the experimenter the following day.

The subjects were assured that all information was confidential and would be used solely for research purposes. Of course, each individual was offered the opportunity to learn the results of the study and how his individual ratings compared to the rest of the population questioned.

The sex-role questionnaire was scored so that it yielded two scores for each individual: a mean masculinity score of the 28 items which Rosenkrantz found to be rated high for males (the competency cluster); and a mean femininity score of the 11 items which Rosenkrantz found to be rated high for females (the warmth-expressiveness cluster). Each individual subject, then yielded two
scores—one score on the masculine scale and one score on the feminine scale.
Table 3

Subjects’ Age and Educational Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean Age</th>
<th>Number of S's in Each Educational Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Managers</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>high school: 7, some college: 8, college degree: 8, graduate degree: 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Managers</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>high school: 4, some college: 7, college degree: 14, graduate degree: 3, (?) 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Non-Managers</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>grade school: 1, high school: 4, some college: 8, college degree: 10, graduate degree: 4, (?) 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Non-Managers</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>high school: 5, some college: 6, college degree: 15, graduate degree: 3, (?) 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS

A. Main Effects

1. Sex

   a. For the masculinity scale (see Figure 1), sex was found to be a significant main effect at the .01 level of confidence. However, the direction of the difference was the opposite of that predicted. Females responded with higher masculinity ratings, whether they were rating themselves, the typical male manager, or the typical female manager. The mean masculinity rating of females was 49.18 whereas the mean rating for males was 46.74.

   b. For the femininity scale (see Figure 5), sex was not found to be a significant main effect, whether the subjects were rating themselves, the typical male manager or the typical female manager. Females showed an overall rating of 48.59 on femininity, whereas males showed only a slightly lower mean rating of 47.87 (p = .5).

2. Status

   a. Status was found to be a significant main effect (see Figure 2) for masculinity (p = .006). Managers responded with higher masculinity ratings than non-managers, whether they were rating themselves, the typical male manager, or the typical female manager. The mean masculinity rating

1 See Table 3 and 4.
Table 4
Analysis of Variance for the Masculinity Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>214.96</td>
<td>214.96</td>
<td>7.80**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>178.42</td>
<td>178.42</td>
<td>6.48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150.03</td>
<td>150.03</td>
<td>5.45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>450.88</td>
<td>225.44</td>
<td>8.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status x Form</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>188.77</td>
<td>94.38</td>
<td>3.43*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex x Form</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>710.18</td>
<td>355.09</td>
<td>12.89**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status x Sex x Form</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>193.60</td>
<td>96.80</td>
<td>3.51*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (wg)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>2974.80</td>
<td>27.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant at the .05 level
** significant at the .01 level
Table 5
Analysis of Variance for the Femininity Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.47</td>
<td>15.47</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.08</td>
<td>20.08</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>278.70</td>
<td>139.35</td>
<td>4.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status x Form</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>166.99</td>
<td>83.49</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex x Form</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99.35</td>
<td>49.68</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status x Sex x Form</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49.99</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>3475.74</td>
<td>32.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant at the .02 level
for managers was 49.30 whereas the mean rating for non-managers was 46.62.

3. Form

a. For the masculinity scale (see Figure 3), form was found to be a significant main effect ($p = .0008$). Overall, the subjects' ratings of themselves were lower than the subjects' ratings of the typical male manager or the typical female manager. These differences were in the predicted direction. The mean self-rating was 46.41, the mean rating of the typical female manager was 46.78, and the mean rating of the typical male manager was the highest, at 50.70. Thus, subjects saw themselves as much less masculine than the typical male manager, and only slightly less masculine than the typical female manager.

b. For the femininity scale, form was also found to be a significant main effect (see Figure 6). Self-ratings, as predicted, were the highest, with a mean of 50.12, the female manager stereotype was the next highest, with a mean of 48.18, and the male manager stereotype was the lowest, with a mean of 46.39. This difference was found to be significant at the .02 level of confidence. This main effect for form was the only effect found to be significant for the femininity variable.
B. Joint Interaction Effect

1. As predicted for masculinity, the joint interaction effect among the variables of sex, status, and form was found to be significant at the .03 level of confidence (see Figure 4).

2. For the femininity scale (see Figure 7), the joint interaction effect of sex, status, and form was not found to be significant ($p = .53$).

C. Specific Comparisons of Means

1. The self-ratings of female managers on masculinity did not differ significantly from the self-ratings of male managers, although males were predicted to be higher than females. On the contrary, female managers' self-ratings were slightly higher, with a mean of 49.60, whereas the mean of the male managers' self-ratings was 47.79 ($p = .42$).

2. Female managers showed a mean femininity rating of 49.91, and male managers showed a mean femininity rating of 48.34. This difference was not found to be significant.

3. As predicted, female managers were found to have significantly higher self-ratings on masculinity than female non-managers. Female managers' mean masculinity rating of 49.60 was significantly higher than female non-managers' self-rating of 44.18. This difference was significant at the .05 level of confidence.
4. Female managers showed a mean self-rating on femininity of 49.91 whereas female non-managers showed a mean self-rating of 51.55. This difference was not found to be significant.

5. Female managers' self-ratings on masculinity were significantly higher than male non-managers' self-ratings. This difference was predicted, but the direction of the difference was not predicted. Female managers showed a mean self-rating of 49.60, where male non-managers showed a mean of 44.06. This difference is significant at the .05 level.

6. Female managers were not found to differ significantly from male managers on self-ratings of femininity. They showed a mean self-rating on femininity of 49.91, whereas male non-managers showed a mean of 50.68. This difference was not found to be significant.

7. Male managers were not found to be significantly higher than male non-managers on self-ratings of masculinity, although it was predicted that male managers would be higher than male non-managers. Male managers' mean self-rating was 47.79, whereas male non-managers' mean self-rating was 44.06.

8. Male managers and male non-managers did not differ significantly on self-ratings of femininity. Male managers showed a mean femininity rating of 48.34 while male non-managers showed a mean of 50.68.
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RELATED FINDINGS

A. Specific Comparison of Stereotype Means - Masculinity (Competence)

(see Figure 4)

1. Female managers were not found to perceive the typical female manager as significantly different from the typical male manager on masculinity. Female managers rated the typical female manager as 48.16 on masculinity, only slightly lower than female managers' rating of the typical male manager of 50.45 (p = .37).

2. Contrary to the perceptions of female managers, male managers saw the typical male manager as being significantly more masculine than the typical female manager. Male managers rated the typical male manager as 55.26 on masculinity, the highest rating given by any group, compared to the 44.54 on masculinity for the typical female manager. This difference is significant at the .01 level of confidence.

3. Female non-managers also perceive a significant difference between the typical male manager and the typical female manager on ratings of masculinity. However, female non-managers see the typical female manager as significantly higher on ratings of masculinity than the typical male manager. The typical female manager received a masculinity mean of 54.41 as compared with the typical male manager's rating of 48.29. This difference is significant at the .05 level of confidence.
4. Male non-managers seem to agree with male managers in seeing the typical male manager as much more masculine than the typical female manager. Male non-managers' mean masculinity rating for the typical male manager was 48.77, compared to the rating of 40.03 for the typical female manager. This latter rating was the lowest masculinity rating by any group. This difference is significant at the .01 level of confidence.

B. Specific Comparison of Stereotype Means - Femininity (Warmth)

(see Figure 7)

5. Female managers were not found to perceive any significant difference between the typical female manager and the typical male manager on femininity. Female managers rated the typical female manager as 49.24 and the typical male manager as 46.04 on femininity.

6. Male managers also did not perceive the typical male manager to differ significantly from the typical female manager on femininity. Male managers assigned a rating of 50.38 to male managers on the feminine variable, which is slightly higher than their rating of the female manager, which was 46.76.

7. Female non-managers perceived the female manager to be slightly, though not significantly, higher than the male manager on femininity. They rated female managers as 49.77 on femininity while they rated male managers as 45.03 on this variable.
8. Male non-managers also saw the female manager as only slightly more feminine than the male manager. They rated female managers as 46.94 on femininity, while rating the male manager as 44.13 on femininity. This difference also was not significant.

C. Managers' Self vs. Stereotype Ratings - Masculinity (Competence) (see Figure 4)

1. Female managers' self-ratings on masculinity were not found to differ significantly from the ratings female managers assigned to the typical female manager. Female managers' mean self-rating on masculinity was 49.60, while female managers' mean rating of the typical female manager was 48.16. This difference was not found to be significant (p = .5).

2. Female managers also did not rate themselves significantly different from the way female managers rated the typical male manager. Female managers' mean self-rating for masculinity, as stated above, was 49.60, while female managers' ratings of the typical male manager was 50.45. This difference also was not statistically significant (p = .75).

3. As with female managers, male managers also did not rate themselves significantly different from the way they rated the typical female manager on masculinity. Male managers' mean self-rating on masculinity was 47.79, whereas male managers' rating of the typical female manager was only slightly lower, at 44.54. This difference was not statistically significant (p = .18).
4. However, male managers did rate themselves as lower on masculinity than male managers rated the typical male manager. The mean masculinity self-rating for male managers was 47.79 whereas the mean masculinity rating for the typical male manager was 55.26. This difference was significant at the .01 level.

D. Managers' Self vs. Stereotype Ratings - Femininity (Warmth) (see Figure 7)

1. Female managers' self-ratings on femininity did not differ significantly from female managers' perceptions of the typical female manager. They rated themselves as 49.91 on femininity, while they rated the female manager as 49.24 on femininity.

2. Female managers' self-ratings on femininity also did not differ significantly from female managers' ratings of the typical male manager. Their self rating of 49.91 is only slightly higher than their rating of the male manager, which is 46.04.

3. Male managers' ratings of themselves on femininity were not found to be significantly different from male managers' ratings of the typical female manager. Male managers rated the typical female manager as 46.76 on femininity, and their self-rating was 48.34.

4. Male managers also did not see themselves as significantly different from the typical male manager in terms of femininity. They rated the male manager as 50.37 on femininity, while rating themselves as 48.34.
DISCUSSION

The Yin and the Yang--Female Managers

In the eastern Taoist philosophy, the universe moves in the balance of two opposite forces: yin--the feminine creative force, and yang--the masculine, destructive force. In the universe and among those individuals who are a part of it, one finds the actions of these two forces which, though opposite, are part of the same totality. It has been the combination of these two forces in individual lives which has been the subject for the present investigation. The main focus of the study has been to test the hypothesis that women managers incorporate masculine, competent attributes into their self identities no less than male managers, as well as retaining feminine, or warm, characteristics as much as other women. From the results obtained here, it appears that women managers indeed do incorporate qualities of masculinity and competence into their identity as much as male managers do. Male and female managers did not differ in their self-perceptions of masculinity. Yet, women managers see themselves as significantly more masculine than women non-managers see themselves, although women managers did not see themselves as less feminine than women non-managers see themselves. Women managers did not differ from women non-managers in terms of femininity. However, they also do not see themselves as different in terms of femininity from the males in
the study, whether managers or non-managers. It seems that there were no large differences between any of the groups in terms of self-perceived femininity. Males and females, managers and non-managers, all perceived themselves to be fairly similar in terms of warmth, or feminine qualities. Although women managers did not differ from women non-managers, they also did not differ from males in terms of femininity.

In addition to giving some insight into the qualities of masculinity and femininity in women managers as compared to others in the working world, this study also provides further support for the idea that masculinity and femininity are not opposite ends of the same continuum. While the items in the Rosenkrantz Sex-Role Stereotype Questionnaire may all have differentiated between the male and female stereotype and male and female self-perceptions in the standardization sample, in this particular population they did not differentiate between males and females in self-perceptions. When the masculinity and femininity clusters were separated, only those items in the masculinity cluster differentiated between males and females. Those items in the femininity cluster did not differentiate male responses from female responses. This indicates that these two variables are not varying similarly for all people and may not be negatively related for all people, as has been assumed by the general public and several designers of tests to measure masculinity and femininity.
A significant aspect of this study has been the investigation of women managers' self-perceptions, as compared to the self-perceptions of others in the working world. In the masculinity variable, the self-ratings of female managers, although slightly higher than male managers' self-ratings, were not significantly different from male managers' self-ratings. The female managers, then, did not see themselves as significantly less masculine than men managers saw themselves. This lends some support to Day and Stogdill's study (1972) which showed that male and female supervisors differed very little in the methods of supervision which they used. Thus female managers do not seem to see themselves as significantly different in masculinity or in style of supervision from the way male managers see themselves. This finding also appears to be in sharp contrast to the findings of Goldberg (1968), Sumner and Johnson (1940), and Ryan (1974), which indicate that women, even very competent women, see themselves as less competent than men. However, in these studies women were not merely rating themselves, but were directly comparing themselves to a male stereotype. Perhaps competent women will rate themselves as less competent, or masculine, when comparing themselves to a male norm (for example, the male manager). Yet when self-ratings are compared, as in this study, the differences between males and females are minimized.

The present findings also seem to contrast with the attitudes held toward women managers by male executives (Schwartz, 1971;
Gilmer, 1961). These executives viewed women managers to be much less competent than male managers. Similarly, male managers in this study also saw women managers as stereotypically less competent than male managers. Yet when self-perceptions of the male and female manager were compared, no significant differences occurred. In this study and in the previous studies of this stereotypic perception of the female manager, male managers seem to be using their experience of females in general to rate female managers, rather than their experience of managers in general. When rating a female manager, then, on this masculine attribute, the sex of the female manager is much more important than her position. These men see her as more like women in general—that is, stereotypically low in competence—than like managers in general.

It must be remembered that the question was not asked here if women actually are as competent as men. The question asked here concerns only self-perceptions and perceptions of managers. Indeed, male and female managers' self-perceptions do not differ as much as men executives and women, even very competent women, have seen them as differing.

Although women managers did not see themselves as more masculine than male managers, they did see themselves as more masculine than women non-managers saw themselves. This is not surprising since managers in general are seen as possessing characteristics more similar to those of men than of women
Schein (1973). This finding is also consistent with Morrison and Sebald's (1974) data indicating that female executives differed from female non-executives in having a greater need for power, higher self esteem, and greater intellectual capabilities, all characteristics included in the competence cluster. Thus, masculinity, or competence, seems to differentiate between managers and non-managers for the female population in this study. Yet masculinity did not differentiate between managers and non-managers for the male subjects. This suggests that a female's status may be a greater factor in predicting her own self-perception of masculinity than is her sex.

Although masculinity differentiated between female managers and non-managers, femininity did not. This also supports Morrison and Sebald's idea that women executives may not differ from women non-executives in attributes generally considered feminine. However, these women managers also did not differ on femininity from males in the study. This particular addition clouds the issue somewhat and will be discussed in the section entitled "Femininity, or warmth, as a generally desirable characteristic."

Stereotypic Perceptions of Female Managers

One interesting finding is the difference each group of subjects perceived between the competence, or masculinity, of the typical male and the typical female manager. It appears that there is definitely a sex bias operating in favor of the respondent's own sex for the masculinity variable but not for the femininity variable.
This seems to be similar to the age-old phenomenon commonly known as "the war between the sexes." Males, both managers and non-managers, rated the typical male manager as significantly more masculine than the typical female manager. They saw male managers, then, as possessing qualities such as independence, aggressiveness, dominance, and the ability to make logical decisions much more than female managers do. Female managers were the only group of subjects who did not perceive any significant difference between the typical male manager and the typical female manager. Female managers rated the male manager as only slightly more masculine than the female manager. In fact, it appears that the significant joint interaction effect for masculinity may be due in large part to these differing perceptions of the masculinity of the female manager. Self-perceptions and perceptions of the typical male manager, although differing from group to group, are basically parallel between the groups. But perceptions of the female manager varied much more widely. This trend also seemed to be a large part of the main effect for sex. Males, both manager and non-manager, rated the female manager very low, while female non-managers rated her very high. Thus, males were found to have lower overall masculinity ratings.

For the males, these findings seem to be consistent with the negative attitudes toward women executives previously reported by Bowman, Wortney and Greyser (1965). In these studies, male executives were found to view the female as temperamentally unfit for management.
Gilmer (1961) similarly reported that 63% of the male managers she questioned felt women supervisors to be inferior to men. Basil (1974) has also found that a high proportion of firms consider women to be unsuitable for management. All these findings, and those in the present study, may be similar because the managers questioned were rating the stereotype of the female manager. The subjects here seem to feel that the stereotypic female manager is less objective, active, logical, and self-confident than the stereotypic male manager. Thus it can be concluded that men's stereotypic perceptions toward the woman manager have not changed a great deal over the last fifteen years.

On the other hand, women non-managers see women managers as significantly more competent, or masculine, than they see male managers. This may contradict the notion that women are prejudiced against women, as Goldberg (1968) has stated. Although female non-managers were not asked if they would like to work for a woman, or whether they liked these traits in a woman, they did seem to feel that she is more objective, active, logical, and self-confident than they felt the male manager was. Perhaps one explanation for this rating by female non-managers is that they may believe that women have to be extraordinarily masculine and competent in order to be managers. In their working experience they may have known few women managers. This may augment, then, their perception that women have to be very masculine in order to gain management status. Men, being less personally invested in observing women who have become successful, may not be as personally
aware of these issues and may continue to operate under stereotypic perceptions of women.

These findings may be viewed by some as examples of the "war between the sexes." This term denotes the tendency for men to see men more positively than women, and for women to see women more positively than men. In this study, subjects tended to see their own sex more favorably in terms of masculinity than they saw the opposite sex, or the way the opposite sex saw them. A possible explanation for this phenomenon may involve the familiarity each group of subjects has with the role of the female manager. Male managers, having experienced the role of manager, know the requirements of that role. However, they have not experienced being in the role of a woman; thus, they see women managers more in the role of women than in the role of managers, since it is in this role that they differ. Consequently they rely on the stereotype of women in general for their perceptions of the woman manager. They see women managers, then, as much less masculine than male managers. Male non-managers, also, are somewhat familiar with the role of manager, since managers are perceived as having qualities characteristic of men. Yet they too are unfamiliar with the role of women and perceive women managers along stereotypic lines, as less masculine than male managers. However, the woman non-manager is familiar with the role of women but is unfamiliar with the role of manager. Her unique view of the woman manager perceives the difference between herself and the woman manager as being in terms of the managerial role, one which is typically thought of as masculine.
She, then, exaggerates this particular aspect of the woman manager's personality and sees her as very masculine, more masculine even than the male manager.

Women managers themselves are familiar with both the role of manager and the role of women in general. Consequently the role of the typical female manager is not a mystery to them, and they have experiences in this role which probably present a more realistic picture of how women managers perceive themselves. In fact, the women managers' perceptions of themselves differed only a very small amount from the women managers' perceptions of the typical female manager.

**Stereotypic Perceptions of Male Managers**

When rating the typical male manager, subjects also differed, although not to such a great extent as when rating the female manager. Male managers, especially, differed from the other groups in seeing the typical male manager as highly masculine. Although this difference was not tested for significance, male managers did rate the typical male manager as higher than any group was rated. This seems to indicate that male managers perceive a standard of masculinity for themselves which is higher than they expect to reach. This is further evidenced by the fact that male managers' perception of the typical male manager is significantly higher than male managers' self-perceptions. On the other hand, women managers did not rate the male manager as higher on masculinity than women managers rated themselves. It appears, then, that at least in
male managers' eyes, the stereotype of a very masculine manager still exists. As Ryan (1973) and Rosenkrantz (1968) point out, men seem to feel that they do not live up to their own idealized perception of masculinity. Male managers may feel that they must always strive to achieve this unattainably high standard and consequently experience stress and anxiety when unable to do so, provoking the high levels of ulcers and heart disease found in that population.

This high rating of the masculinity of managers extends to the rest of the population, although not to such a great extent as rated by male managers. Overall, the subjects rated the male manager as more masculine than the female manager was rated, or than either male or female self-perceptions were rated. This is evidenced in the significant main effect for form for the masculinity variable (p = .0008). Subjects rated the typical male manager as the most masculine, the female manager as the next most masculine, and the self as least masculine.

These findings are consistent with Schein's work which revealed the significant resemblance between ratings of men in general and managers, whereas there is little resemblance between ratings of women in general and managers. That is, managers are seen as more masculine than they are feminine. Thus, for men the management stereotype is sex-role appropriate, a stereotype including being competent, logical, assertive, and generally self-confident and knowledgeable. The female manager is seen, consequently, as somewhat less masculine, since this stereotype is not sex-role
appropriate for women. Yet she still is seen as having more of these characteristics than the average person sees himself as having, since she has actually attained management status.

Self-perceptions, whether of males or females, were rated lowest in terms of masculinity. Females would be expected to rate themselves lower on this dimension than they would rate the female or the male manager. But males also rated themselves as less masculine than the average male manager or female manager rated himself. Rosenkrantz (1968) similarly found that men and women alike rate themselves as significantly less masculine than men in general were rated. Ryan (1973) found a similar trend, that men would predict that they would not perform as well as the norm for men dictated.

Conversely, male managers were perceived as the least feminine, the female manager next, and the individuals' self ratings were the highest on femininity. This is evidenced by the significant main effect for the femininity variable. Since managers, especially male managers, are stereotypically seen as very masculine, then it follows that they should be perceived as least feminine since these characteristics are stereotypically seen as opposite. Women managers, seen as a little less masculine, are, consequently, seen as a little more feminine, and self-perceptions, which are the least in terms of masculinity, are the greatest in terms of femininity.

Although subjects overall rated the male manager as the most masculine, non-managers tended to rate him as less masculine than
either male or female managers rated him. Although this difference
was not tested for significance, a trend seems to emerge in this
vein. Perhaps managers see the stereotyped male managers as
masculine in order to bring into consonance their feelings about
their own masculinity and their identification with the managerial
stereotype. Managers probably have a great investment in their
masculinity, or competence, and, consequently, an investment in the
masculinity of others who are like them. Yet non-managers do not
have this great an investment in perceiving the male manager as
competent. Thus non-managers' ratings of the male manager are
somewhat lower.

Additionally, managers overall tended to rate themselves,
the female manager, and the male manager as higher on masculinity
than non-managers rated them. This is evidenced in the significant
main effect for status. Except for the low rating given to the
female manager by the male managers, this is generally true. The
investment managers seem to feel in their own masculinity and that
of others who are like them has been mentioned above.

Femininity as a Generally Desirable Characteristic

On the femininity variable, each group of subjects did not
see themselves, the male manager, or the female manager as different
from the way the other groups saw themselves, the male manager, or
the female manager. In fact, the entire range of femininity scores
on self-perception was less than four points. (On the LSD test in
this analysis, two means must differ by 5.03 points to be significant
at the .05 level of confidence.)

It is possible that the sample used in this study differed from the original sample used by Rosenkrantz to construct this scale. In the Rosenkrantz sample, some of the female respondents were not presently employed (i.e., the sample consisted of college students and their mothers). This sample may be contrasted with the present sample in which all the women were full-time, paid employees. Thus, we may expect that the original female sample would score higher on the feminine dimension of warmth than our present sample, whose identity is more work-oriented than sex-role oriented. Similarly, the males in the present sample, like the females, were Civil Service employees. Characteristic of Civil Service employment is both its relative security and its greater opportunity for one to be involved in personal interactive positions such as social service agencies. Both of these characteristics are given weight in the warmth dimension of the Rosenkrantz scale (i.e., need for security and level of one's personal interactive skills). Thus, for this reason, men employed in Civil Service positions, as were those used in this study, may differ on this dimension from the men used in the original sample.

Another possible explanation for the tendency for all the groups of subjects to perceive themselves similarly on the warmth dimension may be in the questionnaire itself. Rosenkrantz found that, although the items on this dimension differentiated both between the stereotype of women and men and between self-ratings of women and men, men appeared to reserve for men those masculine traits
which are socially desirable for adults in general, but they also ascribed 40% of the desirable feminine characteristics as being equally desirable for men. That is, the men in his study considered masculine traits inappropriate for women, but they did not consider all the feminine traits as being inappropriate for men. In fact, 40% of the feminine traits were considered equally desirable for men as for women. Perhaps the men in this study were responding to those items which are socially desirable for adults in general as much as the women did.

The most plausible explanation for the similarities among groups on the femininity variable seems to be that the feminine dimension may be one which most people feel they can rate highly on, whereas not all feel they can rate highly on masculinity. This may be due to the standards considered desirable for adults in our society. The masculine standard may be one that not all people feel they can live up to. Indeed, men and masculine characteristics are more highly valued in our society than are women and feminine characteristics (Rosenkrantz 1968). These competence qualities may be seen as those which help people to be successful and productive. The stereotypical feminine standard is one which, perhaps because of its lesser perceived economic value, most people in the working world feel they can live up to. Therefore, working people rate themselves as similar in femininity, perceiving this particular dimension to be generally desirable, but not economically necessary. In fact, one of the strongest points made by the women's liberation movement has been the devaluation of the work women traditionally do, such as
raising a family. The task of raising children is one which requires nurturance and warmth, yet housewives are not generally paid for raising their own children. Feminine qualities do not command as much status and economic gain as do masculine qualities. Hence working people, who differ in terms of perceived status and probably compensation, might also differ in the amount of masculinity they perceived themselves as having. Yet, they might not be expected to differ in terms of femininity, since this quality is not seen as influencing to a great extent status or compensation in the organization.

Masculinity and Femininity as Separate Dimensions

The present study has provided some further support for the idea that masculinity and femininity may not be opposite ends of the same continuum for all people. When the warmth and competence clusters were separated, only those items in the competence cluster differentiated between groups on self-perceptions, whereas warmth items did not. If these two had not been separated, valuable information concerning individuals' relative standings on these variables would have been obscured. This may indicate that the two variables are not varying similarly for all people, and may not be negatively related for all people in their self-perceptions.

However, stereotypic perceptions of masculinity and femininity may be a different matter. As mentioned previously, a significant main effect for form was found for both masculinity and femininity. In fact these main effects varied in opposite directions. The self-
ratings were highest on femininity and lowest on masculinity. Male managers' ratings were highest on masculinity and lowest on femininity. Stereotypic perceptions of masculinity and femininity are seen as opposite extremes, while self-ratings were much more moderate.

From viewing the data on both variables, although the two were not directly compared in this study, it seems that male and female non-managers were lowest in self-ratings of masculinity and highest in self-ratings of femininity, both being very similar (see Figure 8). Male and female managers, although not quite as similar as non-managers, were, nevertheless, somewhat similar on these dimensions. They had more masculinity and less femininity than non-managers, but a more equal amount of both than had non-managers. This might point toward a hypothesis that managers are more androgynous than non-managers, having more equal amounts of both masculinity and femininity. Non-managers, then, may be more strongly sex-role stereotypic than managers. This would be consistent with Spence's (1975) finding that more successful people tend to be androgynous, whereas less successful people are more strongly sex-typed. This possibility could not be investigated unless masculinity and femininity are considered on two dimensions rather than opposite ends of the same bipolar dimension.
Figure 8

Relationship Between Masculinity and Femininity for Self Ratings

Variables

Self Ratings
Suggestions for Future Research

It is suggested for future research that the number of items included in the femininity scale be enlarged, to obtain a more comprehensive assessment of the traits included in the feminine dimension. In addition, the study might well be replicated in a setting other than civil service, to rule out particular organizational effects that might influence ratings. This may be somewhat more difficult, since women managers are much more scarce in private industry. Future research in the masculinity/femininity of managers should also compare these two dimensions more directly than the present study did. For example, it is possible that these two dimensions may be positively related overall, as has been suggested by Broverman, yet for some populations the two may be more positively related than for others. The concept of androgyny, initially investigated by Bem, may also be a useful tool in the examination of the masculinity/femininity of managers. The method for determining androgyny developed by Spence et al. (1975) is one suggested here. Spence divided subjects into four quadrants based on scores on masculinity and on femininity. The subjects were high masculine-low feminine, low masculine-high feminine, low masculine-low feminine, or high masculine-high feminine. Those who possessed the highest degree of both masculinity and femininity showed the highest self esteem. It would be interesting to use this method of determining androgyny in the organizational setting. It might be hypothesized that managers, particularly female managers, would fall in the high
androgyne quadrant, showing both a high degree of both masculinity as well as femininity.

Future studies could also shed some light on the issue of whether or not exposure to women managers changes stereotypic perceptions over time. The present study has shown that, at least in the governmental sector, opinions of women managers, men managers, women non-managers, and men non-managers toward the female manager differ greatly. If positive opinions and attitudes toward women managers increase when workers have worked for or with a woman manager, then one might expect the generally negative stereotyped perceptions males seem to have toward women managers would change gradually to a more positive one as women move more into management ranks.
SUMMARY

The present study examined the effects of sex (male or female), status (manager or non-manager), and form (whether the subjects were rating themselves, the typical male manager, or the typical female manager) on how people see themselves and managers in terms of competence—a masculinity dimension, and warmth—a femininity dimension. Masculinity and femininity in the past have been assumed to be opposite ends of the same continuum, measurable by a single set of items yielding one score. Consequently a subject would either be high on one or the other, or in the middle. He could not be high on both. This assumption of the unidimensionality of the masculinity/femininity concept has been criticized recently by several investigators. Several studies have indicated that masculinity and femininity are at least two separate dimensions, which may even be positively related to each other.

This study used the Rosenkrantz Sex-Role Stereotype Questionnaire to obtain scores on these dimensions. However, each subject received two scores instead of one, as the questionnaire was originally scored. Those items, the socially desirable pole of which was considered to be generally feminine, were separated from those which were seen as generally masculine. Each subject received a score on each of the two dimensions. When these clusters were separated it was expected that a subjects' scores on these dimensions would
depend not only on the subject's sex, but also his/her status, and whether he was rating himself, the male manager, or the female manager.

The main focus of the study was to investigate the possibility that women managers could incorporate masculine aspects into their personalities as men managers do, yet retain the feminine aspects of their personalities as other women do. Female managers were not expected to differ significantly from male managers on masculinity but it was felt that they would rate themselves as significantly more masculine than the female non-manager would rate herself. Female managers were also expected to be significantly higher than male managers on femininity, but not significantly different from female non-managers on femininity.

It was also hypothesized that, overall, males and managers would see themselves, the typical male manager, and the typical female manager as more masculine than females and non-managers, respectively, would see themselves. A stereotype of the manager was also hypothesized in which the male manager would be perceived as the most masculine, the female manager next, and the self-rating lowest on masculinity. On the femininity dimension it was hypothesized that females would have higher overall femininity ratings than males. Self-ratings were expected to be highest on femininity, the female manager next, and the male manager lowest on femininity. Additionally, the stereotypical perception of the male and female manager were compared, and self-perceptions were also compared to these stereotypes.

Subjects were 30 female managers, 30 male managers, 30 female
non-managers, and 30 male non-managers drawn from four agencies of the state of Louisiana. Male and female managers were matched on organizational level and were considered middle-level managers. Managers were matched with non-managers on age educational level. Each subject was contacted by the experimenter and, if he agreed to participate, was given one of three forms to complete. He/she was asked either to rate him/herself, the male manager, or the female manager on 82 bipolar dimensions. Subjects received two scores on the questionnaire—one for the dependent variable, masculinity, and one for the dependent variable, femininity. The results were analyzed using a 2x2x3 factorial analysis of variance for each dependent variable. The independent variables in each analysis were sex (male or female), status (manager or non-manager) and form (self, the male manager, or the female manager). Specific comparisons of cell means were made using the Least Significant Difference (LSD) test.

Results for the masculinity variable showed significant main effects for sex, status, and form, and also a significant joint interaction effect of these variables. Females and managers responded with higher masculinity ratings, whether they were rating themselves, the male manager, or the female manager. Overall, as predicted, the male manager was rated highest in masculinity, the female manager next highest, and the self-ratings were lowest for masculinity. For the femininity variable, form was the only effect found to be significant. As predicted, self-ratings were highest, and ratings for the male manager were lowest on femininity.
The results also indicated that women managers may, indeed, incorporate masculine qualities into their personalities while retaining feminine qualities. No significant differences were found between the self-ratings of female and male managers. However, women managers were significantly higher on masculinity than were women non-managers. In addition no significant difference was found between women managers and women non-managers on femininity. However, women managers were also not found to differ significantly from males, whether managers or non-managers, in terms of femininity. The subjects overall tended to see themselves similarly on the femininity dimension.

Surprisingly, male managers were not found to differ significantly from male non-managers in terms of masculinity. Thus, it seems that for men, the degree of masculinity is not a salient factor in differentiating managers from non-managers, while it seems to be a differentiating factor for females.

One interesting finding was the wide differences between groups when rating the female manager. It appears that there is definitely a sex bias operating in favor of the respondent's own sex when comparing the typical male and female managers. Males, both managers and non-managers, rated the typical male manager as significantly more masculine than the typical female manager. On the other hand, female non-managers perceived her to be much more masculine than the male manager. Female managers themselves were
the only group of subjects who did not perceive a significant
difference between the two. These findings are consistent with
previous studies which revealed negative perceptions of women
managers by men executives. It seems that men are still operating
under stereotypic perceptions of women in general, seeing them as
low in masculinity, while women non-managers may believe women mana-
gers have to be extraordinarily masculine in order to be managers.
This was explained in terms of the familiarity each group of subjects
has with the role of the female manager.

Another interesting finding is that male managers see
themselves as less masculine than they believe the typical male
manager to be, while females do not perceive this difference. Thus,
in men managers' eyes, the stereotype of the super-masculine manager
exists. This finding is consistent with previous findings which
have suggested that men feel that they do not live up to an idealized
view of masculinity, while women do not have such an exaggerated
perception of masculinity. It seems that working men are still
operating under traditional sex-role stereotypes, while working women
are perceiving less differences between men and women than are stereo-
typically seen.

Yet this stereotype of the male manager extends to the rest
of the population, although not to such a great extent as for the
male managers themselves. The stereotypic male manager emerged as the
most masculine and the least feminine of all, while people perceived
themselves to be the least masculine and most feminine. This seems to indicate that the male norm is one that most people do not feel that they can attain. However, most people feel they can live up to and probably surpass the norm for females, feeling they can be as warm as most other people. Masculinity, then, may be seen as necessary for success and economic gain, whereas femininity may not be seen as so crucial. Thus femininity may be seen as generally socially desirable for people in the working world, and most people feel they can achieve this. But the standard of masculinity held up for our society seems to be so high that most people, men and women alike, do not feel they can achieve it.

It is surprising that the masculinity cluster differentiated between groups of subjects on self-perception, while the femininity cluster did not. Although the two variables were not directly compared in this study, it seems that they may be varying differently for different populations. While for non-managers the two may be negatively related, it seems that for managers the two may be positively related. Thus masculinity and femininity do not appear to be negatively related for all people, and valuable information would have been lost if they had not been measured separately. The evidence in this study, then, lends additional support to the hypothesis that masculinity and femininity may be at least two separate dimensions which may be positively related for some populations.
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We would like to know something about what people are like. For example, to what extent do you like or dislike the color red? On each scale, put a slash (/) according to what you are like.

For example:

Strong dislike for the color red 1 ........ 2 ........ 3 ........ 4 ........ 5 ........ 6 ........ 7

Strong liking for the color red 8 ........ 9 ........ 10........

On the following pages are a number of scales like the one above. Please place a slash according to what you are like. You may put your slash anywhere on the scale, not just on the numbers. PLEASE BE SURE TO MARK EVERY ITEM.
We would like to know something about what people expect other people to be like. Imagine that you are going to meet someone for the first time, and the only thing you know in advance is that he is a male manager. What sort of things would you expect? For example, what would you expect about his liking or disliking the color red? On each scale, please put a slash (/) according to what you think a male manager is like.

For example:

Strong dislike for the color red 1........2........3........4........5........6........7 Strong liking for the color red

On the following pages are a number of scales like the one above. Please place a slash according to what you expect a male manager to be like. You may put your slash anywhere on the scale, not just on the numbers. PLEASE BE SURE TO MARK EVERY ITEM.
We would like to know something about what people expect other people to be like. Imagine that you are going to meet someone for the first time, and the only thing you know in advance is that she is a female manager. What sort of things would you expect? For example, what would you expect about her liking or disliking the color red? On each scale, please put a slash (/) according to what you think a female manager is like.

For example:

Strong dislike for the color red 1........2........3........4........5........6........7 Strong liking for the color red

On the following pages are a number of scales like the one above. Please place a slash according to what you expect a female manager to be like. You may put your slash anywhere on the scale, not just on the numbers. PLEASE BE SURE TO MARK EVERY ITEM.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Numbers (1 to 7)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not at all aggressive</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7</td>
<td>Very aggressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Very irrational</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7</td>
<td>Very rational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Very practical</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7</td>
<td>Very impractical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Not at all independent</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7</td>
<td>Very independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Not at all consistent</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7</td>
<td>Very consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Very emotional</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7</td>
<td>Not at all emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very realistic</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7</td>
<td>Not at all realistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Not at all idealistic</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7</td>
<td>Very idealistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Does not hide emotions at all</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7</td>
<td>Almost always hides emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Very subjective</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7</td>
<td>Very objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mainly interested in details</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7</td>
<td>Mainly interested in generalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Always thinks before acting</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7</td>
<td>Never thinks before acting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Not at all easily influenced</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7</td>
<td>Very easily influenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Not at all talkative</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Very grateful</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Doesn't mind at all when things are not clear</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Very dominant</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Dislikes math and science very much</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Not at all reckless</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Not at all excitable in a major crisis</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Not at all excitable in a minor crisis</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Not at all strict</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Very weak personality</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Very active</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Not at all able to devote self completely to others</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Very blunt</td>
<td>1...7</td>
<td>Very tactful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Very gentle</td>
<td>1...7</td>
<td>Very rough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Very helpful to others</td>
<td>1...7</td>
<td>Not at all helpful to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Not at all competitive</td>
<td>1...7</td>
<td>Very competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Very logical</td>
<td>1...7</td>
<td>Very illogical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Not at all competent</td>
<td>1...7</td>
<td>Very competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Very wordly</td>
<td>1...7</td>
<td>Very home oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Not at all skilled in business</td>
<td>1...7</td>
<td>Very skilled in business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Very direct</td>
<td>1...7</td>
<td>Very sneaky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Knows the way of the world</td>
<td>1...7</td>
<td>Does not know the way of the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Not at all kind</td>
<td>1...7</td>
<td>Very kind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Not at all willing to accept change</td>
<td>1...7</td>
<td>Very willing to accept change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Feelings not easily hurt</td>
<td>1...7</td>
<td>Feelings easily hurt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Not at all adventurous</td>
<td>Very adventurous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Very aware of the feelings of others</td>
<td>Not at all aware of the feelings of others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Not at all religious</td>
<td>Very religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Not at all intelligent</td>
<td>Very intelligent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Not at all interested in own appearance</td>
<td>Very interested in own appearance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Can easily make decisions</td>
<td>Has difficulty making decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Gives up very easily</td>
<td>Never gives up easily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Very shy</td>
<td>Very outgoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Always does things without being told</td>
<td>Never does things without being told</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Never cries</td>
<td>Cries very easily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Almost never acts as a leader</td>
<td>Almost always acts as a leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Trait</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Never worried</td>
<td>1..................2..................3..................4..................5..................6..................7 Always worried</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Very neat in habits</td>
<td>1..................2..................3..................4..................5..................6..................7 Very sloppy in habits'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Very quiet</td>
<td>1..................2..................3..................4..................5..................6..................7 Very loud</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Not at all intellectual</td>
<td>1..................2..................3..................4..................5..................6..................7 Very intellectual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Very careful</td>
<td>1..................2..................3..................4..................5..................6..................7 Very careless</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Not at all self-confident</td>
<td>1..................2..................3..................4..................5..................6..................7 Very self-confident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Feels very superior</td>
<td>1..................2..................3..................4..................5..................6..................7 Feels very inferior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Always sees self</td>
<td>1..................2..................3..................4..................5..................6..................7 Never sees self running the show</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as running the show</td>
<td>1..................2..................3..................4..................5..................6..................7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Not at all uncomfortable</td>
<td>1..................2..................3..................4..................5..................6..................7 Very uncomfortable about being aggressive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>about being aggressive</td>
<td>1..................2..................3..................4..................5..................6..................7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Very good sense of humor</td>
<td>1..................2..................3..................4..................5..................6..................7 Very poor sense of humor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Not at all understanding</td>
<td>1..................2..................3..................4..................5..................6..................7 Very understanding of others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of others</td>
<td>1..................2..................3..................4..................5..................6..................7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Very warm in relations</td>
<td>1..................2..................3..................4..................5..................6..................7 Very cold in relations with others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with others</td>
<td>1..................2..................3..................4..................5..................6..................7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Doesn't care about being</td>
<td>1..................2..................3..................4..................5..................6..................7 Greatly prefers being in a group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in a group</td>
<td>1..................2..................3..................4..................5..................6..................7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Very little need for</td>
<td>1..................2..................3..................4..................5..................6..................7 Very strong need for security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>security</td>
<td>1..................2..................3..................4..................5..................6..................7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Rating Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Not at all ambitious</td>
<td>Very ambitious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Very rarely takes extreme positions</td>
<td>Very frequently takes extreme positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Able to separate feelings from ideas</td>
<td>Unable to separate feelings from ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Not at all dependent</td>
<td>Very dependent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Does not enjoy art and literature at all</td>
<td>Enjoys art and literature very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Seeks out new experience</td>
<td>Avoids new experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Not at all restless</td>
<td>Very restless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Very uncomfortable when people express emotions</td>
<td>Not at all uncomfortable when people express emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. Easily expresses tender feelings</td>
<td>Does not express tender feelings easily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. Very conceited about appearance</td>
<td>Never conceited about appearance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. Retiring</td>
<td>Forward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. Thinks men are superior to women</td>
<td>Does not think men are superior to women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. Very sociable</td>
<td>Not at all sociable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
77. Very affectionate
1........2........3........4........5........6........7
Not at all affectionate

78. Very conventional
1........2........3........4........5........6........7
Not at all conventional

79. Very masculine
1........2........3........4........5........6........7
Not at all masculine

80. Very feminine
1........2........3........4........5........6........7
Not at all feminine

81. Very assertive
1........2........3........4........5........6........7
Not at all assertive

82. Very impulsive
1........2........3........4........5........6........7
Not at all impulsive
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