

## 5

# Social Role Theory of Sex Differences and Similarities: A Current Appraisal

Alice H. Eagly  
*Northwestern University*

Wendy Wood  
*Texas A&M University*

Amanda B. Diekman  
*Northwestern University*

Social role theory originated as an effort to understand the causes of sex differences and similarities in social behavior. In the 1980s when the theory emerged, many research psychologists had begun to use meta-analytic methods to aggregate research findings bearing on the issue of whether female and male behavior differs (Eagly, 1987). These researchers had to come to terms with the persisting presence of differences in these data. Although these differences were typically not large (Eagly, 1995, 1997a; Hyde, 1996), they were often large enough to be consequential, particularly in view of the substantial cumulative impact that small differences can have if repeatedly enacted over a period of time (Abelson, 1985; Martell, Lane, & Emrich, 1995). The more accurate description of sex differences and similarities produced by quantitative reviewing, compared with earlier narrative reviewing (e.g., Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974), allowed more systematic examination of important issues such as the variation of differences and similarities across situations. More valid descriptions

brought a flowering of theory, as some researchers were inspired to renew their efforts to develop theories that explain the intriguing patterns of difference and similarity present in psychological findings (e.g., Ashmore & Del Boca, 1986; Beall & Sternberg, 1993; Deaux & Major, 1987).

Psychologists benefited as well from the growth of knowledge about the beliefs that people hold about women and men—work that began in the 1950s (McKee & Sherriffs, 1957; Sherriffs & McKee, 1957) and intensified in the 1970s (e.g., Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz, 1972; Spence & Helmreich, 1978). This research on gender stereotypes made it clear that perceivers have a highly elaborated set of associations concerning men and women and believe in a range of overall differences between these groups. This stereotype research raised questions concerning the accuracy of these beliefs and the processes by which perceivers derive them and apply them in everyday social interaction.

As the scientific literature on sex differences and similarities began to mature in the 1980s in the wake of the prior decade's research on gender stereotypes, it became apparent that there is something of a match between the differences revealed in the scientific literature and the beliefs that perceivers hold about differences, despite the traditional depiction of stereotypes by social scientists as inaccurate portrayals of groups (Allport, 1954). Fueled by social psychologists' increasing knowledge of the power of expectancies to produce behavior that confirms them (see review by Olson, Roese, & Zanna, 1996), social role theory evolved in part from the observation of this match between the content of the ideas people have about women and men and scientifically documented sex differences in social behavior and personality. This theory argues that the beliefs that people hold about the sexes are derived from observations of the role performances of men and women and thus reflect the sexual division of labor and gender hierarchy of the society. In their abstract and general form, these beliefs constitute gender roles, which, through a variety of mediating processes, foster real differences in behavior.

Another important influence on our social role theory of sex differences and similarities is the sociological tradition of studying social roles—analyses that extend back to the classic role theorists such as Georg Simmel, George Herbert Mead, Ralph Linton, and Jacob Moreno (see Biddle, 1979, 1986). This tradition is wide ranging and encompasses many different types of research. Of specific relevance to gender roles is the functional analysis of role differentiation in the family proposed by Parsons and Bales (1955). These theorists observed a traditional division of labor between husbands and wives that they described in terms of male instrumental specialization and female expressive specialization. They also observed a presumably analogous division of responsibility in all-male groups between task leaders and social emotional leaders. Moreover, in mixed-sex groups men, more

than women, tended to specialize in behaviors related to task accomplishment, and women, more than men, in behaviors related to group maintenance and other distinctively social concerns (Strodtbeck & Mann, 1956). These commonalities led these early functional theorists to reason that families and small groups produce role differentiation along instrumental and expressive lines that is functionally necessary to harmonious social interaction. This analysis has been justifiably criticized for its assumption that complementary male and female roles are necessary to a smoothly functioning society (Connell, 1995; Lopata & Thorne, 1978) and its lack of emphasis on status and power differences between the sexes (Howard & Hollander, 1997; Meeker & Weitzel-O'Neill, 1977, 1985).

In our social role theory of sex differences and similarities, the concept of gender role is stripped from its functionalist moorings by recognizing that it is not inherent in the construct of gender roles that they be complementary or have particular expressive or instrumental content. Also, our analysis does not assume that personal adjustment or harmonious social interaction require gender roles that have the content assumed by Parsons and Bales (1955). However, in the spirit of Parsons and Bales' analysis, our theory assumes that gender roles reflect a society's distributions of men and women into breadwinner and homemaker roles and into occupations. Moreover, as we argue in this chapter, expectations about women and men necessarily reflect status and power differences to the extent that women and men are positioned in a gender hierarchy. Freed from the nonessential aspects of the Parsons and Bales framework, postulating gender roles correctly recognizes that cultures feature shared expectations for the appropriate conduct of men and women and that these expectations foster sex-differentiated behavior. Moreover, social role theory treats gender roles as a dynamic aspect of culture that changes in response to alterations of the typical work and family roles of the sexes. To explicate this approach, this chapter begins with a summary of the theory and then provides detailed discussion of some of the theory's components, combined with review of relevant empirical literature.

## SOCIAL ROLE THEORY

According to social role theory, the differences in the behavior of women and men that are observed in psychological studies of social behavior and personality originate in the contrasting distributions of men and women into social roles (Eagly, 1987, 1997b). As the division of labor is realized in the United States and many other nations, women perform more domestic work than men and spend fewer hours in paid employment (Shelton, 1992). Although most women in the United States are employed in the paid workforce, they have lower wages than men, are concentrated in different

occupations, and are rarely at the highest levels of organizational hierarchies (Jacobs, 1989; Tomaskovic-Devey, 1995; Valian, 1998). Also, in contemporary American society and in most other societies, women have less power, status, and resources (Rhoadie, 1989). This aspect of social structure is often denoted by terms such as gender hierarchy or patriarchy. From a social structural perspective, these features of social organization, in particular the sexual division of labor and gender hierarchy, are the root cause of sex-differentiated behavior.

The sex differences that commonly occur in social behavior follow from the typical characteristics of roles commonly held by women versus men. One principle governing these differences follows from the differing balance of activities associated with the typical roles of each sex. Women and men adjust to sex-typical roles by acquiring the specific skills and resources linked to successful role performance and by adapting their social behavior to role requirements. A variety of sex-differentiated skills and beliefs arise from the typical family and economic roles of men and women. Although in many contemporary societies, especially industrial countries, these roles can be described as resource provider and homemaker, the roles of women and men that are modal in a society have taken a wide variety of forms when they are viewed cross-culturally (Murdock & Provost, 1973). Women and men seek to accommodate to the roles that are available to them in their society by acquiring role-related skills; for example, in the presence of a homemaker-provider division of labor, women and girls learn domestic skills such as cooking and sewing, and men and boys learn skills that are marketable in the paid economy. The types of social behavior that typify the homemaker-provider division of labor have been characterized in terms of the distinction between communal and agentic characteristics (Bakan, 1966; Eagly, 1987). Thus, women's accommodation to the domestic role fosters a pattern of interpersonally facilitative and friendly behaviors that can be termed communal. Particularly important in encouraging communal behaviors is the assignment of the majority of childrearing to women, a responsibility that requires nurturant behaviors that facilitate care for children and other dependent individuals. The importance of close relationships to women's nurturing role favors the acquisition of superior interpersonal skills and ability to communicate nonverbally. In contrast, men's accommodation to the employment role, especially to male-dominated occupations, favors a pattern of relatively assertive and independent behaviors that can be termed agentic (Eagly & Steffen, 1984).

In societies with high levels of female labor force participation, such as the United States, the distribution of the sexes into occupations is another important influence on gender roles. Given the moderately strong sex segregation of the labor force (Reskin & Padavic, 1994), perceivers may infer the typical qualities of the sexes from observations of the type of paid

work that they most commonly undertake. Surely paid occupations show wide variation in the extent to which they favor more masculine or feminine qualities. Yet, consistent with the agentic focus of the male gender role and the communal focus of the female gender role, occupational success is perceived to follow from agentic personal qualities to the extent that occupations are male-dominated and from communal personal qualities to the extent that they are female-dominated (Cejka & Eagly, 1999; Glick, 1991).

Although social role theory treats the differing assignments of women and men into social roles as the basic underlying cause of sex-differentiated social behavior, the impact of roles on behavior is mediated by psychological and social processes. Important among these processes is the formation of gender roles by which each sex is expected to have characteristics that equip it for its sex-typical roles. Gender roles are thus the shared expectations that apply to individuals on the basis of their socially identified sex. Gender roles are emergents from the activities carried out by individuals of each sex in their sex-typical occupational and family roles; the characteristics required by these activities become stereotypic of women or men. To the extent that women more than men occupy roles that require predominantly communal behaviors, domestic behaviors, or subordinate behaviors for successful role performance, such tendencies become stereotypic of women and are incorporated into a female gender role. To the extent that men more than women occupy roles that require predominantly agentic behaviors, resource acquisition behaviors, or dominant behaviors for successful role performance, such tendencies become stereotypic of men and are incorporated into a male gender role. These gender roles, which are an important focus of socialization, begin to be acquired early in childhood and are elaborated throughout childhood and adolescence.

Gender roles facilitate the activities typically carried out by adults of each sex. For example, the expectation that women be other-oriented and compassionate facilitates their nurturing activities within the family as well as their work in many female-dominated occupations (e.g., teacher, nurse, social worker). The expectancies associated with gender roles act as normative pressures that foster behaviors consistent with sex-typical work roles through expectancy confirmation processes and self-regulatory processes. Gender roles can thereby induce sex differences in behavior in the absence of any intrinsic, inborn psychological differences between women and men. In the remainder of this chapter, we explicate these ideas and review empirical support for them after first discussing the first component of our theory, the division of labor and gender hierarchy.

## ORIGINS OF DIVISION OF LABOR AND GENDER HIERARCHY

To become a convincing theory of sex differences and similarities, social role theory must face the task of explaining the sexual division of labor (see Wood & Eagly, 1999). If sex differences in human behavior originate mainly in the contrasting social roles of men and women rather than in psychological differences that are intrinsic to women and men (e.g., evolved mechanisms, see Buss & Kenrick, 1998), these role distributions must themselves be determined primarily by factors other than intrinsic psychological sex differences. If, for example, genetically controlled differences in brain structure and hormones are the principal cause of behavioral sex differences, position in the social structure and the associated gender roles would be mere by-products of these more distal causal forces. If men and women are intrinsically different psychological beings, it would hardly be surprising that they tend to occupy different social roles. However, contrary to such reasoning, a strong case can be made that the division of labor and gender hierarchy are produced by factors other than intrinsic psychological sex differences.

Any analysis of the division of labor must acknowledge impressive evidence for commonalities in this division across societies. Cross-cultural research by anthropologists has shown that all known societies established a division of labor according to sex. Within individual societies, the majority of productive activities are carried out solely or typically by one sex (Murdock, 1967; Murdock & Provost, 1973; Schlegel & Barry, 1986). Moreover, viewed cross-culturally, certain activities are typically in the province of one sex. For example, in Murdock and Provost's sample of 185 societies, a variety of specific activities were highly gender typed: Hunting of large aquatic animals, metalworking, smelting of ores, lumbering, and hunting large land animals were performed exclusively or almost exclusively by men; water carrying, laundering, cooking, and gathering and preparation of vegetal foods were performed primarily by women.

Another cross-cultural commonality is that the status and power differences that do exist within societies typically favor men (e.g., Leacock, 1978; Pratto, 1996; Rhoadie, 1989). Although this aspect of social structure has often been treated as a global feature of societies and labeled gender hierarchy or patriarchy, the dimensions of status that are linked to sex appear to vary across societies (Mukhopadhyay & Higgins, 1988) and to be relatively independent of one another in cross-cultural analyses (Whyte, 1978). Yet, sex differences on these dimensions are typically in the direction of women possessing fewer resources than men, of less value being placed

on women's lives, and of greater control of women's marital and sexual behavior.

First and foremost among the causal factors implicated by anthropologists as accounting for the division of labor are physical sex differences, especially women's reproductive activities of pregnancy and lactation (see Wood & Eagly, 1999). Reproduction affects role occupancy directly as well as indirectly through facilitating or limiting other types of behaviors (Schlegel, 1977). Women's tasks thus include gestating, nursing, and caring for highly dependent infants; and these activities limit women's ability to perform tasks that require speed, uninterrupted periods of activity, or long-distance travel away from home. Therefore, women generally eschew tasks such as hunting large animals, plowing, and warfare in favor of activities that can be performed simultaneously with child care (Brown, 1970; Friedl, 1978; Murdock & Provost, 1973). Such consequences of reproduction are less important in societies with low birthrates, less reliance on lactation for feeding infants, and more nonmaternal care of young children.

Another determinant of the distribution of the sexes into social roles is men's greater size and strength. To the extent that productive tasks within a society are highly demanding of speed and of physical strength, especially brief bursts of force and upper-body strength, men, on average, are more likely to be successful at task performance than women. In foraging, horticultural, and agricultural societies, the activities especially likely to be facilitated by men's physical attributes include hunting large animals, plowing, and warfare (M. Harris, 1993; Murdock & Provost, 1973). These considerations of men's greater size and strength are less important in societies in which few occupational roles demand these attributes, such as post-industrial societies in particular.

In general, physical sex differences, in interaction with demands of the economy, technology, and local ecology, influence the roles held by men and women (see Wood & Eagly, 1999). The resulting division of labor does not necessarily produce patriarchy (see Broude, 1990). In fact, social structural accounts of male-female relations typically emphasize that relatively egalitarian relations are found in decentralized, nonhierarchical societies with limited technology and especially in simple economies that derive subsistence from foraging (e.g., Ehrenberg, 1989; Leacock, 1978; Lerner, 1986; Lévi-Strauss, 1949/1969). Yet, in more complex societies, the physical attributes of the sexes generally interact with economic and technological developments to enhance men's power and status. For example, in societies with somewhat developed economies and technology, men's greater upper-body strength and speed generally give them preference over women in performance of activities, such as warfare, that can yield decision-making power, authority, and access to resources (M. Harris, 1993; Hayden, Deal, Cannon, & Casey, 1986).

A number of specific aspects of technology and the economy have been linked to gender-typed role assignments that foster gender hierarchies. These features include (a) the development and use of plow technology in agricultural societies (Ehrenberg, 1989; M. Harris, 1993; Murdock & Provost, 1973); (b) women's increased domestic work that takes them out of the public sphere in societies with intensive agriculture (Ehrenberg, 1989; Ember, 1983); and (c) a constellation of economic factors including private property ownership, the exchange of commodities and women between tribes, and the inheritance of land through men (Coontz & Henderson, 1986; Engels, 1902/1942; Lerner, 1986; Lévi-Strauss, 1949/1969; Whyte, 1978). Common to these analyses is the idea that prior to some specific economic, technological, or social development or some complex of such developments, societies tended to be relatively egalitarian, including in relations between the sexes. A shift to male dominance occurred concurrent with one or more such developments.

In conclusion, most anthropological scholarship accounts for the division of labor and gender hierarchy by arguments that physical sex differences, particularly women's reproduction and men's size and strength, interact with the demands of socioeconomic systems. Psychological specialization of women and men is rarely explicitly postulated as a prior cause of the division of labor or gender hierarchy. It thus does not contradict the great majority of these scholars to argue that these features of social structure are for the most part a product of the sexes' accommodations to gender-typed social roles.

### GENDER STEREOTYPES AND ROLES: WHAT PEOPLE THINK ABOUT HOW MEN AND WOMEN ACTUALLY BEHAVE AND SHOULD BEHAVE

Because in social role theory the contrasting social position of the sexes produces differing gender roles, it is crucial to understand what gender roles are. As collections of beliefs about what women and men actually do and ought to do, the construct of gender role derives from the general concept of social role, which refers to the shared expectations that apply to persons who occupy a certain social position or are members of a particular social category (e.g., Biddle, 1979; Sarbin & Allen, 1968; Staines, 1986).<sup>1</sup> Like

<sup>1</sup>In another tradition of defining social role, the key aspect of roles is not expectations but typical patterns of behavior of persons occupying a given social position, as these behaviors are regulated by a set of rights and duties (see Biddle, 1979). Although this approach is also useful, especially in sociological scholarship, psychologists generally define roles as sets of

other social roles, gender roles encompass what Cialdini and Trost (1998) labeled *injunctive norms*, which are expectations about what people ought to do or ideally would do, as well as what they labeled *descriptive norms*, which are expectations about what people actually do.

The distinction between descriptive and injunctive norms helps explain why gender roles have the power to influence behavior. In general, observations of deviations from descriptive norms produce emotions that are imbued with surprise, whereas observations of deviations from injunctive norms produce emotions that are tinged more strongly with moral disapproval (Cialdini & Trost, 1998). Because descriptive norms describe what is normal or typical, they can provide guidance concerning what behaviors are likely to be effective in a situation. Perceivers may thus refer to others of their own sex to find out what sorts of behaviors are usual for their sex in a situation. Especially if a situation is unfamiliar, ambiguous, or confusing, perceivers very often turn to others for guidance (Festinger, 1954) and tend to conform to sex-typical behaviors. Illustrating this principle are social learning experiments performed with child participants, which have shown greater imitation of models of the child's own sex (vs. the other sex) when several same-sex models behave in a particular manner or the model behaves in a manner that is typical of his or her sex (Perry & Bussey, 1979).

Because injunctive norms describe what is desirable and proper, they can provide guidance concerning the behaviors that are likely to elicit approval from others. Consistent with the well-known concept of *normative influence* (e.g., Deutsch & Gerard, 1955) as well as the use of others' approval as a determinant of action in attitude-behavior models (e.g., Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975), people tend to engage in behaviors that they believe are approved by significant others. To the extent that norms differ for women and men, people tend to refer to what is desirable for individuals of their own sex and thereby form intentions and engage in actions that differ by sex. However, if information effectively counters a norm by which a behavior is deemed more desirable for one sex, the stereotypic sex difference in the behavior should erode. Demonstrating this principle is Grossman and Wood's (1993) research in which the general tendency for emotionality to be perceived as more desirable in women than men was countered by a manipulation that made emotional responsiveness seem generally desirable or undesirable. When normative expectations were thus made equivalent for women and men, the typical sex difference in participants' self-reports of their emotions was absent.

In contrast to specific roles based on occupations, family relationships, and membership in other groups such as volunteer organizations, gender

expectations or beliefs that are shared among members of a society. This more psychological definition links readily to research on stereotyping and cognitive processes more generally.

roles are diffuse because they apply to people who have membership in the extremely general social categories of men and women. Gender roles thus pertain to virtually everyone. These roles, like other diffuse roles based on demographic characteristics such as age, race, and social class,<sup>2</sup> have great scope or generality because they are applicable to all portions of one's daily life. In contrast, more specific roles based on factors such as family relationships (e.g., father, daughter) and occupation (e.g., kindergarten teacher, police officer) are mainly relevant to behavior in a particular group or organizational context—in the workplace, for example, in the case of occupational roles. Gender roles coexist with specific roles and are relevant to most social interactions, including encounters that are also structured by these specific roles (see subsequent section, "Multiple Roles: Gender Roles and Specific Roles"). Gender roles are thus ubiquitous in their influence. Because categorization as male or female is fundamental to social interaction, gender roles cannot be temporarily eliminated by moving to a different social context.

### People Believe in Sex Differences

At the individual level, a role encompasses a construct or knowledge structure consisting of a set of beliefs about a group of people. Empirical evidence that people have such knowledge structures about women and men follows from research on gender stereotypes, which has consistently documented that people believe that the typical traits and behaviors of men and women differ (e.g., Berndt & Heller, 1986; Broverman et al., 1972; Cejka & Eagly, 1999; Diekman & Eagly, in press; McKee & Sherriffs, 1957; Spence & Buckner, in press; Spence & Helmreich, 1978; Survey Research Consultants International, 1998; Williams & Best, 1990a). The implicit statistical model that perceivers generally hold is of differences in central tendency, with distributions of women and men overlapping to a greater or lesser extent, depending on the domain (Eagly, 1987; Swim, 1994). Factor analytic studies have shown that a substantial portion of the content of these perceived differences can be summarized in terms of personal characteristics

<sup>2</sup>Critics of the gender-role construct (e.g., Lopata & Thorne, 1978) have noted that social scientists often refer to gender (or sex) roles but seldom to race roles or class roles. Although there surely are diffuse expectations associated with race and social class, as claimed by status characteristics theorists (e.g., Berger & Zelditch, 1985), these expectations may not be as often conceptualized as roles because they may lack the prescriptive force of expectations about women and men. Whereas people thus tend to agree that it is desirable that women and men have certain sex-differentiated characteristics (e.g., agentic and communal tendencies: see Spence & Helmreich, 1978), they are no doubt far less likely to agree on the desirability of race-based and class-based patterns of behavior.

that are readily grouped into the communal and agentic categories that we noted in our description of social role theory. The communal personal characteristics that are disproportionately assigned to women, such as friendly and concerned with others, and the agentic characteristics that are assigned to men, such as independent and instrumentally competent, are generally expressed in trait terminology (Berninger & DeSoto, 1985; Deaux & Lewis, 1983). This pattern appears not only in conventional stereotype studies in which respondents describe men and women in general but also in studies in which respondents rate the characteristics of individual women and men who are presented in photographs (Feingold, 1998).

Beliefs about the sexes also include ideas about undesirable personal characteristics of each sex. Particularly ascribed to men are domineering qualities that reflect an excess of agency that is unmitigated by communion (e.g., arrogant, boastful, unprincipled); particularly ascribed to women are passive, subordinate qualities that reflect an excess of communion unmitigated by agency (e.g., spineless, servile, nagging; Fritz & Helgeson, 1998; Helgeson, 1994; Spence, Helmreich, & Holahan, 1979). Finally, people's ideas about the sexes encompass beliefs about physical characteristics, typical roles, cognitive abilities, attitudes, specific skills, and emotional dispositions (Cejka & Eagly, 1999; Deaux & Lewis, 1983, 1984; Eckes, 1994a). In general, the network of associations concerning men and women is highly elaborated, reflecting perceivers' high frequency of close contact with persons of both sexes (S. T. Fiske & Stevens, 1993).

The ubiquity of thinking about people as female and male is revealed by findings showing that sex is the personal characteristic that most readily captures perceivers' attention; it provides the strongest basis of categorizing people, even when compared with race, age, and occupation (A. P. Fiske, Haslam, & Fiske, 1991; Stangor, Lynch, Duan, & Glass, 1992; van Knippenberg, van Twuyver, & Pepels, 1994). Moreover, numerous experiments have demonstrated not merely that people hold gender-stereotypic beliefs but in addition that these beliefs are easily and automatically activated. For example, preconscious priming gender-related words (e.g., jobs such as *nurse* or *doctor*) versus nonstereotypic words caused participants to classify gender-matched pronouns (e.g., *he* or *she*) more quickly into male and female categories (Banaji & Hardin, 1996). Also, preconscious priming stereotypic characteristics (e.g., *sensitive* or *logical*) caused participants to more quickly identify the gender of male or female first names (e.g., *Gina* or *Gary*) that matched the primes' gender (Blair & Banaji, 1996). In addition, implicit but conscious priming induced by having participants unscramble sentences with male or female stereotypic (vs. nonstereotypic) content produced more stereotypic ratings of the gender-matched male or female target person (Banaji, Hardin, & Rothman, 1993). Other research has shown that participants classified people by occupation

more quickly in stereotypic than counterstereotypic combinations of person and occupation (Zarate & Sandoval, 1995) and exhibited larger event-related brain potentials (i.e., indicating semantic incongruity) in response to sentences containing counterstereotypic occupational information (e.g., "the beautician put himself through beauty school"; Osterhout, Bersick, & McLaughlin, 1997). Such phenomena are consistent with the claim that perceivers have acquired a network of associations about men and women that are readily activated by the presentation of gender-related cues, even if that presentation is preconscious (see S. T. Fiske, 1998).

### People Approve of Many Stereotypic Sex Differences

Demonstrations that people's knowledge structures about women and men encompass injunctive norms as well as descriptive norms can be found in research showing that stereotypic ways of behaving are perceived as generally desirable for people of the congruent sex, insofar as researchers examine the evaluatively positive aspects of gender stereotypes. To identify the behaviors thought to be desirable for women versus men, researchers have investigated the beliefs that people hold about ideal women and men (Broverman et al., 1972; Spence & Helmreich, 1978; Williams & Best, 1990b) or that women and men hold about the selves that they ideally would be or ought to be (Wood, Christensen, Hebl, & Rothgerber, 1997). In general, such beliefs about the ideal traits and behaviors of women and men resemble beliefs about the positive aspects of their typical behavior. Moreover, the more sex-differentiated that behaviors and traits actually are, the more strongly they are differentially evaluated as appropriate for only one sex. This important relation was established by Hall and Carter (1998), who found a positive relation between the desirability of 77 diverse traits and behaviors for women versus men and the actual predominance of these traits and behaviors in women versus men, as established by meta-analytic reviews of sex differences. It thus appears that people tend to think that they themselves as well as women and men more generally ought to differ in gender-typed ways. This oughtness adds the essential injunctive ingredient that transforms gender stereotypes into gender roles. Moreover, the prescriptive quality of gender roles connects them to a broader ideology by which gender differentiation and inequality are viewed as the natural order of human life (see Jackman, 1994; Pratto, 1999).

The tendency for the attributes that are differentially ascribed to each sex to be valued in their behavior fits with evidence that the stereotypes of both sexes are in general evaluatively positive. Although women are typically a subordinated group in the society and thus perceived as inferior in power and status, they are not generally devalued, as shown by analyses of the

evaluative content of gender stereotypes (e.g., Williams & Best, 1990a). On the contrary, the stereotype of women is even somewhat more positive than the stereotype of men, at least in some recent North American data sets, largely because of the high value placed on the positive communal characteristics that are ascribed more to women than men (Eagly & Mladinic, 1989, 1994; Eagly, Mladinic, & Otto, 1991; Haddock & Zanna, 1994).<sup>3</sup> These very qualities, however, contribute to patriarchal features of society because they are thought to qualify women for the domestic role (Eagly & Steffen, 1984) as well as for female-dominated occupations (Cejka & Eagly, 1999). A similar point was made by Jackman (1994) based on her survey research assessing Americans' beliefs about women and men: "Women are warmly congratulated for their distinctiveness in personal traits that are appropriate to the tasks and behaviors assigned to them and to which men have no aspirations" (p. 347).

### People Are Aware That Beliefs About Men and Women Are Shared in Society

The idea that expectations about male and female behavior are shared implies that some degree of consensus exists about typical and appropriate behaviors and that people are aware of this consensus. Despite some limited evidence that beliefs about the sexes are weakly correlated with respondents' attitudes on sexism scales (Spence & Buckner, in press; Swim, Aikin, Hall, & Hunter, 1995), these beliefs appear to be widely held. Research has thus established that largely similar beliefs are held by men and women, students and older adults, and people who differ in social class and income (e.g., Broverman et al., 1972; Diekman & Eagly, in press; Hall & Carter, 1998; Jackman, 1994). Developmentally, children even as young as 3 years of age show stereotyping of children's toys and activities and of traitlike characteristics; more complex gender-stereotypic beliefs develop steadily throughout the preschool and elementary years (Ruble & Martin, 1998). Moreover, consistent with the social cognitive research noted earlier in this section (e.g., Banaji & Hardin, 1996), it is reasonable to argue that virtually everyone has a cognitive representation of their culture's stereotypic beliefs about the sexes (see also Devine, 1989), although the possibility remains that these

<sup>3</sup>These studies obtained such findings with methods that involved explicitly asking respondents about the qualities that are typical of women and men. In addition, Mitchell (1998) obtained more positive evaluations of women than men using an implicit measure that assessed participants' reaction time for associating men or women with the adjective *pleasant* or *unpleasant*. With this task, the tendency to evaluate women more favorably than men was stronger among the female than the male participants, but significant in both sexes.

available beliefs may be more accessible among people with sexist attitudes (e.g., Dijksterhuis, Macrae, & Haddock, 1999).

This consensus does not mean that everyone approves of all evaluatively positive aspects of sex differences. Rather, as observers of their world, people become aware of the sex-differentiated aspects of behavior and the positive value placed on many of these differences, and moreover they become aware that other people are also cognizant of these differences. This awareness of an apparent consensus has been shown in research that asked respondents to report the characteristics that they think that people in their culture associate with each sex (e.g., Lunneborg, 1970; Williams & Best, 1990a). Respondents readily reported these characteristics. Although surely there are individual differences in personal evaluation of stereotypic behaviors and practices, especially in relation to the rights and roles of women and men (e.g., Glick & Fiske, 1996; Spence & Helmreich, 1978; Swim et al., 1995; Tougas, Brown, Beaton, & Joly, 1995), people would tend to expect that the typical other person endorses the norms that are modal in the culture and thus would react with surprise and disapproval to behavior that is inconsistent with them. Therefore, it is reasonable for people to assume that the most likely route to social approval in most situations is to behave consistently with their gender role or at least to avoid strongly deviating from it. However, cues that others hold nontraditional attitudes and beliefs can produce contexts in which nontraditional behaviors are likely to elicit approval (e.g., Zanna & Pack, 1975).

To the extent that role constructs are consensual—that is, shared among members of a society—they are important structures at the macrosocial level as well as the individual level. Roles are thus aspects of culture, which can be understood as “cognitive and evaluative beliefs shared among members of a social system and generally developed and maintained through processes of socialization” (House, 1995, p. 390). Roles produce constraints on behavior and therefore influence social structure, which can be understood as “persisting and bounded patterns of behavior and interaction among people or positions” (House, 1995, p. 390). Thus, people who have the same social position within a social structure such as an organization or family or who are classified in the same general societal category (e.g., as women, as immigrants) experience common prescriptive constraints that tend to maintain their characteristic patterns of behavior. These constraints arise from the shared beliefs that people in their society hold.

## WHY GENDER STEREOTYPES HAVE CERTAIN CONTENT: CORRESPONDENT INFERENCE CAUSES THESE STEREOTYPES TO REFLECT THE SOCIAL POSITION OF THE SEXES

### Perceivers Assume Correspondence Between Role-Constrained Behavior and the Personal Attributes of Role Occupants

That perceivers assume correspondence between the type of actions people engage in and their inner dispositions is a basic principle of social psychology (see Gilbert, 1998). Because people often do not give much weight to situational constraints in interpreting others' behavior, this correspondence tendency has often been interpreted as producing error and labeled, for example, the *fundamental attribution error* (Ross, 1977) or *correspondence bias* (Gilbert & Malone, 1995). Yet, regardless of whether inferring people's inner qualities from their actions produces erroneous judgments, correspondent inference is the basic psychological process that produces stereotypes of social groups that mirror the qualities that they play out in their social roles.

Supporting this point about correspondent inference, research has demonstrated that people fail to give much weight to the constraints of social roles in inferring role players' dispositions. For example, an experiment by Ross, Amabile, and Steinmetz (1977) involved encounters between undergraduates who were arbitrarily placed either in the social role of questioner who composed difficult questions based on his or her general knowledge or in the role of answerer of these questions. Failing to take account of the biasing effects of these questioner and answerer roles, participants rated the questioners as superior to the answerers in their general knowledge. Therefore, to the extent that these participants described dispositional knowledge and not merely enacted, role-bound behavior, they gave relatively little weight to role constraints. Similarly, perceivers who ascribe nurturance to women are engaging in correspondent inference that gives little weight to role requirements by which women must more frequently perform nurturant behavior in carrying out the child care aspects of the domestic role.

Reflecting this logic of correspondence bias, Schaller (1994, 1996; Schaller & O'Brien, 1992) argued that accurate inferences about group members' enduring traits require that perceivers control for situational constraints by using statistical reasoning analogous to an analysis of covariance in which these constraints would function as covariates. Schaller has shown that people generally fail to engage in such reasoning and as a consequence form erroneous impressions of groups. In a similar vein,



Hoffman and Hurst (1990) argued that gender stereotypes can function as rationalizations for role distributions and that these stereotypes can develop in the absence of any true intrinsic differences between the sexes. Providing a creative experimental demonstration using fictitious groups of city workers and child raisers who were described as not differing in their agentic and communal traits, Hoffman and Hurst showed that, even under these conditions, role-consistent agentic traits were ascribed to city workers and communal traits to child raisers. Hoffman and Hurst argued that such correspondent inferences allow stereotypes to justify role distributions, a viewpoint that was furthered by Jost and Banaji's (1994) analysis of stereotypes as providing *system justification*.

One reservation about this correspondent inference theory of stereotyping arises from perceivers' possible logic that dispositional differences between groups determine role assignment—for example, the reasoning that people who become city workers differed at the outset from people who become child rearers because they freely chose these social roles based on their preferences.<sup>4</sup> However, research suggests that perceivers do not give a large weight to freedom of choice versus coercion in inferring target persons' dispositions. The classic demonstration of this phenomenon is Jones and Harris' (1967) experiment, in which participants inferred the attitude of the author of an essay that either supported or opposed Castro's regime. The essayist was described as having freely chosen to support one side of this issue or as having been required to take the side by an authority figure. In general, participants demonstrated correspondent inference by indicating that the essayists endorsed the positions that they took. Although knowing that the position was coerced reduced this effect somewhat, it did not eliminate it: Participants still judged the pro-Castro essayist as more favorable to Castro than the anti-Castro essayist. Demonstrating an analogous effect in relation to family roles, Riggs (1998) described a target father or mother who anticipated either being employed or staying at home to care for his or her baby and either having choice or no choice about employment or staying at home. Participants rated persons who expected to stay at home as more communal and less agentic than persons who expected to be employed. Although the absence of choice reduced these effects, it did not eliminate them. This experiment thus demonstrates the overriding tendency for perceivers to judge that dispositions correspond to behaviors, even when these behaviors are constrained by roles that are not freely chosen.

<sup>4</sup>Hoffman and Hurst (1990) tried to restrain this inference by providing information about the equivalence of the dispositions of their child rearers and city workers.

### Correspondent Inferences About Women and Men Reflect Their Typical Social Roles

Underlying the principle that gender stereotypes follow from the distribution of the sexes into social roles are the insights that (a) the roles typically performed by men versus women have somewhat different requirements and demands and (b) perceivers make correspondent inferences from role behavior to the dispositions of role occupants. Yount (1986) expressed this argument especially clearly by arguing that people's knowledge about the sexes emerges from attributes that are associated with their productive activity. Because gender-stereotypic attributes reflect the social and physical conditions of this productive activity, Yount regarded these stereotypes as instances of *work-emergent traits*. The conditions of production differ for women and men in a largely sex-segregated workforce, and therefore the traits ascribed to women and men differ. It follows that sex-typical roles should be thought to require gender-stereotypic attributes. We consider the relation between the distribution of the sexes into social roles and the gender stereotyping of these roles by reviewing studies of the attributes ascribed to employees versus homemakers, job-holders in male-dominated versus female-dominated occupations, and occupants of higher status versus lower status roles.<sup>5</sup>

**Employees and Homemakers.** That gender-stereotypic meaning follows from the division of labor between domestic labor and wage labor was demonstrated empirically in experiments by Eagly and Steffen (1984, 1986b, 1988), which elicited judgments of the communal and agentic attributes of people who were described in various ways. Participants thus judged women and men whose occupations were not indicated or were described as either homemaker or full-time employee. As expected, occupational role proved to be a strong determinant of judgments of communal and agentic attributes: People in the domestic role were regarded as more communal and less agentic than people in the employee role, regardless of their sex. Male and female homemakers were perceived equivalently, and male and female

<sup>5</sup>One criticism of the proposition that the division of labor and gender hierarchy produce gender roles stems from the idea that most roles are actually quite flexible in allowing for a fairly wide range of more masculine and feminine behaviors (e.g., Valian, 1998). Although there is surely some flexibility, it is likely to be sharply limited in actual practice because of the norms that grow up around occupations and foster particular ways of behaving. These norms change only gradually. Moreover, occupations do require that certain activities be carried out, and many of these activities inherently and predominantly demand styles of social interaction that are associated with one sex (e.g., taking care of infants demands communal behavior; military combat requires agentic behavior. See also subsequent discussion of "Multiple Roles: Gender Roles and Specific Roles.").

employees were perceived similarly.<sup>6</sup> Also, average women and men whose occupations were not mentioned were perceived stereotypically: Women were seen as higher in communion and lower in agency compared with men. According to social role theory, this gender-stereotypic perception of the sexes stems from the perceived association of women with the domestic role and of men with the provider role. The characteristics that are thought to typify providers are thus ascribed to men in general, and the characteristics that are thought to typify homemakers are ascribed to women in general. Consistent with this demonstration, in studies of the subtypes of women that people commonly identify, the overall stereotype of women resembled the subtype stereotypes of mothers and housewives (Deaux, Winton, Crowley, & Lewis, 1985; Eckes, 1994a, 1994b).

These findings showing an association between the basic division of labor between providers and homemakers and the ascription of agentic and communal qualities to people have been replicated by several other researchers who have incorporated part of Eagly and Steffen's (1984) homemaker-employee design into their experiments (e.g., Bridges & Etaugh, 1992; Bridges & Orza, 1992, 1993; Kite, 1996; Riggs, 1997, 1998). Also, given the prevalence of part-time employment, especially among women, Eagly and Steffen (1986b) extended their earlier analysis by examining perceptions of the communal and agentic attributes of part-time employees as well as homemakers and full-time employees. As expected, part-time employees were in general accorded a middle ground between these other two groups.

**Occupational Roles Differing in Sex Distributions.** The activities that perceivers associate with agentic qualities can be described broadly as those connected with paid employment. However, certain occupational activities that are highly male-dominated may be especially important in shaping the male gender role and stereotype to emphasize agentic qualities. For example, M. Harris (1977, 1993) argued that the assignment of military roles to men

<sup>6</sup>A consistent tendency emerged for female employees to receive somewhat more extreme ratings on agentic characteristics than male employees. Perhaps, as Eagly and Steffen (1984) maintained, the perception that women have greater freedom of choice about being employed may underlie this trend. Subsequently, Biernat and Manis' shifting standards model (Biernat, 1995; Biernat & Manis, 1994) showed that implicit stereotypes can shape within-sex standards for evaluating men and women on gender-typed attributes. According to this principle, a level of agency that would be considered "somewhat agentic" for a man might be considered "very agentic" for a woman because a higher level of agency is thought to be typical of men and both sexes are judged in relation to their own group. Therefore, in Eagly and Steffen's experiments, employed women may not have been perceived as more agentic than employed men. More generally, perceived sex differences may actually be more stereotypic than those revealed by studies that present respondents with subjective rating scales that allow standards to shift between male and female targets.

fosters society's ascription of aggressiveness and other agentic qualities in men. More generally, Cejka and Eagly (1999) demonstrated that to the extent that occupational roles are male dominated, they are perceived to require agentic qualities for successful performance and to the extent that occupational roles are female dominated, they are thought to require communal qualities (see also Glick, 1991). Moreover, stereotypically masculine physical qualities (e.g., muscular, tall, brawny) are thought to be more important for success in occupations to the extent that they are male dominated, and stereotypically feminine physical qualities (e.g., sexy, dainty, pretty) are thought to be more important to the extent that they are female dominated. In addition, numerous other studies have established that occupations' sex ratios are related to the ascription of some gender-stereotypic attributes to job holders in these occupations (e.g., Kalin, 1986; McLean & Kalin, 1994; Shinar, 1978) or to the perceived masculinity versus femininity of occupations (Beggs & Doolittle, 1993; Shinar, 1975). The particular masculine qualities associated with male-dominated occupations are thus varied (e.g., physical strength in some, assertiveness and leadership qualities in others), as are the particular feminine qualities associated with female-dominated occupations (e.g., pleasing physical appearance in some, kindness and nurturance in others).

**High-Status and Low-Status Roles.** Also important in relation to gender roles and stereotypes is the tendency for the specific roles occupied by men to be higher in hierarchies of status and authority than the roles occupied by women. The domestic role has lower status than the provider role; and in the family, husbands have an overall power advantage for both routine decision making and conflict resolution, even though there are some areas of decision making in which wives have primary authority (Scanzoni, 1979; Steil, 1997). In employment settings, women are more likely than men to be employed in positions that have relatively low status and that have little power and limited opportunity for advancement. As far as supervisory and administrative roles in organizations are concerned, there is abundant evidence that women are much scarcer at higher levels (e.g., Federal Glass Ceiling Commission, 1995; Valian, 1998; Zweigenhaft & Domhoff, 1998).

Consistent with the argument that sex differences in role status underlie gender stereotypes, status is correlated with beliefs about role occupants' agentic and communal qualities. Eagly and Steffen (1984) thus found a strong tendency for occupants of higher status to be perceived as more agentic than occupants of lower status roles. Illustrating one aspect of this greater agency, Eagly and Wood (1982) showed that people holding higher status roles in an organization are believed to exert influence more successfully and to be influenced less readily than people holding lower status roles, regardless of their sex. However, when Eagly and Wood's

participants had no information about target individuals' roles, they judged that men were more influential and women easily influenced, presumably because of their prior observations of women's chronically lower status in natural settings. Without any information contradicting the usual covariation of sex and status within organizations, participants thus assumed that men are likely to be in higher-status roles than women; inferences about social influence followed from this assumption (see also Eagly, 1983). Substantiating this claim that status and influence are associated, Moskowitz, Suh, and Desaulniers (1994) found that occupants of organizational roles perceived themselves as less dominant and more submissive when interacting with supervisors than with subordinates.

The idea that the link between sex and status in people's minds produces an increment in men's perceived agency is consistent with the perspective and research findings of sociologists working within the tradition of *status characteristics theory*, which is one of the branches of *expectation states theory* (e.g., Berger, Wagner, & Zelditch, 1985; Berger, Webster, Ridgeway, & Rosenholtz, 1986). According to this approach, sex functions as a status cue or *diffuse status characteristic* (e.g., Meeker & Weitzel-O'Neill, 1977, 1985; Ridgeway & Diekema, 1992; P. Stewart, 1988; Wagner & Berger, 1997). People use sex as a status cue because of their prior experience in natural settings where they observed that men were likely to have greater power and status. According to this theory, in task-oriented groups people infer others' general competence from their sex because of its function as a status cue. Men are therefore thought to be more competent than women, when competence is construed in terms of the agentic qualities that are most relevant to performance in task-oriented groups.

Status also influences perceptions of communal characteristics, although this effect does not appear to be as strong as its impact on agentic characteristics. Eagly and Steffen (1984) failed to produce such an effect in two experiments in which participants rated the gender-stereotypic attributes of men and women who were described as having higher status occupations (e.g., bank vice president, physician) or lower status occupations (e.g., bank teller, X-ray technician). However, research by Conway, Pizzamiglio, and Mount (1996) showed that Eagly and Steffen's null finding reflected their nonrepresentative selection of high-status roles that are somewhat communally demanding. With more representative sampling of high-status roles, low-status occupations were indeed perceived as generally higher in terms of their interpersonal, communal demands. Moreover, fictitious groups described as having low status were perceived more communally as well as more agentially than groups described as having high status.

In agreement with this association of lower status with communal behavior, Ridgeway and Diekema (1992) argued that women display more cooperative and group-oriented behavior in group settings because, in the

absence of such behavior, their attempts to gain influence tend to be perceived as illegitimate because of their low diffuse status. Women who behave in this group-oriented way achieve more influence than they otherwise would, whereas men's ability to influence is unaffected by such displays (Ridgeway, 1982; Shackelford, Wood, & Worchel, 1996). Such demonstrations suggest a relation between low status and communal behavior that is consistent with the claim that the ascription of communal attributes to women stems at least in part from their occupancy of social roles with less status and authority attached to them (see also Wood & Karten, 1986). In summary, a substantial body of research has established that the stereotypic beliefs that women are especially communal and men are especially agentic have their roots in three features of social structure: (a) the division of labor between providers and homemakers, (b) the distribution of the sexes into male-dominated and female-dominated paid occupations, and (c) the gender hierarchy by which men are more likely than women to occupy high-status roles.

Finally, the general proposition that beliefs about the attributes of members of social groups follow from their positioning in the social structure provides a general theory of the content of stereotypes of all social groups. Therefore, it is not surprising that this principle has been invoked by researchers investigating stereotypes based on ethnicity (e.g., Brewer & Campbell, 1976; LeVine & Campbell, 1972), race (Feldman, 1972; Smedley & Bayton, 1978), nationality (Eagly & Kite, 1987), and age (Kite, 1996). For example, because African Americans are more socioeconomically disadvantaged than European Americans, the content of the African American stereotype reflects the roles typically occupied by citizens who are poorer and less educated. This more general applicability of a social structural analysis strengthens its plausibility as an analysis of gender stereotypes and roles.

### WHY ACTUAL SEX DIFFERENCES MIRROR GENDER ROLES AND STEREOTYPES: THE IMPORTANCE OF EXPECTANCY CONFIRMATION AND SELF-REGULATION

After correspondent inference has shaped perceivers' ideas about the dispositions of men and women and these ideas are shared to become aspects of culture, these shared ideas are powerful influences on the self-concepts and behavior of both sexes. These ideas foster sex-differentiated behavior. The principle that actual differences between the sexes mirror gender stereotypes, which in turn mirror the positioning of the sexes in the social

structure, reaches back to the classic functional analysis of role differentiation in the family offered by Parsons and Bales (1955). Elaborating aspects of this analysis, Williams and Best (1990a) argued that, because communal qualities are important for good performance of domestic activities, especially childrearing, and agentic qualities are important for good performance of behaviors enacted in the specific roles more often occupied by men, each sex accommodates by becoming appropriately specialized. More generally, each sex accommodates to its unpaid and paid specific roles. This personal participation in roles dominated by one's own sex throughout the life cycle is critical to the socialization and maintenance of sex differences. Females and males thereby learn different skills and acquire different attitudes, insofar as they occupy such roles. However, social role theory goes beyond the simple statement that people who are in particular social roles perform in role-appropriate ways. In addition, the theory maintains that the differing histories of women and men in sex-typical social roles in a society and the embodiment of these histories in the culture in the form of consensual gender roles foster general behavioral tendencies that differ in women and men. The mechanisms that are especially important in instilling these tendencies are the behavioral confirmation of others' gender-stereotypic expectancies and the self-regulation of behavior based on gender-stereotypic self-construals.

### People Behaviorally Confirm Others' Gender-Stereotypic Expectancies

That people often conform to others' expectancies is a social psychological principle that extends back to classic concepts such as *self-fulfilling prophecy* (Jussim, 1986; Merton, 1948) and *normative influence* (Deutsch & Gerard, 1955). In general, people are assumed to communicate their expectations to others through verbal and nonverbal behaviors and to react positively if their expectations are confirmed. The relevant processes are presumed to operate often at a relatively implicit or automatic level. Thus, perceivers are not necessarily aware of their expectations or of the processes by which they convey them to others; nor are the targets of these expectancies necessarily aware of others' influence on them (Vorauer & Miller, 1997). The specific processes by which one person's expectations result in another's expectancy-confirming behavior are diverse, and the link between expectancies and behavior is contingent on various conditions (see Darley & Fazio, 1980; M. J. Harris & Rosenthal, 1985; Snyder, 1984). Surely people do not always passively acquiesce by behaving consistently with expectations and norms. Instead, individuals differ in the extent to which they conform to norms, and situations differ in the extent to which

they elicit conformity (see review by Olson et al., 1996). Nonetheless, expectancy-confirming behavior appears to be common (Rosenthal & Rubin, 1978), and stereotypic expectancies have considerable power to produce behavior that confirms them (see Snyder, 1981).

Expectancies about women and men have yielded some of the clearest demonstrations of behavioral confirmation (e.g., Christensen & Rosenthal, 1982; von Baeyer, Sherk, & Zanna, 1981; Zanna & Pack, 1975; see review by Geis, 1993). Illustrating these demonstrations is Skrypnek and Snyder's (1982) experiment in which male-female pairs of students, located in different rooms, used a signaling system to negotiate a division of labor on a series of tasks that differed in the extent to which they were gender-stereotypic. Some male members of the pairs were not informed of their partner's sex; others received either correct (i.e., female) or incorrect (i.e., male) information about the sex of their partner. Men who believed that they were dealing with a woman assigned more feminine tasks to their partner and were less likely to yield to her preferences than men who (incorrectly) believed that they were dealing with a man. Moreover, women whose partners thought they were women chose more feminine tasks than women whose partners believed they were men. Women thus acted to confirm the gender-stereotypic beliefs held by their male partner.

Deaux and Major (1987; see also Deaux & LaFrance, 1998) formulated a comprehensive model of the proximal processes that may be involved in producing behaviors that confirm gender roles. These processes involve the activation of a gender role in the perceiver's mind (i.e., *gender-related schema* in Deaux and Major's terminology), in response to target attributes and situational cues, and the initiation of action toward the target individual. This step of action encompasses the most obvious reason that people confirm others' expectancies—namely, that these others deliver penalties for nonconformity with gender roles and rewards for conformity. These penalties and rewards are often delivered without awareness of gender violations or the formation of an intention to punish them. Rather, people unwittingly and unknowingly manifest approval for conformity to gender norms and disapproval for nonconformity.

One context in which differential sanctions may be applied for behaviors congruent versus incongruent with gender roles is parental socialization. Although cross-culturally it is common that boys are encouraged to be aggressive and self-reliant and to show fortitude and that girls are encouraged to be industrious, responsible, obedient, and sexually restrained (Barry, Josephson, Lauer, & Marshall, 1976), these socialization pressures show systematic variation depending on family structure, societal stratification, and women's power and control (Low, 1989), as social role theory would predict. Although sex-differentiated parental pressures in the domains examined by Barry et al. are generally unremarkable in most

contemporary data from countries such as the United States, a meta-analysis by Lytton and Romney (1991) found relatively clear-cut effects in one area, which is encouraging gender-typed activities and interests—for example, gender-typed toys, games, and chores. Yet, such differential reinforcement is more often delivered by fathers than mothers and directed toward boys rather than girls (Lytton & Romney, 1991; Ruble & Martin, 1998). Consistent with this generalization, Raag and Rackliff (1998) found the strongest evidence for encouragement of gender-typed play for fathers in relation to their sons, and the sons who reported that their fathers would have negative reactions to cross-gender play showed more play with tools and less play with dishes, relative to other children. Because such play activity frequently models adult role performances (e.g., doll play models caring for children), it provides tutelage in sex-typical adult social roles. Assigning household chores on the basis of sex similarly provides apprenticeship in sex-typical adult roles. In addition, such gender-typed activities foster children's learning of gender distinctions and stereotypes and influence their learning of cognitive and social skills. As Ruble and Martin (1998) argued, masculine toys such as vehicles and building sets may foster visual-spatial, mechanical, and exploratory skills, whereas feminine toys such as dolls may foster verbal skills.

Childhood and adolescent peer groups are also important sources of encouragement for gender-stereotypic behavior, as Maccoby (1998) argued. Each sex develops strong gender stereotypes and group cultures, enhanced by considerable voluntary sex segregation in childhood. Consistent with J. R. Harris' (1995, 1998) arguments about the importance of socialization by peer groups, the gender roles sustained by such groups may be a more powerful influence enhancing sex-differentiated behavior than parental socialization.

In social psychological research on adults, evidence abounds for negative reactions to deviations from male and female gender roles. For example, one early study demonstrated that men who were portrayed as behaving passively and women as behaving assertively were rated less favorably than men who were portrayed as behaving assertively and women as behaving passively (Costrich, Feinstein, Kidder, Marecek, & Pascale, 1975). Other research showed that when gender-role expectations were violated by mothers who were described as employed full-time after the birth of an infant or by fathers who were described as employed part-time, participants reacted more negatively than they did to the role-congruent parents (i.e., mothers employed part-time and fathers employed full-time; Etaugh & Folger, 1998). In addition, consistent with Heilman's (1983) lack-of-fit model of sex bias in work settings, job applicants whose sex is atypical of job-holders in an occupation are perceived as generally less qualified than equivalent applicants of the typical sex (e.g., Glick, 1991; Judd & Oswald,

1997). Experimental studies of hiring hypothetical candidates for management and other male-dominated occupations generally showed bias against women, even though the characteristics of the female and male candidates were equated (e.g., see meta-analysis by Davison & Burke, in press; Olian, Schwab, & Haberfeld, 1988).

Because of the contemporary change in the status of women in the United States and many other nations, many studies have examined reactions to behavior that is traditionally considered to be masculine. Much of this research has documented the negative sanctioning of women who behave in agentic or dominant ways. For example, attitudinal studies have shown that "feminists" are evaluated less favorably than "housewives" (Haddock & Zanna, 1994). In a meta-analysis of 61 experiments involving evaluations of male and female leaders whose behavior had been equated, Eagly, Makhijani, and Klonsky (1992) showed that women who adopted a male-stereotypic autocratic and directive leadership style were evaluated more negatively than men who adopted this same style, whereas women and men who adopted more democratic and participative styles were evaluated equivalently. In small-group interaction, women's competent, task-oriented contributions are more likely to be ignored and to elicit negative reactions than comparable contributions from men (Altemeyer & Jones, 1974; Ridgeway, 1982). Rudman (1998) presented evidence that self-promotion in the form of speaking directly and highlighting one's accomplishments can make a woman less likable and attractive, whereas self-promoting men do not suffer these costs. In general, women tend to lose likability and influence when they behave in a dominant style by expressing clear-cut disagreement with another person, using direct rather than tentative speech, and behaving in an extremely competent manner (e.g., Carli, 1990, 1995; see review by Carli & Eagly, 1999). Such research details some of the processes involved in the norm-sending mechanism that helps produce gender-congruent behavior. People thus elicit conformity to gender-role norms by dispensing rewards such as liking, compliance, and cooperation in return for conformity and dispensing punishments such as rejection, noncompliance, and neglect in return for nonconformity. These negative reactions to gender nonconformity can be relatively subtle (e.g., facial expressions conveying disapproval; Butler & Geis, 1990).

Consistent with the idea that gender roles' power stems in part from their communication of appropriate or desirable behavior, the presence of other people can affect how gender-stereotypic behavior is. The presence of others may make gender-role norms more salient, especially under certain circumstances (e.g., when one is a numerical token in a group; Kanter, 1977). Also, the presence of others may bring self-presentational concerns to the fore, as people become more concerned about gaining others' approval. Consistent with the idea that the presence of other people often produces

more stereotypic behavior was Eagly and Crowley's (1986) meta-analytic finding that the presence of an audience heightens the greater helping by men than women that is typical of situations that allow for chivalrous or heroic actions. Analogous findings have been obtained in several contexts. For example, in public but not in private, men took a more independent stance in response to group pressure, whereas women did not show this effect (Eagly, Wood, & Fishbaugh, 1981; see also Eagly & Chvala, 1986). Also, women made more modest interpretations of their performance on laboratory tests of ability in public than in private (Berg, Stephan, & Dodson, 1981), whereas men were unaffected by this variation (Gould & Slone, 1982). Similarly, first-year college women (but not men) made more modest predictions of their first semester grade point averages in public than in private (Daubman, Heatherington, & Ahn, 1992; Heatherington et al., 1993). Also, women's (but not men's) aggression decreased when research participants were individually identified to others rather than anonymous (Lightdale & Prentice, 1994). Given the assumptions that gender roles call for men to be chivalrous, heroic, and independent in the face of group pressure and for women to be unaggressive and modest about achievements, research thus shows that behavior is typically more gender-stereotypic in the presence of others.

Because people often sanction behavior that is inconsistent with gender roles, these roles have a generally conservative impact on men and women by exacting costs from those who deviate from norms concerning male and female behavior. Weighing these negative outcomes in a cost-benefit analysis, people would hesitate to engage in nonconformity with their gender role unless it produced benefits that would outweigh these costs. Part of these perceived benefits for women, as members of a subordinate group in society, may be having some chance to gain access to rewards and opportunities formerly reserved for men. Therefore, under some circumstances, increasing the salience of gender-role norms may make women in particular react against traditional expectations. Just such an effect was observed by Cialdini, Wosinska, Dabul, Whetstone-Dion, and Heszen (1998) in a study of modest self-presentation. Gender-role norms were made accessible by having participants respond to stereotypic statements (e.g., "drink beer") by indicating if the behavior was more socially approved for females or males (vs. respond to nonstereotypic statements in a control condition). Participants then completed a self-report measure of modesty. Although when gender norms were not made accessible, the women were indeed more modest than the men, the manipulation substantially decreased women's modesty, so that women were then as immodest as the men. However, this effect was not obtained in a sample of university students in Poland. Gender roles in the United States are apparently sufficiently questioned by female

university students that enhancing their awareness of them can produce a boomerang toward nontraditional behavior.

### **People Regulate Their Own Behavior Based on Gender-Stereotypic Self-Construals**

Gender roles can produce sex differences in behavior not only by affecting the rewards and punishments received from others but also by influencing the self-concepts of women and men. In forming that aspect of the self that has been termed gender identity, people thus take societal gender roles into account along with their self-categorization in terms of biological sex (Ashmore, 1990; Frable, 1997). As Spence (1993) showed, a person's gender identity does not ordinarily entail accepting all of the attributes that are generally thought to be typical and appropriate for his or her sex but accepting some portion of them. Also, gender identity is not necessarily activated in a given situation; rather, situational cues can activate aspects of gender identity (Deaux & Major, 1987). For example, Hogg and Turner (1987) showed that people thought of themselves in more gender-stereotypic terms in mixed-sex groups than in single-sex dyads, presumably because gender identity was triggered by the presence of the other sex.

Because self-definitions are important in regulating behavior (see reviews by Baumeister, 1998; Mischel, Cantor, & Feldman, 1996), gender-typed selves as well as others' expectations can underlie sex-differentiated behavior. Research showing that people's self-concepts tend to have gender-stereotypic content (e.g., Bem, 1974; Biernat, 1991; Spence, 1993; Spence & Buckner, 1998; Spence & Helmreich, 1978) suggests that gender roles influence people's ideas about themselves. Providing an analysis of sex differences in the structure of the self, Cross and Madson (1997) maintained that women's construals of themselves are oriented toward interdependence in the sense that they treat representations of others as part of their selves and that men's construals of themselves are oriented toward independence and separation in the sense that they treat representations of others as separate from the self (see also Josephs, Markus, & Tafarodi, 1992). This characterization of men has proven controversial, however. Baumeister and Sommer (1997) maintained that men's seemingly independent self-construals are oriented to connections with larger social groups rather than the dyads and intimate groups favored by women and are especially directed toward competition for status and power. Research by Gabriel and Gardner (1999) has supported the principle that women focus more on the relational aspects of interdependence and men on the collective aspects of interdependence. A male emphasis on competition for power and status in larger collectives is surely compatible with social role theory, which argues

that the male gender role follows in part from men's greater access to status and power in society. As a consequence, men's self-concepts should be marked by their striving for advantaged positions in social hierarchies.

The internalization of gender-stereotypic qualities results in people adopting gender-typed norms as personal standards for judging their own behavior. They tend to evaluate themselves favorably to the extent that they conform to these personal standards and to evaluate themselves unfavorably to the extent that they deviate from these standards. In a demonstration of such processes, Wood et al. (1997) investigated normative beliefs that men are powerful, dominant, and self-assertive and that women are caring, intimate with others, and emotionally expressive. They found that to the extent that these gender-role norms were personally relevant to participants, experiences that were congruent with gender norms yielded positive feelings about the self and brought participants' actual self-concepts closer to the standards represented by their ought and ideal selves.<sup>7</sup> This evidence thus demonstrates that one of the processes by which gender roles affect behavior is that they are incorporated into people's self-concepts and then operate as personal standards.

The link between gender roles and self-construals helps explain why there are substantial individual differences in the extent to which women and men engage in behavior consistent with the consensual gender roles of their culture. Although everyone acquires knowledge of the gender roles of their culture, some individuals internalize and personally endorse aspects of these societal gender roles, and others do not. Moreover, people who do internalize gendered norms behave more stereotypically in the areas regulated by these norms, as Grossman and Wood (1993) demonstrated in relation to emotional expression. More generally, Taylor and Hall (1982) meta-analytically demonstrated that to the extent that people have a more communal self-concept, they have a stronger tendency to engage in communal behaviors; to the extent that they have a more agentic self-concept, they have a stronger tendency to engage in agentic behaviors. Conversely, people raised in or influenced by culturally atypical environments may not internalize conventional gender-role norms and thus may have self-construals atypical of their gender. Such individuals are less likely to show traditionally gender-typed behavior. Findings from several

<sup>7</sup>In theorizing about self-knowledge, Higgins (1987) distinguished between two types of self-guides: the ideal self, which contains ideas about the person one would like ideally to be, and the ought self, which contains ideas about the person one should try to be. Under some circumstances, the ideal self and the ought self may diverge. According to Higgins' approach, falling short of one's ideal self produces emotions of sadness and depression, whereas falling short of one's ought self produces emotions of anxiety and guilt. The distinction is relevant to gender roles to the extent that they become internalized into the self and thereby produce ideal and ought self-guides (see Wood et al., 1997).

types of studies are thus consistent with the assumption that self-regulatory processes are important causes of sex-differentiated behavior.

### THE OUTCOME: MODAL WOMEN AND MEN BEHAVE STEREOTYPICALLY

Social role theory predicts that, as general tendencies, the sex differences manifested in behavior conform to gender roles and stereotypes. As these differences are assessed by psychologists, they are behavioral tendencies that are manifested on questionnaires and other measures of abilities, traits, and attitudes as well as in laboratory settings and occasionally in field settings. To the extent that men and women actually behave stereotypically, these differences would in turn strengthen gender roles and stereotypes and channel men and women into different social roles. Thus, the forward causal sequence of social role theory—from division of labor and gender hierarchy to gender roles to behavior—should allow for a backward sequence as well. Moreover, to the extent that causes of sex differences not treated by social role theory (e.g., direct impact of sex hormones on behavior) might have some influence, their impact would also flow backward onto gender roles and role distributions.

Given the propositions of social role theory, it is important to examine the extent to which psychological research has established that actual sex differences correspond to gender stereotypes and roles. In recent years, most of the scientific discussion about psychological sex differences has centered on meta-analytic integrations (see Johnson & Eagly, in press) of relatively large numbers of studies of particular classes of behaviors (see overviews by Eagly, 1995; Hall, 1998; Hyde, 1996), although more qualitative research that is not amenable to meta-analysis remains influential (e.g., Gilligan, 1982; Tannen, 1990). These richly elaborated meta-analytic reviews have provided grist for the theoretical mill as psychologists have pondered the causes of sex differences, both as "main effect" findings that are averaged across all available studies and as "interaction" findings that are moderated by studies' characteristics.

With respect to social behavior and personality, meta-analyses were conducted in many research literatures. For example, Hall and her colleagues (Hall, 1984; Hall & Halberstadt, 1986; Stier & Hall, 1984) carried out numerous meta-analyses on sex differences in nonverbal behaviors. Also reviewed were studies of conformity and social influence (Becker, 1986; Cooper, 1979; Eagly & Carli, 1981; Lockheed, 1985), empathy (Eisenberg & Lennon, 1983), helping behavior (Eagly & Crowley, 1986), and aggressive behavior (Bettencourt & Miller, 1996; Eagly & Steffen, 1986a;

Hyde, 1984). Meta-analyses of group behavior investigated interaction styles (L. R. Anderson & Blanchard, 1982; Carli, 1982), leader emergence (Eagly & Karau, 1991), group performance (Wood, 1987), and competition and cooperation (Walters, Stuhlmacher, & Meyer, 1998). In syntheses that included both organizational and laboratory studies, meta-analysts examined whether the style and the effectiveness of leaders and managers differ according to their sex (Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Eagly, Karau, & Makhijani, 1995).

Quantitative reviewers examined whether men differ from women in the qualities they prefer in mates (Feingold, 1990, 1992), their disclosure of personal concerns to others (Dindia & Allen, 1992), and their body image (Feingold & Mazzella, 1998). Other meta-analyses concerned sexual behavior and attitudes (Kite & Whitley, 1996; Murnen & Stockton, 1997; Oliver & Hyde, 1993), subjective well-being (Wood, Rhodes, & Whelan, 1989), mental illness (Nolen-Hoeksema, 1987), personality traits (Feingold, 1994; Twenge, 1997b), and personality growth (Cohn, 1991). Also quantitatively synthesized were sex differences in attitudes and beliefs concerning other people in general (Winqvist, Mohr, & Kenny, 1998), women's rights and roles (Twenge, 1997a), rape (K. B. Anderson, Cooper, & Okamura, 1997), sexual harassment (Blumenthal, 1998), computers (Whitley, 1997), science (Weinburgh, 1995), and the ethics of business (Franke, Crown, & Spake, 1997). Finally, with respect to cognitive abilities and performances, researchers provided numerous meta-analyses and summaries of large databases (e.g., Hedges & Nowell, 1995; see overviews by Halpern, 1992, 1997).

Each meta-analysis produced a complex set of findings: Conclusions about an overall difference between the sexes were accompanied by a series of conclusions about moderator variables that revealed some of the conditions under which the overall difference became larger or smaller or even sometimes reversed its usual direction. The great majority of these meta-analyses yielded evidence of consequential differences, at least under some circumstances. Although the complexity of the outcomes of typical meta-analytic reviews means that main-effect sex differences are only the beginning of the story that the reviewers told about gender in each domain of behavior, researchers have provided listings of these overall findings (e.g., Ashmore, 1990, Table 19.1). Particularly complete is Hall's (1998, Tables 7.1 and 7.2) listing of 77 traits and behaviors. Perhaps the best global description of these meta-analytic results is that they generally conform to people's ideas about the sexes, a generalization that is compatible with social role theory. This conclusion was first proposed on the basis of a thematic analysis of demonstrated sex differences in social behavior and personality (Eagly & Wood, 1991).

Considerably more formal evidence of the stereotypic quality of sex differences has emerged subsequently. The first such demonstration was Swim's (1994) study showing that student judges' estimates of differences between the sexes with respect to 17 different attributes of personality, social behavior, and cognitive abilities predicted with considerable success the mean effect sizes representing the sex differences obtained in meta-analyses of psychological research findings on these attributes. The correlation between the estimated sex differences and the meta-analytic effect sizes—the criterion provided by psychological research—was high in two studies ( $r_s = .79$  and  $.78$ ).<sup>8</sup> Using a similar procedure, Briton and Hall (1995) investigated perceptions of sex differences in 17 aspects of nonverbal communication and obtained similar correlations between perceived and meta-analytic sex differences.

In a far more extensive study examining 77 meta-analyzed traits, abilities, and behaviors, Hall and Carter (1999) found a similar correlation between student judges' estimates of sex differences and the meta-analytic effect sizes ( $r = .70$ ). Accuracy was similarly high for women and men, and it held across various behavioral domains. These judges displayed understanding of the relative magnitude of differences in addition to their male or female direction. Also demonstrating the sophistication of perceivers' knowledge of gender are meta-analyses that obtained judges' estimates of female and male behavior for each of the reviewed studies (Eagly & Crowley, 1986; Eagly & Karau, 1991; Eagly & Steffen, 1986a). Specifically, student judges estimated male and female behavior after reading a brief description of the particular behavior examined in each of the studies that had compared the behavior of women and men. The correlations between these estimates, which represented gender stereotypes about specific types of behaviors, and the behavioral sex differences in the studies, assessed by their effect sizes, were positive and significant (e.g., Eagly & Crowley, 1986, Table 5; Eagly & Karau, 1991, Table 6; Eagly & Steffen, 1986a, Table 5). In showing that the judges were successful in taking the particular characteristics of the behaviors and their situational contexts into account, these findings demonstrate the detail and subtlety of people's beliefs about women and men.

This research showing the rather close match between the sex differences obtained in psychological research and perceivers' beliefs about the sexes is important from several perspectives, including of course the social role

<sup>8</sup>These correlations and the others cited in this section are based on correlating judges' mean estimates of sex differences with an index of sex differences. Another strategy is to correlate the estimates and the index of differences separately for each individual judge and to average these correlations across the judges. Correlations of the first type, which are based on aggregated data, are generally larger than correlations of the second type, which are based on individual data.



proposition that gender roles help produce these very differences. Although the correlational nature of these findings limits their ability to show that gender roles are causal in relation to sex differences, they are surely consistent with the argument. Also, these findings add fuel to the debate about the accuracy of stereotypes (see Lee, Jussim, & McCauley, 1995) and weigh in generally on the side of accuracy (see Eagly & Diekman, 1997). As Hall and Carter (1999) argued based on their examination of the personality correlates of accuracy in predicting sex differences, the ability to accurately predict male and female behavior reveals a sensitivity to one's social environment or ecological sensitivity that is a product of careful observation not only of sex differences but of other features of human behavior. This point is not to deny that there are biases in perceiving the sexes (see Eagly, Diekman, & Kulesa, 1999). Moreover, accuracy at the level of differences between groups does not imply that predictions of individual behavior that are guided by these stereotypes are accurate. Instead, the categorization of people into groups tends to produce somewhat homogeneous perceptions of group members and thus results in some bias at the level of predicting individual behavior (see Brewer & Brown, 1998).

### MULTIPLE ROLES: GENDER ROLES AND SPECIFIC ROLES

Gender roles, viewed as shared expectations that apply to individuals on the basis of their socially identified sex (Eagly, 1987), coexist with specific roles based on factors such as family relationships (e.g., mother, son) and occupations (e.g., secretary, firefighter). In workplace settings, for example, a manager occupies a role defined by occupation but is simultaneously a man or woman and thus to some extent functions also under the constraints of his or her gender role. Similarly, in a community organization an individual who has the role of volunteer is simultaneously categorized as female or male and is thus perceived in terms of the expectations that are applied to people of that sex. According to social role theory, because specific social roles are typically very constraining, gender roles become relatively less important determinants of behavior in their presence.

Children and adults have a generally different situation with respect to the pressures of specific social roles. Whereas adults generally have constraining occupational roles and family roles as mothers and fathers, children have roles based mainly on gender and on being dependent members of a family. They lack the strong forces of other roles, especially occupational roles, that compete with gender roles for control of adult behavior. The tendencies for children to have quite rigid ideas about gender

and to show pronounced gender prejudice (see reviews by Glick & Hilt, chap. 8, this volume; Ruble & Martin, 1998) may reflect the relatively greater prominence of gender roles in their lives. Among adults, other social roles exert their influence, and sex differences tend to diminish when men and women occupying the same specific social role are compared. However, gender roles ordinarily continue to have some impact on adult behavior, despite the constraints of specific roles. In agreement with this reasoning, Gutek and Morasch (1982) argued that gender roles "spill over" to workplace roles and cause people to have different expectations for female and male occupants of the same workplace role.

Experimental evidence (e.g., Hembroff, 1982) suggests that people combine or average the expectations associated with specific roles and more diffuse roles such as gender roles in a manner that weights each set of expectations according to its relevance to the task at hand. Because specific roles have more direct implications for task performance in many natural settings, they may often be generally more important than gender roles. This conclusion was foreshadowed by experimental demonstrations that stereotypic sex differences can be eliminated by providing information that specifically counters gender-based expectations. For example, Wood and Karten (1986) found that manipulating competency-based status in mixed-sex groups through false feedback that described participants as low or high in competence eliminated the usual sex differences in interaction style by which men, compared with women, showed more active task behavior and less positive social behavior (see also Shackelford et al., 1996). Also suggesting an erosion of sex differences by experimental manipulations of demands are Snodgrass' (1985, 1992) experiments investigating the moderation of sex differences in interpersonal sensitivity by superior-subordinate roles that were assigned in a laboratory task. In experiments in which teacher-learner roles (Snodgrass, 1985) or boss-employee roles (Snodgrass, 1992) were established, status differences in sensitivity were found but not the sex differences that are typically present.

The social role theory analysis of the joint impact of gender roles and specific roles on behavior was implemented by Eagly and Johnson (1990) in a meta-analytic review of studies that had compared the leadership styles of men and women. In organizational studies, because the men and women who were compared had the same job (e.g., as middle managers in a business organization), they occupied the same specific managerial role. Because organizations have traditions of management that managers of both sexes have to learn, the constraints of the managerial role were expected to minimize sex differences in leadership style, at least compared with the differences that would occur in laboratory studies with student participants, who were merely temporary occupants of a leadership role in a group formed for an experiment. Yet, gender roles should not disappear entirely in

organizations but continue to have some impact, above and beyond the managerial role. The meta-analytic findings obtained by Eagly and Johnson were generally supportive of this reasoning. Specifically, in organizational studies, male and female managers did not differ in their tendencies to adopt an interpersonally oriented style or a task-oriented style. However, college students in laboratory studies did show gender-stereotypic differences in these aspects of leadership style. Nonetheless, among the organizational managers (and the college students as well), there was one important difference between the women and men: Women tended to adopt a more participative or democratic style, compared with the more directive and autocratic style of men. This stereotypic difference may be a product of several factors, especially the effects of the diffuse gender roles that continued to influence managers, despite their occupancy of the same workplace role.

Another meta-analysis relevant to the simultaneous influence of gender roles and organizational roles concerned ethical decision making in business contexts (Franke et al., 1997). Although in general women were more likely than men to perceive questionable business practices (e.g., use of insider information) as unethical, this difference was largest in the student samples and declined with increases in the work experience of the respondent sample. This sex difference was thus quite small among nonstudents, who in the typical study were women and men in the same occupation (e.g., Fortune 1000 executives, advertising professionals) and were therefore subject to the influence of similar employment roles.

An exceptional study by Moskowitz et al. (1994) used behavioral measures to examine the simultaneous influence of gender roles and organizational roles with a sample of Canadian adults who held a wide range of jobs in a variety of organizational settings. This study used an experience-sampling method by which participants monitored their interpersonal behavior for 20 days, using an event-sampling strategy. For each event, participants indicated the gender and role of the interaction partner and chose from a list the behaviors that they had engaged in during the social interaction. These behaviors represented dominance, agreeableness, submissiveness, and quarrelsomeness, and the researchers subtracted submissive from dominant behaviors to assess agency and subtracted quarrelsome from agreeable behaviors to assess communion. With the partner's status represented in terms of the social roles of supervisor, coworker, or supervisee, the effects of participants' gender were examined. In general, agentic behavior was controlled by the relative status of the interaction partners, with participants behaving most agentially when with a supervisee and least agentially when with a boss. Yet, communal behaviors were influenced by the sex of participants, with women behaving more communally, especially in interactions with other women.

Research on physicians has also demonstrated women's more communal behavior, even in the presence of a constraining occupational role. For example, a study by Hall, Irish, Roter, Ehrlich, and Miller (1994) analyzed videotaped physician-patient interactions during 100 routine medical visits. Compared with male physicians, female physicians evidenced a more communal style of interaction, characterized by more positive statements, more statements implying partnership with the patient, more smiling and nodding, and more back-channel responses (i.e., attentive and encouraging statements emitted by a speaker who does not have the floor). More generally, Roter and Hall's (1998) meta-analysis of 19 studies of physician-patient interaction found that, in this research literature as a whole, female physicians engaged in more partnership building with the patient, more emotionally focused talk, more positive talk, more giving of psychosocial information (e.g., concerning personal habits, impact on family), and more question asking in all content areas.

Although research concerning the joint impact of gender roles and other roles is sparse and mainly centers on occupational roles, some tentative generalizations are suggested about the leveling of sex differences by the demands of other roles. It is thus likely that employment roles provide relatively clear-cut rules about the performance of particular tasks. A physician, for example, must obtain information about symptoms from a patient, provide a diagnosis, and design treatment that is intended to alleviate the patient's symptoms. Within the task rules that regulate physician-patient interactions, there is still room for some variation in behavioral styles. Physicians may behave in a warm, caring manner that focuses on producing a positive relationship or in a more remote and less personally responsive style that focuses more exclusively on information exchange and problem solving. The female gender role may foster more caring, communal behavior in physicians or a more participative style of decision making in managers. Thus, occupational roles no doubt have primary influence on how people accomplish the tasks required by their jobs, which would therefore be similarly accomplished by male and female role occupants. In contrast, gender roles may "spill over" to have their primary influence on the discretionary behaviors that are not required by the occupational role, which may sometimes be behaviors in the communal repertoire but other times be other types of behaviors. Gender roles are thus still an important factor, even if they become something of a background influence in settings in which specific roles are of primary importance. As Ridgeway (1997) wrote in relation to social interaction in the workplace, "The problems of interacting cause actors to automatically sex-categorize others and, thus, to cue gender stereotypes that have various effects on interactional outcomes, usually by modifying the performance of other, more salient identities" (p. 200).

### CHANGE IN GENDER ROLES AND SEX DIFFERENCES OVER TIME

The view that gender roles are rooted in the division of labor and gender hierarchy implies that these roles should change if these features of social structure change. Remarkable in the second half of the 20th century is the rapid increase in the extent to which women are employed in the paid labor force in the United States and many other nations (Reskin & Padavic, 1994). In the United States, the percentages of employed women and men were 34% and 86%, respectively, in 1950 and 60% and 75% in 1997 (U.S. Department of Labor, 1999). Women's greatly increased education, by which their rates of school and university education exceed those of men in the United States and some other nations (United Nations Development Programme, 1999), has qualified them for jobs with more status and income than the jobs that women typically held in the past. Additionally, the career plans of male and female university students showed a marked convergence from 1966 to 1996 that is accounted for mainly by changes in women's career aspirations (Astin, Parrott, Korn, & Sax, 1997). Even though the tendency for men to increase their responsibility for child care and other domestic work is modest (Shelton, 1992), these changes in the division of labor, especially women's entry into paid employment, should result in decreasing acceptance of the traditional gender roles and a redefinition of the patterns of behavior that are most appropriate to women and men. Yet, the impact of such molar social changes would be quite variable, depending on life stage (A. J. Stewart & Healy, 1989) and personality characteristics (Agronick & Duncan, 1998; Roberts & Helson, 1997).

Attitudinal changes congruent with actual changes in the roles of men and women have been documented in the form of increasingly less approval of the traditional system of divergent roles and responsibilities for women and men (R. J. Harris & Firestone, 1998; Loo & Thorpe, 1998; Sherman & Spence, 1997; Simon & Landis, 1989; Spence & Hahn, 1997). Twenge (1997a) meta-analytically demonstrated a general shift toward more egalitarian definitions of women's rights and responsibilities between 1970 and 1995, although the change in women's attitudes was somewhat larger than the change in men's attitudes. However, some portion of people in Western nations still endorse aspects of traditional gender roles, as displayed in survey data (e.g., Zuo, 1997) and individual differences in acceptance of traditional norms about male and female behavior (e.g., Glick & Fiske, 1996; Swim et al., 1995; Tougas et al., 1995). Moreover, as studies of gender stereotypes have shown (e.g., Leuptow, Garovich, & Leuptow, 1995; Spence & Buckner, in press), the tendency to ascribe differing communal and agentic personal characteristics to the sexes has shown little change

when earlier and later data sets are compared.<sup>9</sup> However, self-reports of respondents' own communal and agentic tendencies do show change over time, primarily in the form of women viewing themselves as increasingly more agentic (Spence & Buckner, in press; Twenge, 1997b). This mix of findings suggests that gender roles are in considerable flux, at least in Western societies. Although these shifts suggest that a loss of consensus may lessen the power of gender roles to influence behavior, the traditional consensus is apparently intact in some of the more conservative segments of society, and a new consensus may have emerged or be emerging in other segments of society. Nonetheless, the new consensus may share some features with the old consensus, such as the expectation that men take the major responsibility for providing financially for their families (Riggs, 1997). Furthermore, occupational sex segregation is still prevalent with women concentrated (more than men) in occupations that are thought to require feminine qualities and men (more than women) in occupations thought to require masculine qualities (e.g., Cejka & Eagly, 1999; Glick, 1991). Given that occupational segregation currently takes this form, social role theory would not predict that either gender stereotypes or sex-differentiated behavior should have already disappeared. Instead, to the extent that the traditional sexual division between wage labor and domestic labor erodes and the sexes become similarly distributed into paid occupations, men and women should become more similar. In some psychological research literatures, this idea that sex differences are disappearing is amenable to testing, at least over a limited span of years, with meta-analytic techniques (e.g., Feingold, 1988; Nowell & Hedges, 1998; Twenge, 1997b).

Regardless of the status of scientific evidence on the convergence of the sexes, perceivers believe that men and women are becoming more similar. These beliefs have been demonstrated by Diekman and Eagly (in press), who showed that people believe that women and men have converged in their personality, cognitive, and physical characteristics during the past 50 years and will continue to converge during the next 50 years. Path analyses suggested that perceivers function like implicit role theorists by assuming that, because the roles of women and men have become more similar, their attributes converge. The demise of most sex differences with increasing gender equality, a proposition that thus fits popular beliefs about the characteristics of women and men, is a prediction of social role theory that

<sup>9</sup>This apparent lag in changes in gender stereotypes is provocative from the perspective of social cognitive theories of stereotype change (see review by Hilton & von Hippel, 1996). Although "bookkeeping" models that presume constant updating of stereotypes in response to changing reality suggest that stereotypes should change as external realities change, other models suggest mechanisms whereby stereotypes can readily be maintained (e.g., the formation of subtypes to encompass deviating cases).

will be more adequately tested as more societies produce conditions of equality or near equality.

## CONCLUSION

The social role theory of sex differences in behavior, initially proposed over a decade ago (Eagly, 1987), has been greatly enriched through empirical work that has tested its propositions and in some cases produced modifications. Fitting within a body of social psychology that maintains that social structural and cultural factors influence individual behavior (see Pettigrew, 1997), the theory maintains its initial focus on the positioning of women and men in the social structure as the root cause of sex differences in behavior. The contrasting position of the sexes yields gender roles, which have powerful effects on individuals, who strive to take these roles into account as they try to reach important goals, enhance their self-esteem, and gain approval from others. Other social roles, especially those pertaining to occupations and family relationships, are also very important, and the effects of these other roles combine with those of gender roles to influence behavior. In all social settings, people must engage in social interaction as a man or a woman and therefore must contend with their own and others' expectations concerning the behavior that is typical and appropriate for individuals of their sex. For children and adolescents, understanding gender roles and the consequences of gender conformity and deviation are a critical focus of their learning to successfully negotiate their social environment. Violating others' expectations about male or female behavior can bring a variety of negative reactions, whereas meeting their expectations can bring rewards of social approval and cooperation. In addition, living up to one's own personal expectations about gender-appropriate behavior can yield rewards of self-esteem and satisfaction. Yet, in many modern societies, because women's position in the social structure is undergoing rapid change, gender roles are in flux. Although shifting gender roles can loosen the constraints of traditional rules about how men and women should behave and thus allow more behavioral flexibility, these changes also produce ambiguity, confusion, and debates concerning what is the proper place of women and men in society.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writing of this chapter was supported by a research grant to the first author from the National Science Foundation, SBR-9729449. The chapter

was written while the first author was a Visiting Scholar at the Murray Research Center of Radcliffe College and supported by a Sabbatical Award from the James McKeen Cattell Fund.

## REFERENCES

- Abelson, R. P. (1985). A variance explanation paradox: When a little is a lot. *Psychological Bulletin*, *97*, 129-133.
- Agronick, G. S., & Duncan, L. E. (1998). Personality and social change: Individual differences, life path, and importance attributed to the women's movement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*, 1545-1555.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Altemeyer, R. A., & Jones, K. (1974). Sexual identity, physical attractiveness and seating position as determinants of influence in discussion groups. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, *6*, 357-375.
- Anderson, K. B., Cooper, H., & Okamura, L. (1997). Individual differences and attitudes toward rape: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *23*, 295-315.
- Anderson, L. R., & Blanchard, P. N. (1982). Sex differences in task and social-emotional behavior. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *3*, 109-139.
- Ashmore, R. D. (1990). Sex, gender, and the individual. In L. A. Pervin (Ed.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 486-526). New York: Guilford.
- Ashmore, R. D., & Del Boca, F. K. (Eds.). (1986). *The social psychology of female-male relations: A critical analysis of central concepts*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Astin, A. W., Parrott, S. A., Korn, W. S., & Sax, L. J. (1997). *The American freshman: Thirty year trends*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute. UCLA.
- Bakan, D. (1966). *The duality of human existence: An essay on psychology and religion*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Banaji, M. R., & Hardin, C. (1996). Automatic stereotyping. *Psychological Science*, *7*, 136-141.
- Banaji, M. R., Hardin, C., & Rothman, A. J. (1993). Implicit stereotyping in person judgment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *65*, 272-281.
- Barry, H., III, Josephson, L., Lauer, E., & Marshall, C. (1976). Traits inculcated in childhood: Cross-cultural codes 5. *Ethnology*, *15*, 83-114.
- Baumeister, R. F. (1998). The self. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 1, pp. 680-740). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Sommer, K. L. (1997). What do men want? Gender differences and two spheres of belongingness: Comment on Cross and Madson (1997). *Psychological Bulletin*, *122*, 38-44.
- Beall, A. E., & Sternberg, R. J. (Eds.). (1993). *The psychology of gender*. New York: Guilford.
- Becker, B. J. (1986). Influence again: An examination of reviews and studies of gender differences in social influence. In J. S. Hyde & M. C. Linn (Eds.), *The psychology of gender: Advances through meta-analysis* (pp. 178-209). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Beggs, J. M., & Doolittle, D. C. (1993). Perceptions now and then of occupational sex typing: A replication of Shinar's 1975 study. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *23*, 1435-1453.
- Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *42*, 155-162.

- Berg, J. H., Stephan, W. G., & Dodson, M. (1981). Attributional modesty in women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 5, 711-727.
- Berger, J., Wagner, D. G., & Zelditch, M., Jr. (1985). Expectations states theory: Review and assessment. In J. Berger & M. Zelditch, Jr. (Eds.), *Status, rewards, and influence: How expectations organize behavior* (pp. 1-72). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Berger, J., Webster, M., Jr., Ridgeway, C. L., & Rosenholtz, S. J. (1986). Status cues, expectations, and behaviors. In E. Lawler (Ed.), *Advances in group processes* (Vol. 3, pp. 1-22). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Berger, J., & Zelditch, M., Jr. (Eds.). (1985). *Status, rewards, and influence: How expectations organize behavior*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Berndt, T. J., & Heller, K. A. (1986). Gender stereotypes and social inferences: A developmental study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 889-898.
- Berninger, V. W., & DeSoto, C. (1985). Cognitive representation of personal stereotypes. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 15, 189-211.
- Bettencourt, B. A., & Miller, N. (1996). Gender differences in aggression as a function of provocation: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 119, 422-447.
- Biddle, B. J. (1979). *Role theory: Expectancies, identities, and behaviors*. New York: Academic Press.
- Biddle, B. J. (1986). Recent developments in role theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 12, 67-92.
- Biernat, M. (1994). A multicomponent, developmental analysis of sex typing. *Sex Roles*, 24, 567-586.
- Biernat, M. (1995). The shifting standards model: Implications of stereotype accuracy for social judgment. In Y.-T. Lee, L. J. Jussim, & C. R. McCauley (Eds.), *Stereotype accuracy: Toward appreciating group differences* (pp. 87-114). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Biernat, M., & Manis, M. (1994). Shifting standards and stereotype-based judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66, 5-20.
- Blair, I. V., & Banaji, M. R. (1996). Automatic and controlled processes in stereotype priming. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 1142-1163.
- Blumenthal, J. A. (1998). The reasonable woman standard: A meta-analytic review of gender differences in perceptions of sexual harassment. *Law and Human Behavior*, 22, 33-57.
- Brewer, M. B., & Brown, R. J. (1998). Intergroup relations. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 2, pp. 554-594). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Brewer, M. B., & Campbell, D. T. (1976). *Ethnocentrism and intergroup attitudes: East African evidence*. New York: Sage.
- Bridges, J. S., & Etaugh, C. (1995). College students' perceptions of mothers: Effects of maternal employment-childrearing pattern and motive for employment. *Sex Roles*, 32, 735-751.
- Bridges, J. S., & Orza, A. M. (1992). The effects of employment role and motive for employment on the perceptions of mothers. *Sex Roles*, 27, 331-343.
- Bridges, J. S., & Orza, A. M. (1993). Effects of maternal employment-childrearing pattern on college students' perceptions of a mother and her child. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 17, 103-117.
- Briton, N. J., & Hall, J. A. (1995). Beliefs about female and male nonverbal communication. *Sex Roles*, 32, 79-90.
- Broude, G. J. (1990). The division of labor by sex and other gender-related variables: An exploratory study. *Behavior Science Research*, 24, 29-49.
- Broverman, I. K., Vogel, S. R., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., & Rosenkrantz, P. S. (1972). Sex-role stereotypes: A current appraisal. *Journal of Social Issues*, 28(2), 59-78.

- Brown, J. K. (1970). A note on the division of labor by sex. *American Anthropologist*, 72, 1073-1078.
- Buss, D. M., & Kenrick, D. T. (1998). Evolutionary social psychology. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 2, pp. 982-1026). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Butler, D., & Geis, F. L. (1990). Nonverbal affect responses to male and female leaders: Implications for leadership evaluations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 48-59.
- Carli, L. L. (1982). *Are women more social and men more task-oriented? A meta-analytic review of sex differences in group interaction, reward allocation, coalition formation, and cooperation in the Prisoner's Dilemma game*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- Carli, L. L. (1990). Gender, language, and influence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 941-951.
- Carli, L. L. (1995). Nonverbal behavior, gender, and influence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 1030-1041.
- Carli, L. L., & Eagly, A. H. (1999). Gender effects on social influence and emergent leadership. In G. N. Powell (Ed.), *Handbook of gender in organizations* (pp. 203-222). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cejka, M. A., & Eagly, A. H. (1999). Gender-stereotypic images of occupations correspond to the sex segregation of employment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25, 413-423.
- Christensen, D., & Rosenthal, R. (1982). Gender and nonverbal decoding skill as determinants of interpersonal expectancy effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42, 75-87.
- Cialdini, R. B., & Trost, M. R. (1998). Social influence: Social norms, conformity, and compliance. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 2, pp. 151-192). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Cialdini, R. B., Wosinska, W., Dabul, A. J., Whetstone-Dion, R., & Heszen, I. (1998). When social role salience leads to social role rejection: Modest self-presentation among women and men in two cultures. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24, 473-481.
- Cohn, L. D. (1991). Sex differences in the course of personality development: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 109, 252-266.
- Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Conway, M., Pizzamiglio, M. T., & Mount, L. (1996). Status, communality, and agency: Implications for stereotypes of gender and other groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 25-38.
- Coontz, S., & Henderson, P. (1986). Property forms, political power and female labour in the origins of class and state societies. In S. Coontz & P. Henderson (Eds.), *Women's work, men's property: The origins of gender and class* (pp. 108-155). Thetford, England: Thetford Press.
- Cooper, H. M. (1979). Statistically combining independent studies: A meta-analysis of sex differences in conformity research. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 131-146.
- Costrich, N., Feinstein, J., Kidder, L., Marecek, J., & Pascale, L. (1975). When stereotypes hurt: Three studies of penalties for sex-role reversals. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 11, 520-530.
- Cross, S. E., & Madson, L. (1997). Models of the self: Self-construals and gender. *Psychological Bulletin*, 122, 5-37.
- Darley, J. M., & Fazio, R. H. (1980). Expectancy confirmation processes arising in the social interaction sequence. *American Psychologist*, 35, 867-881.

- Daubman, K. A., Heatherington, L., & Ahn, A. (1992). Gender and the self-presentation of academic achievement. *Sex Roles, 27*, 187-204.
- Davison, H. K., & Burke, M. J. (in press). Sex discrimination in simulated employment contexts: A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*.
- Deaux, K., & LaFrance, M. (1998). Gender. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 1, pp. 788-827). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Deaux, K., & Lewis, L. L. (1983). Assessment of gender stereotypes: Methodology and components. *Psychological Documents, 13* (2) Ms. 2583-25.
- Deaux, K., & Lewis, L. L. (1984). Structure of gender stereotypes: Interrelationships among components and gender label. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46*, 991-1004.
- Deaux, K., & Major, B. (1987). Putting gender into context: An interactive model of gender-related behavior. *Psychological Review, 94*, 369-389.
- Deaux, K., Winton, W., Crowley, M., & Lewis, L. L. (1985). Level of categorization and content of gender stereotypes. *Social Cognition, 3*, 145-167.
- Deutsch, M., & Gerard, H. B. (1955). A study of normative and informational social influences upon individual judgment. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 51*, 629-636.
- Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56*, 5-18.
- Diekmann, A. B., & Eagly, A. H. (in press). Stereotypes as dynamic constructs: Women and men of the past, present, and future. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*.
- Dijksterhuis, A., Macrae, C. N., & Haddock, G. (1999). When recollective experiences matter: Subjective ease of retrieval and stereotyping. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 25*, 760-768.
- Dindia, K., & Allen, M. (1992). Sex differences in self-disclosure: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*, 106-124.
- Eagly, A. H. (1983). Gender and social influence: A social psychological analysis. *American Psychologist, 38*, 971-981.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Eagly, A. H. (1995). The science and politics of comparing women and men. *American Psychologist, 50*, 145-158.
- Eagly, A. H. (1997a). Comparing women and men: Methods, findings, and politics. In M. R. Walsh (Ed.), *Women, men, and gender: Ongoing debates* (pp. 24-31). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Eagly, A. H. (1997b). Sex differences in social behavior: Comparing social role theory and evolutionary psychology. *American Psychologist, 52*, 1380-1383.
- Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (1981). Sex of researchers and sex-typed communications as determinants of sex differences in influenceability: A meta-analysis of social influence studies. *Psychological Bulletin, 90*, 1-20.
- Eagly, A. H., & Chrvala, C. (1986). Sex differences in conformity: Status and gender role interpretations. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 10*, 203-220.
- Eagly, A. H., & Crowley, M. (1986). Gender and helping behavior: A meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. *Psychological Bulletin, 100*, 283-308.
- Eagly, A. H., & Diekmann, A. B. (1997). The accuracy of gender stereotypes: A dilemma for feminism. *Revue Internationale de Psychologie Sociale/International Review of Social Psychology, 10*, 11-30.
- Eagly, A. H., Diekmann, A. B., & Kulesa, P. (1999). *Accuracy and bias in stereotypes about the attitudes of women and men*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*, 233-256.

- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (1991). Gender and the emergence of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*, 685-710.
- Eagly, A. H., Karau, S. J., & Makhijani, M. G. (1995). Gender and the effectiveness of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*, 125-145.
- Eagly, A. H., & Kite, M. E. (1987). Are stereotypes of nationalities applied to both women and men? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*, 451-462.
- Eagly, A. H., Makhijani, M. G., & Klonsky, B. G. (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 111*, 3-22.
- Eagly, A. H., & Mladinic, A. (1989). Gender stereotypes and attitudes toward women and men. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 15*, 543-558.
- Eagly, A. H., & Mladinic, A. (1994). Are people prejudiced against women? Some answers from research on attitudes, gender stereotypes, and judgments of competence. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European review of social psychology* (Vol. 5, pp. 1-35). New York: Wiley.
- Eagly, A. H., Mladinic, A., & Otto, S. (1991). Are women evaluated more favorably than men? An analysis of attitudes, beliefs, and emotions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 15*, 203-216.
- Eagly, A. H., & Steffen, V. J. (1984). Gender stereotypes stem from the distribution of women and men into social roles. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46*, 735-754.
- Eagly, A. H., & Steffen, V. J. (1986a). Gender and aggressive behavior: A meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. *Psychological Bulletin, 100*, 309-330.
- Eagly, A. H., & Steffen, V. J. (1986b). Gender stereotypes, occupational roles, and beliefs about part-time employees. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 10*, 252-262.
- Eagly, A. H., & Steffen, V. J. (1988). A note on assessing stereotypes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 14*, 676-680.
- Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (1982). Inferred sex differences in status as a determinant of gender stereotypes about social influence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43*, 915-928.
- Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (1991). Explaining sex differences in social behavior: A meta-analytic perspective. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 17*, 306-315.
- Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (1999). The origins of sex differences in human behavior: Evolved dispositions versus social roles. *American Psychologist, 54*, 408-423.
- Eagly, A. H., Wood, W., & Fishbaugh, L. (1981). Sex differences in conformity: Surveillance by the group as a determinant of male non-conformity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40*, 384-394.
- Eckes, T. (1994a). Explorations in gender cognition: Content and structure of female and male subtypes. *Social Cognition, 12*, 37-60.
- Eckes, T. (1994b). Features of men, features of women: Assessing stereotypic beliefs about gender subtypes. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 33*, 107-123.
- Ehrenberg, M. (1989). *Women in prehistory*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Eisenberg, N., & Lennon, R. (1983). Sex differences in empathy and related capacities. *Psychological Bulletin, 94*, 100-131.
- Ember, C. R. (1983). The relative decline in women's contribution to agriculture with intensification. *American Anthropologist, 85*, 285-303.
- Engels, F. (1902/1942). *Origin of the family, private property, and the state* [Ursprung der Familie, des Privateigentums und des Staats] (in the light of the researches of Lewis H. Morgan). New York: International Publishers.
- Etaugh, C., & Folger, D. (1998). Perceptions of parents whose work and parenting behaviors deviate from role expectations. *Sex Roles, 39*, 215-223.

- Federal Glass Ceiling Commission. (1995). *Good for business: Making full use of the nation's human capital: The environmental scan: A fact-finding report of the Federal Glass Ceiling Commission*. Washington, DC: Glass Ceiling Commission, U.S. Department of Labor.
- Feingold, A. (1988). Cognitive gender differences are disappearing. *American Psychologist*, *43*, 95-103.
- Feingold, A. (1990). Gender differences in the effects of physical attractiveness on romantic attraction: A comparison across five research paradigms. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *59*, 981-993.
- Feingold, A. (1992). Gender differences in mate selection preferences: A test of the parental investment model. *Psychological Bulletin*, *112*, 125-139.
- Feingold, A. (1994). Gender differences in personality: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *116*, 429-456.
- Feingold, A. (1998). Gender stereotyping for sociability, dominance, character, and mental health: A meta-analysis of findings from the bogus stranger paradigm. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*, *124*, 253-270.
- Feingold, A., & Mazzella, R. (1998). Gender differences in body image are increasing. *Psychological Science*, *9*, 190-195.
- Feldman, J. M. (1972). Stimulus characteristics and subject prejudice as determinants of stereotype attribution. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *21*, 333-340.
- Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations*, *7*, 117-140.
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Fiske, A. P., Haslam, N., & Fiske, S. T. (1991). Confusing one person with another: What errors reveal about the elementary forms of social relations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *60*, 656-674.
- Fiske, S. T. (1998). Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 2, pp. 357-411). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Fiske, S. T., & Stevens, L. E. (1993). What's so special about sex? Gender stereotyping and discrimination. In S. Oskamp & M. Costanzo (Eds.), *Gender issues in contemporary society* (pp. 173-196). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Frable, D. E. S. (1997). Gender, racial, ethnic, sexual, and class identities. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *48*, 139-162.
- Franke, G. R., Crown, D. F., & Spake, D. F. (1997). Gender differences in ethical perceptions of business practices: A social role theory perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *82*, 920-934.
- Friedl, E. (1978). Society and sex roles. *Human Nature*, *1*, 68-75.
- Fritz, H. L., & Helgeson, V. S. (1998). Distinctions of unmitigated communion from communion: Self-neglect and overinvolvement with others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *75*, 121-140.
- Gabriel, S., & Gardner, W. L. (1999). Are there "his" and "hers" types of interdependence? The implications of gender differences in collective versus relational interdependence for affect, behavior, and cognition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *77*, 642-655.
- Geis, F. L. (1993). Self-fulfilling prophecies: A social psychological view of gender. In A. E. Beall & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The psychology of gender* (pp. 9-54). New York: Guilford.
- Gilbert, D. T. (1998). Ordinary personology. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 2, pp. 89-150). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Gilbert, D. T., & Malone, P. S. (1995). The correspondence bias. *Psychological Bulletin*, *117*, 21-38.

- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Glick, P. (1991). Trait-based and sex-based discrimination in occupational prestige, occupational salary, and hiring. *Sex Roles*, *25*, 351-378.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*, 491-512.
- Gould, R. J., & Sloane, C. G. (1982). The "feminine modesty" effect: A self-presentational interpretation of sex differences in causal attribution. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *8*, 477-485.
- Grossman, M., & Wood, W. (1993). Sex differences in intensity of emotional experience: A social role interpretation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *65*, 1010-1022.
- Gutek, B. A., & Morasch, B. (1982). Sex-ratios, sex-role spillover, and sexual harassment of women at work. *Journal of Social Issues*, *38*(4), 55-74.
- Haddock, G., & Zanna, M. P. (1994). Preferring "housewives" to "feminists": Categorization and the favorability of attitudes toward women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *18*, 25-52.
- Hall, J. A. (1984). *Nonverbal sex differences: Communication accuracy and expressive style*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hall, J. A. (1998). How big are nonverbal sex differences? The case of smiling and sensitivity to nonverbal cues. In D. J. Canary & K. Dindia (Eds.), *Sex differences and similarities in communication: Critical essays and empirical investigations of sex and gender in interaction* (pp. 155-177). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hall, J. A., & Carter, J. D. (1998). [Gender appropriateness and gender differences]. Unpublished data.
- Hall, J. A., & Carter, J. D. (1999). Gender-stereotype accuracy as an individual difference. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *77*, 350-359.
- Hall, J. A., & Halberstadt, A. G. (1986). Smiling and gazing. In J. S. Hyde & M. C. Linn (Eds.), *The psychology of gender: Advances through meta-analysis* (pp. 136-158). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hall, J. A., Irish, J. T., Roter, D. L., Ehrlich, C. M., & Miller, L. H. (1994). Gender in medical encounters: An analysis of physician and patient communication in a primary care setting. *Health Psychology*, *13*, 384-392.
- Halpern, D. F. (1992). *Sex differences in cognitive abilities* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Halpern, D. F. (1997). Sex differences in intelligence: Implications for education. *American Psychologist*, *52*, 1091-1102.
- Harris, J. R. (1995). Where is the child's environment? A group socialization theory of development. *Psychological Review*, *102*, 458-489.
- Harris, J. R. (1998). *The nurture assumption: Why children turn out the way they do*. New York: Free Press.
- Harris, M. (1977). *Cannibals and kings*. New York: Random House.
- Harris, M. (1993). The evolution of human gender hierarchies: A trial formulation. In B. D. Miller (Ed.), *Sex and gender hierarchies* (pp. 57-79). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Harris, M. J., & Rosenthal, R. (1985). Mediation of interpersonal expectancy effects: 31 meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin*, *97*, 363-386.
- Harris, R. J., & Firestone, J. M. (1998). Changes in predictors of gender role ideologies among women: A multivariate analysis. *Sex Roles*, *38*, 239-252.
- Hayden, B., Deal, M., Cannon, A., & Casey, J. (1986). Ecological determinants of women's status among hunter/gatherers. *Human Evolution*, *1*, 449-474.

- Heatherington, L., Daubman, K. A., Bates, C., Ahn, A., Brown, H., & Preston, C. (1993). Two investigations of "female modesty" in achievement situations. *Sex Roles, 29*, 739-754.
- Hedges, L. V., & Nowell, A. (1995). Sex differences in mental test scores, variability, and numbers of high-scoring individuals. *Science, 269*, 41-45.
- Heilman, M. E. (1983). Sex bias in work settings: The Lack of Fit model. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 5*, 269-298.
- Helgeson, V. S. (1994). Relation of agency and communion to well-being: Evidence and potential explanations. *Psychological Bulletin, 116*, 412-428.
- Hembroff, L. A. (1982). Resolving status inconsistency: An expectation states theory and test. *Social Forces, 61*, 183-205.
- Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: A theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review, 94*, 319-340.
- Hilton, J. L., & von Hippel, W. (1996). Stereotypes. *Annual Review of Psychology, 47*, 237-271.
- Hoffman, C., & Hurst, N. (1990). Gender stereotypes: Perception or rationalization? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*, 197-208.
- Hogg, M. A., & Turner, J. C. (1987). Intergroup behaviour, self-stereotyping and the salience of social categories. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 26*, 325-340.
- House, J. S. (1995). Social structure, relationships, and the individual. In K. S. Cook, G. A. Fine, & J. S. House (Eds.), *Sociological perspectives on social psychology* (pp. 387-395). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Howard, J. A., & Hollander, J. (1997). *Gendered situations, gendered selves: A gender lens on social psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hyde, J. S. (1984). How large are gender differences in aggression? A developmental meta-analysis. *Developmental Psychology, 20*, 722-736.
- Hyde, J. S. (1996). Where are the gender differences? Where are the gender similarities? In D. M. Buss & N. M. Malamuth (Eds.), *Sex, power, conflict: Evolutionary and feminist perspectives* (pp. 107-118). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jackman, M. R. (1994). *The velvet glove: Paternalism and conflict in gender, class, and race relations*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Jacobs, J. A. (1989). *Revolving doors: Sex segregation and women's careers*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Johnson, B. T., & Eagly, A. H. (in press). Quantitative synthesis of social psychological research. In H. T. Reis & C. M. Judd (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods in social psychology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Jones, E. E., & Harris, V. A. (1967). The attribution of attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 3*, 1-24.
- Josephs, R. A., Markus, H. R., & Tafarodi, R. W. (1992). Gender and self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63*, 391-402.
- Jost, J. T., & Banaji, M. R. (1994). The role of stereotyping in system-justification and the production of false consciousness. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 33*, 1-27.
- Judd, P. C., & Oswald, P. A. (1997). Employment desirability: The interactive effects of gender-typed profile, stimulus sex, and gender-typed occupation. *Sex Roles, 37*, 467-476.
- Jussim, L. (1986). Self-fulfilling prophecies: A theoretical and integrative review. *Psychological Review, 93*, 429-445.
- Kalin, R. (1986, August). *The role of gender in occupational images*. Poster presented at the 94th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). Some effects of proportions on group life: Skewed sex ratios and responses to token women. *American Journal of Sociology, 82*, 465-490.
- Kite, M. E. (1996). Age, gender, and occupational label: A test of social role theory. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 20*, 361-374.

- Kite, M. E., & Whitley, B. E. (1996). Sex differences in attitudes toward homosexual persons, behaviors, and civil rights: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22*, 336-353.
- Leacock, E. (1978). Women's status in egalitarian society: Implications for social evolution. *Current Anthropology, 19*, 247-275.
- Lee, Y.-T., Jussim, L. J., & McCauley, C. R. (Eds.). (1995). *Stereotype accuracy: Toward appreciating group differences*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Lerner, G. (1986). *The creation of patriarchy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Leuptow, L. B., Garovich, L., & Leuptow, M. B. (1995). The persistence of gender stereotypes in the face of changing sex roles: Evidence contrary to the sociocultural model. *Ethology and Sociobiology, 16*, 509-530.
- LeVine, R. A., & Campbell, D. T. (1972). *Ethnocentrism: Theories of conflict, ethnic attitudes, and group behavior*. New York: Wiley.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. (1949/1969). *The elementary structures of kinship*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Lightdale, J. R., & Prentice, D. A. (1994). Rethinking sex differences in aggression: Aggressive behavior in the absence of social roles. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20*, 34-44.
- Lockheed, M. E. (1985). Sex and social influence: A meta-analysis guided by theory. In J. Berger & M. Zelditch, Jr. (Eds.), *Status, rewards, and influence: How expectations organize behavior* (pp. 406-429). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Loo, R., & Thorpe, K. (1998). Attitudes toward women's roles in society: A replication after 20 years. *Sex Roles, 39*, 903-912.
- Lopata, H. Z., & Thorne, B. (1978). On the term "sex roles." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 3*, 718-721.
- Low, B. S. (1989). Cross-cultural patterns in the training of children: An evolutionary perspective. *Journal of Comparative Psychology, 103*, 311-319.
- Lunneborg, P. W. (1970). Stereotypic aspect in masculinity-femininity measurement. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 34*, 113-118.
- Lytton, H., & Romney, D. M. (1991). Parents' differential socialization of boys and girls: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 109*, 267-296.
- Maccoby, E. E. (1998). *The two sexes: Growing up apart, coming together*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. (1974). *The psychology of sex differences*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Martell, R. F., Lane, D. M., & Emrich, C. (1995). Male-female differences: A computer simulation. *American Psychologist, 51*, 157-158.
- McKee, J. P., & Sherriffs, A. C. (1957). The differential evaluation of males and females. *Journal of Personality, 25*, 356-371.
- McLean, H. M., & Kalin, R. (1994). Congruence between self-image and occupational stereotypes in students entering gender-dominated occupations. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 26*, 142-162.
- Meeker, B. F., & Weitzel-O'Neill, P. A. (1977). Sex roles and interpersonal behavior in task-oriented groups. *American Sociological Review, 42*, 91-105.
- Meeker, B. F., & Weitzel-O'Neill, P. A. (1985). Sex roles and interpersonal behavior in task-oriented groups. In J. Berger & M. Zelditch, Jr. (Eds.), *Status, rewards, and influence: How expectations organize behavior* (pp. 379-405). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Merton, R. K. (1948). The self-fulfilling prophecy. *Antioch Review, 8*, 193-210.
- Mitchell, J. (1998). [Dissociated attitudes]. Unpublished data.
- Mischel, W., Cantor, N., & Feldman, S. (1996). Principles of self-regulation: The nature of willpower and self-control. In E. T. Higgins & A. W. Kruglanski (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (pp. 329-360). New York: Guilford.



- Moskowitz, D. W., Suh, E. J., & Desaulniers, J. (1994). Situational influences on gender differences in agency and communion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *66*, 753-761.
- Mukhopadhyay, C. C., & Higgins, P. J. (1988). Anthropological studies of women's status revisited: 1977-1987. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *17*, 461-495.
- Murdock, G. P. (1967). *Ethnographic atlas*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Murdock, G. P., & Provost, C. (1973). Factors in the division of labor by sex: A cross-cultural analysis. *Ethnology*, *13*, 203-225.
- Murmen, S. K., & Stockton, M. (1997). Gender and self-reported sexual arousal in response to sexual stimuli: A meta-analytic review. *Sex Roles*, *37*, 135-153.
- Nolen-Hoeksema, S. (1987). Sex differences in unipolar depression: Evidence and theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, *101*, 259-282.
- Nowell, A., & Hedges, L. V. (1998). Trends in gender differences in academic achievement from 1960 to 1994: An analysis of differences in mean, variance, and extreme scores. *Sex Roles*, *39*, 21-43.
- Olian, J. D., Schwab, D. P., & Haberfeld, Y. (1988). The impact of applicant gender compared to qualifications on hiring recommendations: A meta-analysis of experimental studies. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *41*, 180-195.
- Oliver, M. B., & Hyde, J. S. (1993). Gender differences in sexuality: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *114*, 29-51.
- Olson, J. M., Roesse, N. J., & Zanna, M. P. (1996). Expectancies. In E. T. Higgins & A. W. Kruglanski (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (pp. 211-238). New York: Guilford.
- Osterhout, L., Bersick, M., & McLaughlin, J. (1997). Brain potentials reflect violations of gender stereotypes. *Memory and Cognition*, *25*, 273-285.
- Parsons, T., & Bales, R. F. (Eds.). (1955). *Family, socialization and interaction process*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Perry, D. G., & Bussey, K. (1979). The social learning theory of sex differences: Imitation is alive and well. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *37*, 1699-1712.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1997). Personality and social structure: Social psychological contributions. In R. Hogan, J. Johnson, & S. Briggs (Eds.), *Handbook of personality psychology* (pp. 417-438). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Pratto, F. (1996). Sexual politics: The gender gap in the bedroom, the cupboard, and the cabinet. In D. M. Buss & N. M. Malamuth (Eds.), *Sex, power, conflict: Evolutionary and feminist perspectives* (pp. 179-230). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pratto, F. (1999). The puzzle of continuing group inequality: Piecing together psychological, social, and cultural forces in social dominance theory. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 31, pp. 191-263). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Raag, T., & Rackliff, C. L. (1998). Preschoolers' awareness of social expectations of gender: Relationships to toy choices. *Sex Roles*, *38*, 685-700.
- Reskin, B. F., & Padavic, I. (1994). *Women and men at work*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Rhoadie, E. M. (1989). *Discrimination against women: A global survey of the economic, educational, social and political status of women*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland.
- Ridgeway, C. L. (1982). Status in groups: The importance of motivation. *American Sociological Review*, *47*, 76-88.
- Ridgeway, C. L. (1997). Interaction and the conservation of gender inequality: Considering employment. *American Sociological Review*, *62*, 218-235.
- Ridgeway, C. L., & Diekema, D. (1992). Are gender differences status differences? In C. L. Ridgeway (Ed.), *Gender, interaction, and inequality* (pp. 157-180). New York: Springer.

- Riggs, J. M. (1997). Mandates for mothers and fathers: Perceptions of breadwinners and care givers. *Sex Roles*, *37*, 565-580.
- Riggs, J. M. (1998). Social roles we choose and don't choose: Impressions of employed and unemployed parents. *Sex Roles*, *39*, 431-443.
- Roberts, B. W., & Helson, R. (1997). Changes in culture, changes in personality: The influence of individualism in a longitudinal study of women. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *72*, 641-651.
- Rosenthal, R., & Rubin, D. B. (1978). Interpersonal expectancy effects: The first 345 studies. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *3*, 377-415.
- Ross, L. (1977). The intuitive psychologist and his shortcomings: Distortions in the attribution process. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 10, pp. 173-220). New York: Academic Press.
- Ross, L., Amabile, T. M., & Steinmetz, J. L. (1977). Social roles, social control, and biases in social-perception processes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *35*, 485-494.
- Roter, D. L., & Hall, J. A. (1999). *Physician gender effects in medical communication: A quantitative review*. Manuscript under review.
- Ruble, D. N., & Martin, C. L. (1998). Gender development. In W. Damon (Series Ed.) & N. Eisenberg (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 3. Social, emotional, and personality development* (5th ed., pp. 933-1016). New York: Wiley.
- Rudman, L. A. (1998). Self-promotion as a risk factor for women: The costs and benefits of counterstereotypical impression management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*, 629-645.
- Sarbin, T. R., & Allen, V. L. (1968). Role theory. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (2nd ed., Vol. 1, pp. 488-567). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Scanzoni, J. (1979). Social processes and power in families. In W. R. Burr, R. Hill, F. I. Nye, & I. L. Reiss (Eds.), *Contemporary theories about the family* (Vol. 1, pp. 295-316). New York: The Free Press.
- Schaller, M. (1994). The role of statistical reasoning in the formation, preservation and prevention of group stereotypes. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *33*, 47-61.
- Schaller, M. (1996). Training in statistical reasoning inhibits the formation of erroneous group stereotypes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *22*, 829-844.
- Schaller, M., & O'Brien, M. (1992). "Intuitive analysis of covariance" and group stereotype formation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *18*, 776-785.
- Schlegel, A. (1977). Toward a theory of sexual stratification. In A. Schlegel (Ed.), *Sexual stratification: A cross-cultural view* (pp. 1-40). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Schlegel, A., & Barry, H., III. (1986). The cultural consequences of female contribution to subsistence. *American Anthropologist*, *88*, 142-150.
- Shackelford, S., Wood, W., & Worchel, S. (1996). Behavioral styles and the influence of women in mixed-sex groups. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *59*, 284-293.
- Shelton, B. A. (1992). *Women, men, and time: Gender differences in paid work, housework, and leisure*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Sherman, P. J., & Spence, J. T. (1997). A comparison of two cohorts of college students in responses to the Male-Female Relations Questionnaire. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *21*, 265-278.
- Sherriffs, A. C., & McKee, J. P. (1957). Qualitative aspects of beliefs about men and women. *Journal of Personality*, *25*, 457-464.
- Shinar, E. H. (1975). Sexual stereotypes of occupations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *7*, 99-111.
- Shinar, E. H. (1978). Person perception as a function of occupation and sex. *Sex Roles*, *4*, 679-693.

- Simon, R. J., & Landis, J. M. (1989). The polls – A report: Women's and men's attitudes about a woman's place and role. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 53, 265–276.
- Skrypnik, B. J., & Snyder, M. (1982). On the self-perpetuating nature of stereotypes about women and men. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 18, 277–291.
- Smedley, J. W., & Bayton, J. A. (1978). Evaluative race–class stereotypes by race and perceived class of subjects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36, 530–535.
- Snodgrass, S. E. (1985). Women's intuition: The effect of subordinate role on interpersonal sensitivity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49, 146–155.
- Snodgrass, S. E. (1992). Further effects of role versus gender on interpersonal sensitivity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 154–158.
- Snyder, M. (1981). On the self-perpetuating nature of social stereotypes. In D. L. Hamilton (Ed.), *Cognitive processes in stereotyping and intergroup behavior* (pp. 183–212). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Snyder, M. (1984). When belief creates reality. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 18, pp. 247–305). New York: Academic Press.
- Spence, J. T. (1993). Gender-related traits and gender ideology: Evidence for a multifactorial theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64, 624–635.
- Spence, J. T., & Buckner, C. E. (in press). Gender-related trait stereotypes and self-perceptions: What do they signify? *Psychology of Women Quarterly*.
- Spence, J. T., & Hahn, E. D. (1997). The Attitudes Toward Women Scale and attitude change in college students. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21, 17–34.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1978). *Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates, and antecedents*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R. L., & Holahan, C. K. (1979). Negative and positive components of psychological masculinity and femininity and their relationships to self-reports of neurotic and acting out behaviors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 1673–1682.
- Staines, G. L. (with Libby, P. L.). (1986). Men and women in role relationships. In R. D. Ashmore & F. K. Del Boca (Eds.), *The social psychology of female–male relations: A critical analysis of central concepts* (pp. 211–258). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Stangor, C., Lynch, L., Duan, C., & Glass, B. (1992). Categorization of individuals on the basis of multiple social features. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 207–218.
- Steil, J. M. (1997). *Marital equality: Its relationship to the well-being of husbands and wives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stewart, A. J., & Healy, J. M., Jr. (1989). Linking individual development and social changes. *American Psychologist*, 44, 30–42.
- Stewart, P. (1988). Women and men in groups: A status characteristics approach to interaction. In M. Webster, Jr., & M. Foschi (Eds.), *Status generalization: New theory and research* (pp. 69–85). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Stier, D. S., & Hall, J. A. (1984). Gender differences in touch: An empirical and theoretical review. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47, 440–459.
- Strodtbeck, F. L., & Mann, R. D. (1956). Sex role differentiation in jury deliberations. *Sociometry*, 22, 713–719.
- Survey Research Consultants International. (1998). *Index to international public opinion, 1996–1997*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Swim, J. K. (1994). Perceived versus meta-analytic effect sizes: An assessment of the accuracy of gender stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66, 21–36.
- Swim, J. K., Aiken, K. J., Hall, W. S., & Hunter, B. A. (1995). Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudices. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 199–214.

- Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation*. New York: Morrow.
- Taylor, M. C., & Hall, J. A. (1982). Psychological androgyny: Theories, methods, and conclusions. *Psychological Bulletin*, 92, 347–366.
- Tomaskovic-Devey, D. (1995). Sex composition and gendered earnings inequality: A comparison of job and occupational models. In J. A. Jacobs (Ed.), *Gender inequality at work* (pp. 23–56). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tougas, F., Brown, R., Beaton, A. M., & Joly, S. (1995). Neosexism: Plus ça change, plus c'est pareil. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 842–849.
- Twenge, J. M. (1997a). Attitudes toward women, 1970–1995: A meta-analysis. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21, 35–51.
- Twenge, J. M. (1997b). Changes in masculine and feminine traits over time: A meta-analysis. *Sex Roles*, 36, 305–325.
- United Nations Development Programme. (1999). *Human development report 1999*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- U.S. Department of Labor. (1999). Labor force statistics from the current population survey. Retrieved May 25, 1999 from Bureau of Labor Statistics database (series IDs LFU600001 and LFU600002), on the World Wide Web: <http://146.142.4.24/cgi-bin/srgate>
- Valian, V. (1998). *Why so slow? The advancement of women*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- van Knippenberg, A., van Twuyver, M., & Pepels, J. (1994). Factors affecting social categorization processes in memory. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 33, 419–431.
- von Baeyer, C. L., Sherk, D. L., & Zanna, M. P. (1981). Impression management in the job interview: When the female applicant meets the male "chauvinist" interviewer. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 7, 45–51.
- Vorauer, J. D., & Miller, D. T. (1997). Failure to recognize the effect of implicit social influence on the presentation of self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 281–295.
- Wagner, D. G., & Berger, J. (1997). Gender and interpersonal task behaviors: Status expectation accounts. *Sociological Perspectives*, 40, 1–32.
- Walters, A. E., Stuhlmacher, A. F., & Meyer, L. L. (1998). Gender and negotiator competitiveness: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 76, 1–29.
- Weinburgh, M. (1995). Gender differences in student attitudes toward science: A meta-analysis of the literature from 1970 to 1991. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 32, 387–398.
- Whitley, B. E. (1997). Gender differences in computer-related attitudes and behavior: A meta-analysis. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 13, 1–22.
- Whyte, M. K. (1978). *The status of women in preindustrial societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Williams, J. E., & Best, D. L. (1990a). *Measuring sex stereotypes: A multinational study* (Rev. ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Williams, J. E., & Best, D. L. (1990b). *Sex and psyche: Gender and self viewed cross-culturally*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Winqvist, L. A., Mohr, C. D., & Kenny, D. A. (1998). The female positivity effect in the perception of others. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 32, 370–388.
- Wood, W. (1987). Meta-analytic review of sex differences in group performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, 102, 53–71.
- Wood, W., Christensen, P. N., Hebl, M. R., & Rothgerber, H. (1997). Conformity to sex-typed norms, affect, and the self-concept. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 523–535.

- Wood, W., & Eagly, A. H. (1999). *The origins of the division of labor and gender hierarchy: Implications for sex differences in social behavior*. Manuscript in preparation.
- Wood, W., & Karten, S. J. (1986). Sex differences in interaction style as a product of perceived sex differences in competence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *50*, 341-347.
- Wood, W., Rhodes, N., & Whelan, M. (1989). Sex differences in positive well-being: A consideration of emotional style and marital status. *Psychological Bulletin*, *106*, 249-264.
- Yount, K. (1986). A theory of productive activity: The relationships among self-concept, gender, sex role stereotypes, and work-emergent traits. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *10*, 63-88.
- Zanna, M. P., & Pack, S. J. (1975). On the self-fulfilling nature of apparent sex differences in behavior. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *11*, 583-591.
- Zárate, M. A., & Sandoval, P. (1995). The effects of contextual cues on making occupational and gender categorizations. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *34*, 353-362.
- Zuo, J. (1997). The effect of men's breadwinner status on their changing gender beliefs. *Sex Roles*, *37*, 799-816.
- Zweigenhaft, R. L., & Domhoff, G. W. (1998). *Diversity in the power elite: Have women and minorities reached the top?* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

## III

**GENDER CATEGORIZATION AND  
INTERPERSONAL BEHAVIOR**