

Student Work

4-1-1986

The perceived credibility of masculine, feminine and androgynous women in middle management

Priscilla Carpenter
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>
Please take our feedback survey at: https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE

Recommended Citation

Carpenter, Priscilla, "The perceived credibility of masculine, feminine and androgynous women in middle management" (1986). *Student Work*. 929.
<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/929>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.

THE PERCEIVED CREDIBILITY OF MASCULINE, FEMININE, AND
ANDROGYNOUS WOMEN IN MIDDLE MANAGEMENT

A Thesis
Presented to the
Department of Communication
and the
Faculty of the Graduate College
University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts
University of Nebraska at Omaha

by
Priscilla Carpenter

April 1986

UMI Number: EP73369

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP73369

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

THESIS ACCEPTANCE

Acceptance for the faculty of the Graduate College, University of Nebraska, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of Arts, University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Committee

Name	Department
<u>Marshall Prubell</u>	<u>Communication</u>
<u>Birdie H. Holder</u>	<u>Communication</u>
<u>Birdie H. Holder</u>	<u>Business Education</u>

Chairman

Date

April 21-86

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank committee members Dr. John Wanzenried, Dr. Marshall Prisbell, and Dr. Birdie Holder for their expertise and time. I greatly appreciate the many hours contributed by Dr. Chuck Powell's assistance in computing the statistics.

Also, a special thank you to my parents, Viola and Bill Means, who in many ways provided support and understanding during the completion of my Master's degree.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	v
 Chapter	
I INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Research Questions	3
The Design	4
Definition of Terms	4
II REVIEW OF LITERATURE	7
Females as Equals to Males	9
Sex-Role Differentiation and Conflict	12
Rationale for Questions and Hypotheses	19
III METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES	29
Statement of the Hypotheses	29
Subjects	30
Manipulations Check	30
Procedure	31
Measurement Instrument	31
Experimental Design and Variables	34
IV RESULTS	36
V DISCUSSION	43
Summary	43
Conclusions	44
Future Research	46
Implications	48
REFERENCES	49
APPENDIXES	60
Appendix A: Instrument for Manipulations Check	60
Appendix B: Results of Manipulations Check	65
Appendix C: Measurement Instrument	70
Appendix D: Factor Analysis and Reliability Analysis	75

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I	Pearson r Between Masculine, Feminine, and Androgynous Scales and Between Safety, Qualification, and Dynamism Factors	37
II	Pearson r Between SS and Masculine, Feminine, and Androgynous Scales and Between SS and Safety, Qualification, and Dynamism Factors	39
B-1	t Test for Masculine and Feminine Items by Male and Female Subjects	67
B-2	Mean Values for Androgynous Items by Male and Female Subjects	69
D-1	Reliability Coefficients for Masculine, Feminine, and Androgynous Scales and for Safety, Qualification, and Dynamism Factors	77
D-2	Principal-Axis Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation for the Masculine Scale	78
D-3	Principal-Axis Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation for the Feminine Scale	79
D-4	Principal-Axis Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation for the Androgynous Scale	80

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Women are in a minority position in management and the challenge is to place more women in the upper-level management positions in corporations. Women are not really considered part of the organization in a true membership sense when only one woman is in the executive suite. It is awkward for her, and her male colleagues perceive her as an intruder (Gordon & Strober, 1975). It is essential to create a critical mass in management large enough to make their presence a matter of course, rather than a phenomenon.

But the representation of women in upper-level management cannot increase until there are significant numbers of women in lower and middle management. Increasing numbers have edged from the bottom to the middle, but a group of experts, advisors, and specialists are needed at midlevel and are very rarely promoted on up (Halcomb, 1979). According to Harlan and Weiss (1979), in 1976, women accounted for 15% of all managers at the entry level, 5% at the mid-management level, and 1% of top management. Numbers and ratios are significant in establishing the all-important norms of informal social interaction (e.g., business over a drink in a bar), a process that is of utmost importance in top-management circles (Gordon & Strober, 1975).

With sufficient numbers of women visible in all areas of management, their roles in the organization may overshadow their sex-roles (O'Leary, 1974) and doubtless change current attitudes that accept a greater range of styles for men than for women (Gordon &

Strober, 1975). Then any one woman's personal style would be less attributable to all women, and each would be accepted as an individual, as is any man. When little information is known about the female, it is relatively easy to categorize her as an undifferentiated member of the subgroup of women. However, once more information is obtained concerning her performance, it becomes more difficult to stereotype her (Hall & Hall, 1976; Terborg & Ilgen, 1975). This study is concerned with providing information about sex-role and sex-characteristic stereotyping and their effect on the promotion of women into middle management. These areas are of concern because our society today is experiencing a period of significant change in the concept of a woman's role.

Statement of the Problem

Throughout the literature on attributes and behaviors for effective female leadership, writers disagree as to which sex-role and sex-characteristics should be emphasized. If a woman behaves according to the stereotype, she is of little value to the organization. However, if the woman is "unfeminine," she is not accepted either. [This is due to the incompatibility of a woman's task competence and sexuality (i.e., role conflict).

The extent to which women who achieve success using stereotypical masculine behaviors, such as aggressiveness, are viewed more or less favorably than women who use stereotypical feminine behaviors, such as intuitiveness and sensitivity, in order to succeed is unknown.

(Schein, 1978, p. 260)

Based on this conflicting research, the purpose of this study was to try to determine if masculine, feminine, and androgynous women are differentially perceived in middle management.

Research Questions

The problem confronted in this study was the conflicting findings on effective female leadership. Some supported the masculine sex-role and masculine sex-characteristics for females in leadership positions. Others supported the feminine sex-role and feminine sex-characteristics for females in leadership positions. Still others found that women in leadership positions should be androgynous. From these conflicting findings, the following question arose:

Which female--the masculine, feminine, or androgynous, would be perceived as the most credible at the middle-management level?

Both males and females are in positions to promote women in management, yet there are little data comparing the way males and females evaluate and make decisions about women in management. Reactions to the behavior and performance of women managers has produced inconsistent results. From these conflicting findings on male and female evaluation, the question arose:

Do males and females differentially perceive the credibility of masculine, feminine, and androgynous females at the middle-management level?

The Design

The first step in this study was to run a manipulations check in order to define the masculine female, the feminine female, and the androgynous female. This was accomplished by having the subjects read a list of descriptive items and complete a semantic differential-type scale bounded by the terms "not characteristic" and "characteristic." Masculine and feminine items were included on the final masculine and feminine descriptive forms if they were found to be significant by both male and female subjects. Androgynous items were included on the final androgynous descriptive form if the mean score by both male and female subjects was ≥ 3.5 .

A different set of subjects was then given the three final descriptive forms. Each subject was given a masculine, feminine, and an androgynous female description to read and then asked to complete a credibility scale for each description. The Pearson product moment was used to test the relationships between the three credibility scales of the masculine, feminine, and androgynous females. A multiple regression was used to analyze the variance among the three credibility scales due to the sex of the subject.

Definition of Terms

Masculine sex-role referred to the endorsement of masculine attributes and simultaneous rejection of feminine attributes (Bem, 1975).

Feminine sex-role referred to the endorsement of feminine attributes and simultaneous rejection of masculine attributes (Bem, 1975).

Androgynous sex-role referred to the equal endorsement of both masculine and feminine attributes (Bem, 1975).

Management referred to a leadership position that ensured efficient production of the unit's goods and services, maintained the stability of the unit in changing environments, and ensured that the organization served the needs of its participants (Fenn, 1978).

Leadership was defined as the process of providing direction in group activities and influencing others to achieve group objectives (Fenn, 1978).

Organization was defined as universal constructs designed for the coordination of activities to achieve goals that cannot be accomplished by individuals (Fenn, 1978).

Middle Management referred to the cross-department responsibilities of coordinating with counterparts in other functional areas to see that the work of her own department or group was related as effectively as possible to the immediate objectives and operations of the organization (Hennig & Jardim, 1977).

Credibility was defined as "the image held of a communicator at a given time by a receiver--either one person or a group" (Andersen & Clevenger, 1963, p. 59).

Managerial Credibility referred to competence plus power (Kanter, 1977; Schuler, 1979).

Competence was defined as the manager's ability to do the job based on technical knowledge, administrative skill, and ability in interpersonal skills (Fenn, 1978; Schuler, 1979).

Power was defined as the ability to get results, to mobilize resources (rather than dominate), and to get and use whatever it is that a person needs for the goals they are attempting to meet (Kanter, 1977). It also referred to influence--the ability to obtain coordination and cooperation (Schuler, 1979).

Chapter II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE


This review of literature has two purposes: (a) to provide a background of where women presently stand in the management world, and (b) to provide the rationale leading to the problem questions and hypotheses.

More and more, women are abandoning the traditional female roles which value helping and nurturing others. Changes in both family roles and in public attitude, mores, and values permit this change. Bartel and Manhardt (as cited in Greenwald, 1979) found that, between 1966 and 1975, women's career goals had become increasingly similar to those of men. Public acceptance of the working mother now stands alongside the acceptance and exercise of a woman's freedom of choice to marry. Increasing numbers of women are planning their lives around careers in the work world. This is due not only to the women's movement, affirmative action programs, and equal employment opportunities, but also to persistent, dramatic demographic and socioeconomic changes. There is an increase in claims for social justice for women as a minority who has suffered social, economic, and/or political discrimination. Increasing numbers of women are divorced or widowed; they are less likely to remarry, causing women to work to maintain, not supplement, lifestyles. Women have the power to control the reproductive functions of their bodies, and they are exercising choice in childbearing, family size becoming progressively smaller. Household work is less arduous and time-consuming, while

women's life spans continue to increase (8 years longer than men). Therefore, women no longer must choose between becoming a housewife and mother or a career woman (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). Because more freedom and more choice encourage careers and careers in management are included among all these opportunities, there is a future for women as managers.

"Women constitute the greatest untapped source of managerial, professional, and technical talent in the United States" (Basil, 1972, p. 1). If employment trends continue, it would appear the necessity for women in management would continue to rise. Employment opportunities in managerial positions expand as organizations grow, branch, and decentralize. People now want to work with the manager, not under the manager. It no longer requires a heavy hand of authority, a characteristic ascribed to men. Female attributes are becoming more accepted in management. Women are, therefore, being accepted for management development and training based on their potential for managerial positions (Basil, 1972).

Basil (1972) claims that findings of the behavioral sciences in leadership support the thesis that the old attributes of aggression and decisiveness (attributes that were required of leadership and ascribed to males) are no longer accepted. Therefore, women do not need to worry about these traits. Business leadership is now exercised by negotiation, support toward the people one works with, and guiding a group to consensus (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974). Men and women, therefore, have an equal chance at success by these alternative methods to aggression. According to Stead (1985), male managers



consistently report that men believe women are temperamentally unsuited for management (i.e., too emotional and tense for work that requires objectivity, analytical skills, and careful reasoning). But leadership is not found to be consistently characterized by a high degree of self-control or by a lack of emotional expression. Researchers have failed, then, to differentiate between effective and ineffective leaders using the "trait theory model" which studies the characteristics of male leaders in order to distinguish leaders from nonleaders (Pickford, as cited in Stead, 1985). Women can, therefore, determine their leadership patterns to suit their own personalities and strengths. Gender has little to do with human relations; either managers are sensitive and concerned about the needs of others or he/she is not.

Females as Equals to Males

"There is little reason to suggest that one sex should manage while the other should not" (Larwood & Wood, 1977, p. 29). Generations have assumed the economic and leadership superiority of men, but research has concluded there are no differences of any consequence to management between the mental, emotional, or physical capacities of men and women (Larwood, Wood, & Inderlied, 1978; Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974). Harris and Lucas (1976) found the mentally healthy adult does not have characteristics ascribed to a male, as found by Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz, and Vogel (1970), but rather, the mentally healthy adult can have male or female characteristics. In field studies, women managers perform as credibly as males; effects associated with leaders' gender tend to dissipate in the field

(Fairhurst, in press). According to Terborg and Ilgen (1975), a considerable body of research exists which indicates that women do possess the qualifications of management--Matthews (1972) on problem solving, Lirtzman and Walba (1972) on cooperation and competition, and Bass, Krussell, and Alexander (1971) on potential managerial capability. Wood (1976) surveyed 100 male and female managers to find female managers are competent, handling their emotions and responses to criticisms, and winning increasing acceptance (three areas in which women are usually evaluated as inferior to men). Morrison and Sebal'd's (1974) study supports that female executives are similar to male executives in motivation, mental ability, and self-esteem. Miner (1974) also found males and females to be equally motivated to manage and effective in managing. Harlan and Weiss (1979) found male and female managers to be similar in need for achievement, need for affiliation, need for power, dominance, motivation to manage, and self-esteem.

Up to this time, research studies have found no evidence that makes a case for gender differences in either leadership aptitude or style (Kanter, 1977). Bartol (1978) found few differences between male and female leaders in leader behavior or style, job satisfaction of leaders and subordinates, and job performance. Hall and Hall (1976) found gender did not affect the performance appraisal of male and female incumbents. When evaluated by immediate subordinates, Day and Stogdill (1972) found male and female superiors to exhibit similar patterns of leadership behavior and levels of effectiveness. Leader

gender does not appear then to have a consistent influence on either leader behavior or subordinate satisfaction (Osborn & Vicars, 1976).

Where a candidate's qualifications are clearly acceptable, both males and females are considered equally qualified for management (Rosen & Jerdee, 1974a). Differences across careers and between women in nontraditional and traditional roles is greater than differences between the sexes in careers (Harlan & Weiss, 1979; Wertheim, Widom, & Wortzel, 1978). Bolton and Humphreys (1977) found female managers to have more in common with their male counterparts in strong verbal skills, ability to logically evaluate complex information, and a taste for company politics, than with nonworking women.

The political, social, and economic changes over the past decades have led to a blurring of a formerly sharp division between the roles and attributes of men and women. There is now increasing sex-role permissiveness and restructuring. Masculine and feminine attributes indeed vary virtually independently of each other within each gender. This is found to be true basically in whites of all ages and both sexes but not true for homosexuals (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). Sex-roles can now be viewed as particular social skills or competencies that individuals can use to obtain reinforcement or otherwise interact with the environment (Kelly & Worrell, 1977). It depends on the situation what behaviors are appropriate. "The important issue becomes not whether one has internalized the traits and behaviors appropriate to one's gender, but the extent to which one has assimilated the tendencies highly valued by society" (Jones, Chernovetz, & Hansson, 1978, p. 311).

So women now have a choice among sex-roles. Our society is moving toward a climate where women can express their femininity and/or masculinity through interpersonal relationships as opposed to their performance in stereotyped roles (Van Dusen & Sheldon, as cited in Jewell, 1977). By expanding general role prescriptions for women, as well as by relating occupational role prescriptions more closely to performance requirements, women will have a broader choice of roles to play. Those best qualified to perform the necessary functions will not be excluded because they can express those "feminine" and "masculine" attributes desirable for a satisfactory management style. It is important for industry to identify, select, and promote those women who have the potential for successful management careers.

Sex-Role Differentiation and Conflict

Terborg, Peters, Ilgen, and Smith (1977) report, however, that research findings are mixed, supporting pro-male evaluation bias. These pro-male evaluation studies (Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz, 1972; Schein, 1973, 1975) are a probable explanation for the differential treatment of equally qualified women (versus men) in management. Though there are no legal barriers to women in management, and though they have been found to be as equally qualified as men, yet strong attitudinal barriers to female corporate advancement continue. Two external barriers are: (a) pervasive and persistent societal sex-role and sex-characteristic stereotypes, as inferred post hoc by Rosen and Jerdee (1974b); and (b) the prevalence of the "male managerial" model.

Sex-role differentiation is universal among human societies; women and men are assigned different rights, privileges, and tasks and are likely to be subject to different rules of conduct, particularly in interaction with each other (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). By starting with assumptions, and then prescribing roles based on those assumptions, a structure of relationships develops. Assumptions regard the differences between people based on gender alone (Fenn, 1978). Culturally prescribed behaviors then are deeply rooted in the backgrounds of most of us. Resistance to change has caused the formation of stereotypes as well as their perpetuation. Reflecting this division of roles along sexual lines, men and women are typically assumed to possess different temperamental characteristics and abilities, distinctive sets of attributes whose existence is also used to justify the perpetuation of the society's role structure. Characteristics one attributes to one gender or the other turn out to be results of what our culture expects rather than hard-and-fast biological or chemical differences between the sexes (Halcomb, 1979). While attitudes and behaviors are influenced and may change, women and men are each products of their respective upbringings and stereotypes remain part of our thinking and our vocabulary on an everyday level (Schoonover, as cited in Jewell, 1977).

For years, masculinity was the mark of a psychologically healthy male, and femininity was the mark of a psychologically healthy female. These sex-typed persons have internalized society's sex-typed standards of desirable (i.e., positive) behavior and attributes for men and women (Bem, 1974; Spence & Helmreich, 1978). According to Heilbrun

(1976), masculinity and femininity are independent constructs, not opposite ends of a single dimension (i.e., bipolar), that concentrate on how the two genders differ (i.e., sex-typing). In 1966, Bakan labeled the core properties of femininity the sense of "communion," and the core properties of masculinity the sense of "agency" (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). Communality included nurturance, emotionality, and expressiveness, while the agentic role included instrumentality, rationality, strength, and assertiveness (Jones et al., 1978). These are the same clusters that Bem (1974) labeled on her Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) as "expressive" orientation for feminine traits and behaviors and "instrumental" orientation for masculine traits and behaviors. The expressive orientation has an affective focus on the "welfare of others." The instrumental orientation has a cognitive focus on "getting the job done." The highest feminine loadings on the BSRI are warm, gentle, compassionate, understanding, tender, sympathetic, sensitive to the needs of others, affectionate, eager to soothe hurt feelings, and loyal. The highest masculine loadings are dominant, acts like a leader, aggressive, has leadership abilities, forceful, willing to take a stand, strong personality, and assertive (Waters, Waters, & Pincus, 1977).

Sex-typed persons are restricted, then, in the range of behaviors available to them as they move from situation to situation. The androgynous individual is sensitive, however, to the changing constraints of situations and engages in whatever behavior seems most effective at the moment, regardless of its stereotype as appropriate for one gender or the other (Bem, 1975a). The term androgyny is made

up of the prefix andro, meaning male, and the suffix, gyne, meaning female (Gutek & Stevens, 1979). Androgynous individuals, thus, score high on masculinity and high on femininity and can be both instrumental and expressive, depending upon the appropriateness of these modalities (Bem, 1977).

Stereotypes and roles may be thought of then as forms of categorization that are applied in general use by some group of people. The stereotype is normative in the sense that each of us (of either gender) can recognize it immediately. It "refers to a consistent pattern of values and behaviors that describes the most remembered set of beliefs or actions of members of the category being referenced" (Larwood & Wood, 1977, p. 30). It seems most likely when there is little other than gender on which to base one's judgment (Broverman et al., 1972; Osborn & Vicars, 1976; Schein, 1978). According to Larwood and Wood (1977), while a stereotype provides a sharply focused set of points within a category, a role may be defined in terms of rather flexible category boundaries. A role contains within its boundaries, then, certain important behaviors and values that most people can agree are usually exhibited by those occupying a specific social or organizational position (i.e., consensual prescriptive norms). Sex-role stereotypes, then, are widely held beliefs concerning appropriate behavior of men and women as individuals and in relation to others. Sex-characteristic stereotypes are widely held beliefs about differences in personality traits (Terborg, 1977; Izraeli, Banai, & Zeira, as cited in Stead, 1985). Sex-characteristic stereotypes assume women are less ambitious and rational, and more

emotional, dependent, conforming, and passive than men (Izraeli et al., as cited in Stead, 1985). Sex-role behaviors involve a multitude of roles including vocational activities and the assumption that a woman's first responsibility is to the children. These are more normative while sex-characteristic stereotypes are descriptive.

No society is without a sex-based division of labor. Tradition, not job content, has labeled some jobs as women's and others as men's. At present, sex-based work roles are in a considerable state of flux all over the Western world (Agassi, as cited in Jewell, 1977). Males and females who are in sex-atypical jobs are in jobs in which norms regarding desirable work-related behaviors are not compatible with norms regarding behavior appropriate for the gender (i.e., sex-role incongruence). Schein (1973) states that the managerial job can be classified as masculine, because there are more men than women in management. Due to this classification, stereotyping occurs and male attributes are considered more appropriate. McGregor, in 1967, defined the male managerial model.

The model of a successful manager in our culture is a masculine one. The good manager is aggressive, competitive, firm, and just. He is not feminine, he is not soft and yielding or dependent or intuitive in the womanly sense.

The very expression of emotion is widely viewed as a feminine weakness that would interfere with effective business processes. (O'Leary, 1974, p. 23)

Hobart and Harries's (Jewell, 1977) study found sex-role stereotyping by present and future male and female managers to support this premise.

Work-roles and sex-roles are then in conflict. As managers, women are either out of role by sex and in role by position or in role by sex and out of role by position (Pearce & Rossi, 1984). If women emulate masculine characteristics deemed essential for the job (e.g., professionalism, independence, and rationality), she is then called "unfeminine," "aggressive," adjectives that are derogatory for women. On the other hand, if she does not demonstrate these so-called "masculine" characteristics, she may be considered inadequate for the job (i.e., dependent and nurturant). This double-bind typifies some of the difficulties women face in trying to "make it" to the upper echelons of business and professions (Prather, 1971; Putnam, as cited in Pilotta, 1983; Pickford, as cited in Stead, 1985). As of 1978, Katherine Graham was the only female chief executive of a company on either the first or second Fortune 500 list (Halcomb, 1979). Academic research on discrimination in business has generally concentrated on the sex-typing of management skills as masculine and the implications this has for women who are attempting to enter management positions.

Sex-role stereotypes are inaccurate and may even be oppressive. "Nowhere are . . . arguments [against stereotypes] more intense, nor do they gather more support, than when they point to the historical and contemporary discrimination against women in male-dominated occupations" (Garland & Price, 1977, p. 29). Gatekeepers are often so committed to stereotypes that they are incapable of seeing talent or emerging competence because "the package in which it is presented is so unexpected" (Gordon & Strober, 1975, p. 16). Categorizations ignore the wide variations that exist within each category. The

serious mistake is believing that all individuals within each category are essentially alike. The danger is the potential loss of those capabilities not assumed to be present. It may result in the suppression of achievement striving and lack of desire to move up the corporate structure (Gackenbach, Burke, & Auerbach, as cited in Jewell, 1977; Loring & Wells, 1972).

Expectations of appropriate characteristics and behaviors affect decision-making behavior because of the perceptions that males and females have of themselves and others (Hobart & Harries, as cited in Jewell, 1977; Rosen & Jerdee, 1973). When it is necessary for decision makers to make decisions in the absence of definitive data, stereotypes help individuals fill in for missing information (Bartol & Butterfield, 1976; Greenwald, 1979; Rosen & Jerdee, 1974b). According to Rosen and Jerdee (1973), Gilmer (1971) found the way women behave on the job, rather than the way they perform the technical operations, is the chief determinant of their acceptance as administrators. "Personal influence and attributes may be even more significant to upward mobility than work performance, especially in the upper echelons of the corporation" (Schuler, 1979, p. 36). Schein (1973, 1975) found that sex-role stereotyping impacts on perceptions of managerial ability and performance. She concluded that it has a definite and negative impact on the selection of women into managerial positions.

"The evidence from this and other studies is that women rarely attain true managerial positions much above the rank of first line supervisor" (Basil, 1972, p. 31). Even where women are given higher-level administrative jobs, these do not lead to top-management posts,

but rather are ancillary routes that may be dead ends (Gordon & Strober, 1975). As management jobs increase in responsibility, women become increasingly rare. Management remains the domain of the white male (Lynch, 1973). Male managers tend to promote to middle management those women least likely to reach top management: women who are older and less aggressive. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in 1978, there were 25% women in managerial positions (Collins, as cited in Stead, 1985). Perceptions and expectations stand, then, as barriers to advancing women into higher levels of management, which still are dominated by men (Hobart & Harries, as cited in Jewell, 1977; O'Leary, 1974). Confusion has been created about proper behavior and roles. Unfortunately, there are little data addressing the issue of the effects of stereotypes on the treatment of women in business (Terborg & Ilgen, 1975).

Rationale for Questions and Hypotheses

Lemkau (1979) found no single constellation of personality factors emerges as consistently characteristic of women in male-dominated occupations. Tangri's (1972) reported responses by role innovators (i.e., women in occupations with fewer than 30% female workers) included autonomous, individualistic, unconventional, and intellectual. The female middle managers in Crawford's (1977) study reported themselves to be highly persuasive, highly motivated, competent, aggressive, and competitive. Nontraditional women in Galejs and King's (1983) study viewed themselves as incisive, diplomatic, and independent. O'Connell (1980) was reported by Chusmir (1983) to have

found nontraditional women to be dominant, ambitious, self-confident, achievement-oriented, self-actualizing, and socially posed. Swatko (1981) found the personality differences between nontraditional and traditional women to be contradictory but the nontraditional women were more academically achievement-oriented, more scientific and mechanically interested, less people-oriented and more task-oriented, persevering, investigative, and enterprising.

It appears that women who choose a nontraditional career are likely to possess many of the same personality and motivation characteristics attributed to men (Terborg, 1977). Moulliet (1981) found women in managerial occupations were more likely to be classified as masculine. Segal (1981), using the BSRI, found 70% of nontraditional women to be masculine while most of the rest scored androgynous. College faculty also completed the BSRI for Tyer and Erdwins (1979), 41% of the females scoring masculine and 18% androgynous. But, according to Chusmir (1983), nontraditional women desire to maintain their femininity and identity as a woman. This is supported by Welch (1979) who found masculinity in women to increase as a direct function of the degree of departure from the housewife role. However, the nontraditional women supplemented their feminine identity with masculine characteristics (i.e., were androgynous). This is also supported by Yanico and Hardin (1981). Capka (1979) and Moore and Rickel (1980) also found nontraditional women to be androgynous (over masculine and feminine). Moore and Rickel found, however, the higher the occupational level, the less likely women are to identify with characteristics of managers and women (i.e.,

feminine characteristics). This is in direct conflict to Hennig (1971, as cited in Crawford, 1977) who found female supervisors emulated a masculine behavioral style until middle-age when they moved to a management style which incorporated the "consideration type" (i.e., human relations) management behaviors. Diamond (1971) supports Hennig, having found in higher management levels, male and female characteristics combine to form an effective well-balanced management profile.

According to Schein (1975), Terborg (1977), Peters, Terborg, and Taylor (1974), and Rosen and Jerdee (1974c), successful female middle managers are perceived to possess characteristics, attitudes, and temperaments more commonly ascribed to men in general, than women in general (e.g., vigorous, self-reliant, aggressive, yet emotionally stable). Osborn and Vicars (1976) and Wood (1976) found female managers demonstrate motivation, capacity, and administrative and leadership skills comparable to their male counterparts. Jacklin and Maccoby (1975) and Wood (1976) found women who succeed parallel men in ability, confidence, and desire for authority, status, and challenge. "These and other findings pertaining to women managers suggest that acceptance of stereotypical male characteristics as a basis for success in management may be a necessity for the woman seeking to achieve in the current organizational climate" (Schein, 1975, p. 373). Spence and Helmreich (1972) found competent masculine women to be preferred over competent feminine women. Because this masculine stereotype is similar to the common image of a manager, women with feminine values and behaviors may be excluded from management (Larwood & Wood, 1977).

But, according to Lynch (1973), the management woman does not give up all her personal attributes and must use her femininity (along with her other qualities) effectively. He claims that peers and bosses like to have nontraditional women retain their femininity and not try to be "one of the boys." Lang (1978) counsels nontraditional women to develop a "special skill" as a woman; do not try to be one of the guys but be a woman. According to Crawford (1977), Johnson (1975) and Hackamack and Solid (1972) indicated that so-called "feminine attributes" (e.g., social graces, concern for values and ethics, creativity, responsiveness) can enhance women as managers. "The woman making it in a man's world today keeps some of the best of what it means to be feminine in this society" (Halcomb, 1979, p. 173). Cynthia Epstein (Robie, as cited in Ginzberg & Yohalem, 1973) says women who are professional but not especially forward or aggressive, who try to be gracious as women and not deny their gender, are said to be able to make the best impression on men and gain acceptance. This is in direct conflict with findings from the University of Southern California where the consensus of women participants in the training seminars for middle management was that a woman has to defeminize herself with her male associates. These women also agreed, however, that female managers should not become "mannish" to the point other women distrust them and men feel uncomfortable (Basil, 1972).

Though the above findings support the expression of their femininity, many females in management work out a solution somewhere in-between masculinity and femininity (i.e., androgyny). The women interviewed in Halcomb's (1979) book did not succeed by "playing a

man's game" or by abandoning their own values, but they were not too traditionally feminine or too ardently feminist either. According to Putnam and Heinen (as cited in Stead, 1985), it is not only possible, but preferable that a woman retain her feminine responsiveness without losing the power of assertion or even of command. Lynch (1973) and Loring and Wells (1972) support women who merge competency with femininity, breaking out of the stereotype that defines women by their gender. Bremer (1973) and Wood (1975) believe the management role does not mean playing a "male" role; a woman must be feminine and have open expressions of feelings but also be aggressive to be successful.

The above conflicting findings on effective female leadership gave rise to the question of which female--the masculine, feminine, or androgynous--would be perceived as most credible at the middle-management level. The following findings led to the formulation of the first three hypotheses (found in Chapter III).

Research supports job-appropriate behavior over gender expectations (Cash, Gillen, & Burns, 1977; Greenwald, 1979; Larwood & Wood, 1977). Schuler (1979) found that congruent job type and incumbent are more favorably evaluated. Schein (as cited in Jewell, 1977) supports this in her study where male managers and female managers equated male with management, but not female. These findings suggest that acceptance of stereotypical male characteristics as a basis for success in management may be a necessity for women seeking to achieve in the current organizational climate. Halcomb (1979) found the qualities a woman needs to succeed are the same ones a man needs: firmness, decisiveness, assertiveness, and ability to calculate risks. Crawford (1977) found

the functional aspects of management are the same whether or not the manager is male or female; therefore, both men and women must develop the same basic skills.

Though the above findings support the use of masculine skills, in today's society there is a trend toward androgyny (Miner, as cited in Jewell, 1977). The manager needs to use both assertiveness and nonassertive techniques in order to achieve maximum effectiveness in reaching organizational goals. Assertiveness is the ability to state positively and to maintain one's rightful and reasonable position without attacking or giving in. Nonassertion recognizes that any managerial or interpersonal style is "conditioned in its effectiveness upon the exact nature of the situation" (Ames, 1977). A good deal of managerial psychological and sociological research seems to have converged on the concept that the best leaders are often those who are both competent (i.e., masculine) and expressive (i.e., feminine), as the situation may require. Stanek (as cited in Stead, 1985) claims the "climate is ripe" for change, to reevaluate managerial styles and move away from a results orientation (i.e., the traditional male model) to a human resource orientation, combining organization norms and family norms (e.g., competition and cooperation; dominance and yielding; independence, nurturing, and collaboration). The increase in competency does not appear to detract from the female executive's femininity. "Success for a woman requires that a delicate balance be maintained between acceptable role behavior and demonstrated work abilities. As a rule, a high degree of either one alone is unacceptable to those making . . . advancement decisions" (Larwood &

Wood, 1977, p. 123). Gordon and Strober (1975) believe the primary impact of the entry of women into management will be less to add an alternative "feminine" management style than to develop an androgynous style of management, one that incorporates both so-called masculine styles (e.g., aggressiveness, competitive, achievement-oriented, and determined) and feminine styles (e.g., open, interpersonally aware, and understanding).

Both the findings supporting job-appropriate behavior, and those supporting androgynous behavior, support masculine behavior. Falbo (1977) found that masculine and androgynous persons received more positive peer evaluations than feminine persons. "The general finding has been that androgynous and masculine-typed persons perform well or look best and frequently do not differ significantly from one another on characteristics for which sex-role categories are compared" (Kelly & Worrell, 1977, p. 1113). This would indicate that while androgynous persons possess approximately equal numbers of masculine and feminine characteristics, it may be principally the masculine-typed behaviors that have greater potential for leading to reinforcement (i.e., promotion) in our society. It appears, then, that masculine characteristics and behaviors are more valued by our society.

In contrast, Kelly and Worrell (1977) found feminine-typed subjects tended to "look worse" relative to the masculine and androgynous groups. The feminine persons in Falbo's (1977) study received more negative peer evaluations than either the masculine or androgynous persons. Males in our society are allowed to achieve power in the competitive world while women are programmed for passivity with no

concept of power (Halcomb, 1979). Women do not have the positional power which comes with their positions as managers because management is labeled male. They seldom have personal power (i.e., the ability to influence) because the methods for acquiring this type of power are more available to men than women (Schuler, 1979). It appears, then, that feminine persons have less positive evaluations relative to masculine and androgynous persons, and power is labeled as masculine and valued by our society.

The second problem question arose because of the scarcity of data comparing the way males and females evaluate and make decisions about women in management, even though males and females are both in positions to promote women in management (Gutek & Stevens, 1979). Reactions to the behavior and performance of women managers has produced inconsistent results (Terborg & Ilgen, 1975). Peters et al. (1974), Matteson (1976), and Terborg et al. (1977), using the Women as Managers Scale (WAMS), found women have more favorable attitudes toward women as managers than would males. Welsh (1979) found males endorse a more conservative role for females, particularly in management roles, than do females. Putnam and Heinen (as cited in Stead, 1985) found negative attitudes by men toward women who show a tendency to demand equality, try to be masculine, insist on asserting ego, and are domineering and aggressive. Forgionne and Nwacukwu (1977), however, implied from their study that males have a higher regard for female managers than do females. Fenn (1978) claims that women threaten other women, and therefore, there is a lack of support for women by women.

Rosen and Jerdee (1973) and Schein (1975) found, however, that male and female managers hold similar, and often negative attitudes toward women in management. Though Lynch (1973) found men and women, as a rule, do not mind a female boss when she is competent and understanding, Lang (1978) found women distrust nontraditional women and men are threatened by them or consider them different. Hobart and Harries (as cited in Jewell, 1977) also found females have the same expectations of female managers as males. Men and women in Wood's (1976) study agreed, in general, that the gender of the manager did not affect ability or stability. She also found, contrary to Peters et al. (1974), that both men and women support expanding female roles in business.

From these conflicting findings, it was not apparent whether males and females differentially perceive the credibility of masculine, feminine, and androgynous females at the middle-management level. The following findings then led to the last three hypotheses (found in Chapter III) which were formulated in an attempt to answer this question.

Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman, and Broverman (1968), supported by Lunneborg (1970), found higher valuation of stereotypically masculine than feminine characteristics by both sexes. Broverman et al. (1970) and Peters et al. (1974) agree that males and females see traits required of successful managers to be the same traits commonly attributed to males in general. According to Petty and Miles (1976), both Rosen and Jerdee and Schein agree that male and female managers see managers as possessing characteristics, attitudes, and temperaments

ascribed to men rather than women. Male and female executives rank-ordered characteristics similarly for top management (Basil, 1972). Terborg's (1977) summary in his research review was that women describe themselves and are described by men as having self-concepts that are not suitable for management. Both sexes were also found to prefer the female who possesses highly valued male attributes (e.g., competence) and masculine interests. Males and females prefer competent masculine women to competent feminine women (Spence & Helmreich, 1972). It appears then that masculine characteristics and behaviors are more valued by our society, and both males and females agree on this evaluation.

Chapter III

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

The procedure of this study consisted of two phases. The first step was to run a manipulations check in order to obtain the masculine, feminine, and androgynous terms used on the final measurement instrument. The second phase was the administering of the measurement instrument.

Statement of the Hypotheses

In order to examine the research questions proposed in Chapter I, and using the rationale from the review of literature in Chapter II, the following hypotheses were generated:

H1: The credibility ratings of the masculine female middle manager and the androgynous female middle manager will be similar.

H2: The credibility ratings of the feminine female middle manager and the masculine female middle manager will be significantly different.

H3: The credibility ratings of the feminine female middle manager and the androgynous female middle manager will be significantly different.

H4: Male subjects and female subjects will rate the masculine female manager similarly.

H5: Male subjects and female subjects will rate the feminine female manager similarly.

H6: Male subjects and female subjects will rate the androgynous female manager similarly.

Subjects

The sample for the manipulations check consisted of 110 undergraduate students in the Fundamentals of Public Speaking and Organizational Communication classes in the Communication Department at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. The sample for the final measurement instrument was composed of 110 undergraduate students from the Principles of Management, and Human Resources and Management classes in the Business College at the University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Manipulations Check

In order to define the masculine female, the feminine female, and the androgynous female, three descriptive forms were developed. In developing these descriptive forms, 34 items that differentially describe males and females were garnered from studies by Rosenkrantz et al. (1968) and Schein (as cited in Jewell, 1977) and from the Sex-Role Stereotype Questionnaire by Broverman et al. (1970), the Personal Attributes Questionnaire by Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp (1974), the BSRI (1974), and the Adjective Check List (Heilbrun, 1976).

A preliminary form listing these 34 descriptive items was administered to the undergraduate students during regular class time. Each student was given the same list of 34 items and a 5-point semantic differential-type scale bounded by the terms "not characteristic" and "characteristic" (see Appendix A). The students were asked to rate these items from "characteristic" to "not characteristic" for either a masculine, feminine, or an androgynous person.

Two-tailed t tests for planned comparisons were run on the masculine and feminine forms (see Appendix B). Masculine and feminine items were included on the final masculine and feminine descriptive forms if they were found to be significant by both male and female students. Mean scores were figured for all the androgynous forms (see Appendix B). Androgynous items were included on the final androgynous descriptive form if the mean score by both male and female students was ≥ 3.5 .

Procedure

Students were asked to complete the three final descriptive forms (see Appendix C) during regular class time. Each student was given all three forms (randomly ordered) in order to simulate the essential sequential-comparative nature of selection practices. After reading each of the three descriptions, one at a time, a semantic differential-type scale, used to determine perceived supervisory credibility, was completed.

Measurement Instrument

Experiments concerning ethos have dealt with many and varied topics. They have been concerned with the effects of differences in prestige, credibility, likeableness, and other variables upon attitudes toward political-social issues, upon valuations of art and literature, and upon learning. They have studied the relative effectiveness of majority and expert opinion and the relative susceptibility of the sexes, different age groups, and persons of various educational levels

to prestige suggestion. They have also studied effects and the permanency of the attitude change and the learning induced by different levels of ethos. These studies, which arise from psychology, speech, sociology, and education, are quite diverse in origin.

The research projects above are concerned, then, with the study of such presumed results of ethos as preferences, attitude change, and information gain. In a few instances, however, the development of a measure of ethos has been the main goal of a research project. Between 1960 and 1970 researchers utilized factor analytic techniques in conjunction with semantic differential or Likert-type scaling procedures to uncover the perceptual structure of source credibility. Berlo and Lemert, in 1961, using semantic differential scales, identified three factors of the ethos construct: competence, trustworthiness, and dynamism (McCroskey, 1966). McCroskey used both Likert-type and semantic differential scales. Factor analysis produced two significant factors: authoritativeness and character. While this finding of two-factoredness is consistent with findings of most other researchers, the theoretical "factor" of ethos characterized as "good will" by Aristotle and others, and as "intention" by Hovland, Irving, and Kelly (1953), did not appear. McCroskey speculated, however, that the theoretical "good will" or "intention" factor is not separate from authoritativeness and character. Berlo and Lemert's competence and trustworthiness corresponded with McCroskey's authoritativeness and character. Whitehead (1968) verified the previously identified dimensions of source credibility and the scales for measuring it by generating the

same factors: trustworthiness, competence, and dynamism. However, he also found a fourth factor--objectivity--concluding one cannot regard source credibility as simply a three-factor structure.

In 1969, Berlo, Lemert, and Mertz extended the work of Hovland et al. by investigating the criteria actually used by receivers in evaluating message sources. They argued that credibility is not a static attribute of a source, but rather a perception which is subject to change. Three dimensions were isolated: safety, qualification, and dynamism. The factor analytic results provided a clarification of what Hovland et al. (1953) meant by expertise and trustworthiness, and suggested that there is a third dimension, "dynamism." Hovland et al. seemed to regard the receiver's perceptions of the source's intent as the essential aspect of "trustworthiness." The safety factor for Berlo et al. includes this aspect of the receiver's perceptions, however, it includes other aspects as well. Berlo et al. also concluded that the Hovland conception of "expertise" should be extended to include a more general notion of prestige, as involved in evaluations of their qualification factor. This is Berlo and Lemert's (1961) original "competence" factor, and includes such power-prestige words as important, powerful, and successful.

The scale used in this study was borrowed from the factor analytic research of Berlo et al. (1969) as used by Falcione (1974). Based on the factor analysis of the Berlo et al. instrument, Falcione chose the following factors to measure subordinate perceptions of supervisor credibility:

1. safety: just-unjust, objective-subjective, unselfish-selfish, fair-unfair, ethical-unethical.

2. qualification: experienced-inexperienced, skilled-unskilled, informed-uninformed, intelligent-unintelligent, qualified-unqualified.

3. dynamism: bold-timid, active-passive, aggressive-meek, emphatic-hesitant, forceful-forceless.

Because the Berlo et al. instrument was originally developed by sampling a student population as well as an adult population, the Falcione instrument appeared to be the most appropriate one to use in a university setting to determine management credibility. The Falcione scale was submitted to a principal-axis factor analysis with Varimax rotation and to a reliability analysis using Cronbach's alpha (see Appendix D).

Experimental Design and Variables

The independent variable was the sex of the subjects. The three sex-role descriptions of masculine, feminine, and androgynous acted as an intervening variable. The dependent variable was the credibility rating of each of these three descriptions.

The Pearson product moment was used in order to test the following hypotheses as generated from the problem question concerning which female--the masculine, feminine, or androgynous--would be perceived as most credible in middle management:

H1: The credibility ratings of the masculine female middle manager and the androgynous female middle manager will be similar.

H2: The credibility ratings of the feminine female middle manager and the masculine female middle manager will be significantly different.

H3: The credibility ratings of the feminine female middle manager and the androgynous female middle manager will be significantly different.

The Pearson product moment tested the relationships between the three credibility scales of the masculine, feminine, and androgynous females. It was also used to test the relationships between the safety, qualification, and dynamism factors of the three credibility scales and between these factors and the entire credibility scale.

The Pearson product moment and a multiple regression were used in order to test the following hypotheses as generated from the problem question concerning whether males and females differentially perceive the credibility of masculine, feminine, and androgynous women in middle management:

H4: Male subjects and female subjects will rate the masculine female manager similarly.

H5: Male subjects and female subjects will rate the feminine female manager similarly.

H6: Male subjects and female subjects will rate the androgynous female manager similarly.

A stepwise regression was used to analyze the variance among the three credibility scales due to the sex of the subjects.

Chapter IV

RESULTS

Of the 110 scales administered for the masculine, feminine, and androgynous descriptions, 105 usable scales were obtained for each. There were 62 male subjects and 43 female subjects. The responses for each of the 15 items on these masculine, feminine, and androgynous scales were given a numerical value between 1 and 7 ("1" representing the "highest" rating and "7" the "lowest" rating).

For Hypothesis 1, the Pearson product moment resulted in a correlation coefficient of $r = .40$ ($p < .0009$) for the masculine and androgynous scales. Table I shows the results of the Pearson product moment between the masculine, feminine, and androgynous scales and between the safety, qualification, and dynamism factors. According to Johnson (as cited in Bailey, 1982), this correlation coefficient was statistically significant, supporting Hypothesis 1 that the subjects would rate the masculine female and the androgynous female similarly. The correlation accounted for 16% of the variability between the masculine and androgynous scales. In looking at the safety, qualification, and dynamism factors of the masculine and androgynous scales, however, the Pearson r correlation coefficient was significant for only one factor--qualification.

For Hypothesis 2, the correlation coefficient for the feminine and masculine scales was $r = .30$ ($p < .001$). According to Johnson (as cited in Bailey, 1982), this is a significant correlation. The ratings on the feminine and masculine scales, then, were not

Table I
Pearson r Between Masculine, Feminine, and Androgynous Scales
and Between Safety, Qualification, and Dynamism Factors

	Masculine	A	B	C	Feminine	A	B	C
Androgynous	.40**** (<u>N</u> = 97)				.44**** (<u>N</u> = 98)			
A. Safety		.13* (<u>N</u> = 100)				.38**** (<u>N</u> = 101)		
B. Qualification			.53**** (<u>N</u> = 104)				.42**** (<u>N</u> = 102)	
C. Dynamism				.14* (<u>N</u> = 102)				.27** (<u>N</u> = 104)
Feminine	.30*** (<u>N</u> = 98)							
A. Safety		-.01* (<u>N</u> = 102)						
B. Qualification			.38**** (<u>N</u> = 103)					
C. Dynamism				-.11* (<u>N</u> = 103)				

Note. Not all data are applicable and, therefore, not included.

*ns. ** $p < .003$. *** $p < .001$. **** $p < .0009$.

significantly different, as predicted by Hypothesis 2. The correlation accounted for 9% of the variability between the feminine and masculine scales. The Pearson r for the qualification factor of the feminine and masculine scales was also found to be significantly correlated. The safety and dynamism factors, however, were found to be independent of each other for the feminine and masculine scales. Though these two correlation coefficients were in the direction (i.e., negative) predicted by Hypothesis 2, they were not significant.

Table I presents the Pearson correlation coefficients for Hypothesis 3. The correlation coefficient for the feminine and androgynous scales was the most significant found, therefore not supporting Hypothesis 3. The subjects rated the feminine and androgynous female managers similarly instead of differently. This is supported by the correlation coefficients for the safety, qualification, and dynamism factors of these two scales. The correlation coefficient between the feminine and androgynous scales accounted for 19% of the variability between these two scales.

Hypothesis 4 stated that the male and female subjects would rate the masculine female manager similarly. The Pearson product moment resulted in a nonsignificant correlation coefficient for the sex of subject (SS) and the masculine scale. Table II presents the correlation coefficients between the SS and the masculine, feminine, and androgynous scales and between the SS and the safety, qualification, and dynamism factors. None of the correlation coefficients for the SS and the safety, qualification, and dynamism factors of the masculine scale were found to be significant either. This failure to find significant

Table II
 Pearson r Between SS and Masculine, Feminine, and
 Androgynous Scales and Between SS and Safety,
 Qualification, and Dynamism Factors

Scale or Factor	<u>r</u> ^a	<u>N</u>	<u>p</u>
Masculine	-.17	101	.04
Safety	-.10	103	ns
Qualification	-.12	105	ns
Dynamism	-.18	103	.03
Feminine	-.06	102	ns
Safety	.11	104	ns
Qualification	-.13	103	ns
Dynamism	-.11	105	ns
Androgynous	-.20	101	.02
Safety	-.21	102	.02
Qualification	-.12	104	ns
Dynamism	-.20	104	.02

^aone-tailed

correlation coefficients showed that the SS was independent of the ratings for the masculine scale. The direction, though, of the three coefficients for the SS and the safety, qualification, and dynamism factors (along with the coefficient for the SS and the masculine scale) showed that the female subjects tended to give "higher" ratings than the male subjects.

Further analysis using a multiple regression did not find a significant level for the explained variance due to sex in the masculine scale. The multiple regression yielded a partial correlation for the SS and the masculine scale of $r = -.14$ (ns, $N = 94$). These multiple regression results supported Hypothesis 4 that the male and female subjects rated the masculine female similarly.

Hypothesis 5 stated that the male and female subjects would rate the feminine female manager similarly. The Pearson product moment did not find a significant correlation coefficient for the SS and the feminine scale, nor for the SS and the safety, qualification, and dynamism factors of the feminine scale. These results are shown in Table II. Three coefficients again showed a tendency for the female subjects to give "higher" ratings than the male subjects. However, this was not true for the safety factor of the feminine scale. This factor had a "positive" correlation with the SS. The male subjects (compared to the female subjects) tended to give a "higher" rating to the feminine female manager on the safety factor. These results were not significant, however, and therefore showed that the SS was independent of the ratings for the feminine female manager.

Further analysis using a multiple regression did not find a significant level for the explained variance due to sex in the feminine scale. A stepwise regression for the safety, qualification, and dynamism factors, however, did find a significant level for explained variance due to sex in the safety factor of the feminine scale. The explained variance for the safety factor of the feminine scale was $r^2 = .06$, $F(2, 91) = 7.01$, $p < .001$. The multiple regression yielded a partial correlation for the SS and the feminine scale of $r = .06$ (ns, $N = 94$). The partial correlation for the SS and the safety factor of the feminine scale was $r = .25$ ($N = 94$). As with the Pearson product moment for this factor, the male subjects tended to rate the feminine female manager "higher" than the female subjects did. Though this partial correlation was significant, the results of the multiple regression supported Hypothesis 5 that the male and female subjects rated the feminine female manager similarly. No significant explained variance was found between the SS and the feminine scale.

Hypothesis 6 stated that the male and female subjects would rate the androgynous female manager similarly. The Pearson product moment, however, resulted in three significant correlation coefficients. These results are shown in Table II. The correlation coefficients between the SS and the androgynous scale, the SS and the safety factor of the androgynous scale, and the SS and the dynamism factor of the androgynous scale, all showed significant "negative" correlations. The female subjects rated the androgynous female manager "higher" than the male subjects did. The correlation coefficient for the SS and the qualification factor of the androgynous scale was in the same direction

as the other three coefficients, but it was not significant. The Pearson product moment results, then, do not support Hypothesis 6 that the male and female subjects would rate the androgynous female manager similarly.

Further analysis using a stepwise multiple regression resulted in a significant level for explained variance due to sex in the androgynous scale. The explained variance for the androgynous scale was $r^2 = .05$, $F(1, 92) = 4.74$, $p < .03$. A stepwise multiple regression for the safety, qualification, and dynamism factors also yielded a significant level for explained variance due to sex in the safety factor of the androgynous scale. For this factor, $r^2 = .07$, $F(1, 92) = 7.02$, $p < .009$. The multiple regression yielded a partial correlation for the SS and the androgynous scale of $r = -.17$ (ns, $N = 94$). The partial correlation for the SS and the safety factor of the androgynous scale was $r = -.35$ ($N = 94$). Though the explained variance due to sex in the androgynous scale was found to be significant, the partial correlation was not.

Chapter V

DISCUSSION

Summary

Hypothesis 1 correctly predicted that the credibility ratings of the masculine female and the androgynous female would be similar. Though the overall credibility rating supported the hypothesis, the safety and dynamism factors did not.

Results of this research did not support Hypothesis 2. There was no difference between the credibility rating of the feminine female and that of the masculine female. In fact, the feminine female and the masculine female were rated similarly. This was the weakest relationship, however, between any two of the credibility scales. The ratings on the safety factor and the dynamism factor were in the predicted direction, though not significant.

Hypothesis 3 was not supported either. In fact, the feminine rating and the androgynous rating had the strongest relationship of any two credibility scales. This was supported by the correlations of all three factors of the scales.

Hypothesis 4 correctly predicted that the male subjects and the female subjects would rate the masculine female manager similarly. The female subjects tended to rate the masculine female manager "higher" than the male subjects did, but this was not significant.

Results of this research also supported Hypothesis 5 which predicted that the male subjects and the female subjects would rate

the feminine female similarly. On the safety factor, however, the male subjects rated the feminine female significantly "higher" than the female subjects did.

Results of this research did not support Hypothesis 6 which predicted that the male subjects and the female subjects would rate the androgynous female similarly. The female subjects rated the androgynous female significantly "higher" than the male subjects did. The results of the qualification factor did support this hypothesis, however.

Conclusions

It seemed perplexing why the results of the masculine, feminine, and androgynous ratings were all quite similar and that the masculine and androgynous females were not found to be significantly more credible than the feminine female. As discussed earlier in the review of literature, researchers have failed to differentiate between effective and ineffective leaders using the "trait theory model" which studies the characteristics of male leaders in order to distinguish leaders from nonleaders. This study basically followed the "trait theory model" in trying to predict which female would be most credible. Unlike the "trait theory model," this research studied masculine and feminine characteristics. But, like the "trait theory model," it failed to find which characteristics--masculine, feminine, or androgynous--are most desirable for females to succeed in management. Previous research has also concluded there are no differences of any consequence to management between the mental, emotional, or physical

capacities of men and women. If female managers perform as credibly as male managers, then no matter the sex-type of the female, she may be viewed as equally credible when compared to another female manager or to male managers. Even if the female manager is not perceived as being as credible as the male manager, when comparing one female manager to another female manager, they may be perceived as equally credible because of their gender. Political, social, and economic changes over the past decades have led to a blurring of the formerly sharp division between the roles and attributes of men and women. This change may also mean that women are not only being accepted as managers, but that their sex-type does not matter.

It is difficult to determine why the female subjects rated the androgynous female "higher" than the male subjects did. Because the variance due to sex of subject was barely significant, it could have been due to chance. By using different terms to describe the androgynous female, results could be found that are nonsignificant. It is difficult to test the concept of androgyny since no predetermined list of adjectives exists which describes an androgynous person. Bem and Lenney (as cited in Rose & Andiappan, 1978) found individuals who are androgynous to be more accepting of other androgynous persons than are sex-typed persons. In this study, then, the female subjects may themselves have been more androgynous and the male subjects sex-typed. But, in general, there was no significant difference between the credibility ratings by the male subjects and those by the female subjects. This was the prediction made in this research study and supported by previous research as discussed in the review of

literature. In past research, males and females have agreed, in general, on the evaluation of sex-roles and sex-characteristics, which was supported by this research.

Future Research

The results of this study support the free choice of sex-roles for women. It appears, then, that attitudes toward masculinity, femininity, and androgyny are changing. If indeed perspectives toward sex-roles are changing, then it is necessary to reexamine the sex-typed items of masculinity and femininity as generated by Bem (1974), Broverman et al. (1970), Heilbrun (1976), and others. This researcher is not aware of any other androgynous description like the one developed for this study. The lack of previous research in the area of androgyny as support for this research is one weakness in the methodology used. Therefore, it is recommended that future research be done in order to study current perspectives toward masculinity, femininity, and androgyny.

It is also suggested that future research study the credibility of women in management using variables other than sex of the subjects. In general, no significant difference was found between the masculine, feminine, and androgynous women due to sex. However, this same study may be done using such variables as age, whether or not the subjects work, and others.

A third recommendation is that this research be done as a field study. The use of a student population only may be a weakness in the methodology used in this study. Perspectives of those men and women

who are actually in the position to promote women into management may vary from those of a student population.

The last recommendation is that future research look not at the sex-roles and sex-characteristics of potential female managers, but at the perceptions of those males and females who are in positions to promote the female in management. Rosen and Jerdee (1973) and Schein (1975) found that male and female managers do indeed hold similar attitudes toward women in management, but that these attitudes are often negative. Lang (1978) found women distrust nontraditional women and men are threatened by them. Staines, Tavris, and Jayaratne (as cited in Terborg, 1977) researched what they called the "Queen Bee Syndrome." According to Staines et al., a woman who has attained success and status in a "man's world" views other women as competitors for her position. The male, who has attained success and status in "his" world, begins to question his capabilities and position when a female can come in and do a "man's" job, specifically, his job. He has felt very competent in doing his job, but now his male ego is threatened. Hobart and Harries (as cited in Jewell, 1977) and Rosen and Jerdee (1973) found that expectations of appropriate characteristics and behaviors affect decision-making behavior because of the perceptions that males and females have of themselves and others. It is recommended, then, that future research study these perceptions of the males and females who are in positions to promote the female in management. This needs to be done in order to find out why both males and females feel threatened by the female in management.

Implications

It may be pointed out that all three females were rated on the "higher" end of the credibility scale. In other words, all three females were viewed as being credible and as acceptable nominees for promotion into a middle-management position. Viewed this way, the results of this research support the notion that, today, women are being seriously considered for management positions. One implication of this may be the generalization of these results to women in any nontraditional occupation. The study also supports the free choice of sex-roles for women and the devaluation of masculine characteristics by our society.

Though generations have assumed the leadership superiority of men, the population of this research study supports the suggestion that women are indeed being accepted as legitimate candidates for management. Not only does there appear to be increasing sex-role permissiveness and restructuring, but both males and females are a part of this process. Both males and females consider women and men to be equally qualified for management. Both genders agree that women do have a choice among sex-roles and that masculine characteristics may not necessarily be those that are most valuable. Our society is moving toward a climate where women can express their femininity and/or masculinity through interpersonal relationships as opposed to their performance in stereotyped roles.

REFERENCES

- Agassi, J. B. (1977). The quality of women's working life. In D. O. Jewell (Ed.), Women and management: An expanding role. Atlanta: Publishing Services Division, Georgia State University.
- Ames, M. D. (1977). Nonassertion training has value too. Personnel Journal, 56(7), 348-350.
- Andersen, K., & Clevenger, T., Jr. (1963). A summary of experimental research on ethos. Speech Monographs, 30(2), 59-78.
- Bailey, K. D. (1982). Methods of social research (2nd ed.). New York: The Free Press.
- Bartol, K. M. (1978). The sex structuring of organizations: A search for possible causes. Academy of Management Review, 3(4), 808-815.
- Bartol, K. M., & Butterfield, D. A. (1976). Sex effects in evaluating leaders. Journal of Applied Psychology, 61(4), 446-454.
- Basil, D. C. (1972). Women in management. New York: Dunnellen.
- Bass, B. M., Krussell, J., & Alexander, R. A. (1971). Male managers' attitudes toward working women. American Behavioral Scientist, 15(2), 221-236.
- Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42(2), 155-162.
- Bem, S. L. (1975). Sex-role adaptability: One consequence of psychological androgyny. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31(4), 634-643.
- Bem, S. L. (1977). On the utility of alternative procedures for assessing psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45(2), 196-205.

- Berlo, D. K., Lemert, J. B., & Mertz, R. J. (1969). Dimensions for evaluating the acceptability of message sources. Public Opinion Quarterly, 33, 563-576.
- Bolton, E. B., & Humphreys, L. W. (1977). A training model for women--An androgynous approach. Personnel Journal, 56(5), 230-234.
- Bremer, R. (1973). When the supervisor is a woman. Supervisory Management, 18, 16.
- Broverman, I. K., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., Rosenkrantz, P. S., & Vogel, S. R. (1970). Sex-role stereotypes and clinical judgments of mental health. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 34(1), 1-7.
- 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.
- Capka, D. D. (1979). A comparative study of women employed in traditional, nontraditional, and non-sex-typed occupations. Dissertation Abstracts International, 39(8-B), 4022-4023.
- Cash, T. F., Gillen, B., & Burns, D. S. (1977). Sexism and "beautyism" in personnel consultant decision making. Journal of Applied Psychology, 62(3), 301-310.
- Chusmir, L. H. (1983). Characteristics and predictive dimensions of women who make nontraditional vocational choices. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 62(1), 43-47.
- Collins, G. (1985). Unforeseen business barriers for women. In B. A. Stead (Ed.), Women in management (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Crawford, J. S. (1977). Women in middle management. Ridgewood, NJ: Forkner.
- Day, D. R., & Stogdill, R. M. (1972). Leader behavior of male and female supers: A comparative study. Personnel Psychology, 25, 353-360.
- Diamond, E. E. (1971). Occupational interests: Male-female or high level-low level dichotomy? Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1(4), 305-315.
- Fairhurst, G. T. (in press). Male-female communication on the job: Literature review and commentary. Communication Yearbook.
- Falbo, T. (1977). Relationships between sex, sex role, and social influence. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 2(1), 62-72.
- Falcione, R. L. (1974). Credibility: Qualifier of subordinate participation. Journal of Business Communication, 11(3), 43-54.
- Fenn, M. (1978). Making it in management: A behavioral approach for women executives. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Forgionne, G. A., & Nwacukwu, C. C. (1977). Acceptance of authority in female-managed organizational positions. University of Michigan Business Review, 29(3), 23-28.
- Gackenbach, J. I., Burke, M., & Auerbach, S. M. (1977). In D. O. Jewell (Ed.), Women and management: An expanding role. Atlanta: Publishing Services Division, Georgia State University.
- Galejs, I., & King, A. (1983). Sex-role perceptions of traditional and nontraditional college women. Journal of Psychology, 113(2), 257-263.

- Garland, H., & Price, K. H. (1977). Attitudes toward women in management and attributions for their success and failure in a managerial position. Journal of Applied Psychology, 62(1), 29-33.
- Gordon, F. E., & Strober, M. H. (1975). Bringing women into management. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Greenwald, C. S. (1979). Women in management: Highlights of the literature. Scarsdale, NY: Work in America Institute.
- Gutek, B. A., & Stevens, D. A. (1979). Effects of sex of subject, sex of stimulus cue, and androgyny level on evaluations in work situations which evoke sex-role stereotypes. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14(1), 23-32.
- Halcomb, R. (1979). Women making it: Patterns and profiles of success. New York: Atheneum.
- Hall, F. S., & Hall, D. T. (1976). Effects of job incumbents' race and sex on evaluations of managerial performance. Academy of Management Journal, 19(3), 476-481.
- Harlan, A., & Weiss, C. L. (1979). Sex differences in factors affecting managerial career advancement (Working Paper No. 56). Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College, Center for Research on Women.
- Harris, L. H., & Lucas, M. E. (1976). Sex-role stereotyping. Social Work, 21(5), 390-395.
- Heilbrun, A. B., Jr. (1976). Measurement of masculine and feminine sex-role identities as independent measures. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 44(2), 183-190.
- Hennig, M., & Jardim, A. (1977). The managerial woman. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday.

- Hobart, C. L., & Harries, K. L. (1977). Sex-role stereotyping among future managers. In D. O. Jewell (Ed.), Women and management: An expanding role. Atlanta: Publishing Services Division, Georgia State University.
- Hovland, C. I., Irving, L. J., & Kelly, H. H. (1953). Communication and persuasion, psychological studies of opinion change. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Izraeli, D. N., Banai, M., & Zeira, Y. (1985). Women executives in MNC subsidiaries. In B. A. Stead (Ed.), Women in management (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Jones, W. H., Chernovetz, M. E. O., & Hansson, R. O. (1978). The enigma of androgyny: Differential implications for males and females? Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46(2), 298-313.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). Men and women of the corporation. New York: Basic Books.
- Kelly, J. A., & Worrell, J. (1977). New formulations of sex roles and androgyny: A critical review. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45(6), 1101-1115.
- Lang, K. A. (1978). Suggestions for counseling women who want to enter a nontraditional occupation. Journal of Employment Counseling, pp. 180-187.
- Larwood, L., & Wood, M. M. (1977). Women in management. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

- Larwood, L., Wood, M. M., & Inderlied, S. D. (1978). Training women for management: New problems, old solutions. Academy of Management Review, 3(3), 584-593.
- Lemkau, J. P. (1979). Personality and background characteristics of women in male-dominated occupations: A review. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 4(2), 221-240.
- Loring, R., & Wells, T. (1972). Breakthrough: Women in management. New York: Van Nostrand-Reinhold.
- Lunneborg, P. W. (1970). Stereotypic aspect in masculinity-femininity measure. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 34(1), 113-118.
- Lynch, E. M. (1973). The executive suite--Feminine style. New York: AMACOM.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. (1974). The psychology of sex differences. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Matteson, M. T. (1976). Attitudes toward women as managers: Sex- or role-differences? Psychological Reports, 39, 166.
- McCroskey, J. C. (1966). Scales for the measurement of ethos. Speech Monographs, 33, 65-72.
- Miner, J. B. (1974). Motivation to manage among women: Studies of business managers and educational administrators. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 5(2), 197-208.
- Miner, J. B. (1977). New sources of talent. In D. O. Jewell (Ed.), Women and management: An expanding role. Atlanta: Publishing Services Division, Georgia State University.

- Moore, L. M., & Rickel, A. U. (1980). Characteristics of women in traditional and nontraditional managerial roles. Personnel Psychology, 33(2), 317-333.
- Morrison, R. F., & Sebald, M. L. (1974). Personal characteristics differentiating female executive from female nonexecutive personnel. Journal of Applied Psychology, 59(5), 656-659.
- Moulliet, D. K. (1981). Women employed in managerial and clerical occupations: Differences in personality characteristics and role orientations. Dissertation Abstracts, 41(7-A), 2941.
- O'Leary, V. E. (1974). Some attitudinal barriers to occupational aspirations in women. Psychological Bulletin, 81(11), 808-826.
- Osborn, R. N., & Vicars, W. M. (1976). Sex stereotypes: An artifact in leader behavior and subordinate satisfaction analysis? Academy of Management Journal, 19(3), 439-449.
- Pearce, W. B., & Rossi, S. M. (1984). Problematic practices of "feminism": An interpretive and critical analysis. Communication Quarterly, 32(4), 277-286.
- Peters, L. H., Terborg, J. R., & Taynor, J. (1974). Women as managers scale (WAMS): A measure of attitudes toward women in management positions. JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 4, 1-43.
- Petty, M. M., & Miles, R. H. (1976). Leader sex-role stereotyping in a female-dominated work culture. Personnel Psychology, 29(3), 393-404.

- Pickford, L. J. (1985). The superstructure of myths supporting the subordination of women. In B. A. Stead (Ed.), Women in management (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Prather, J. (1971). Why can't women be more like men? American Behavioral Scientist, 15(2), 172-182.
- Putnam, L. L. (1983). Lady you're trapped: Breaking out of conflict cycles. In J. J. Putnam (Ed.), Women in organizations: Barriers and breakthroughs. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Putnam, L., & Heinen, J. S. (1985). Women in management: The fallacy of the trait approach. In B. A. Stead (Ed.), Women in management (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Robie, E. A. (1973). Challenge to management. In E. Ginzberg & A. M. Yohalem (Eds.), Corporate lib: Women's challenge to management. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Rose, G. L., & Andiappan, P. (1978). Sex effects on managerial hiring decisions. Academy of Management Journal, 21(1), 104-112.
- Rosen, B., & Jerdee, T. H. (1973). The influence of sex-role stereotypes on evaluations of male and female supervisory behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 57(1), 44-48.
- Rosen, B., & Jerdee, T. H. (1974a). Sex stereotyping in the executive suite. Harvard Business Review, 52(2), 45-58.
- Rosen, B., & Jerdee, T. H. (1974b). Influence of sex-role stereotypes on personnel decisions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 59(1), 9-14.
- Rosen, B., & Jerdee, T. H. (1974c). Effects of applicant's sex and difficulty of job on evaluations of candidates for managerial positions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 59(4), 511-512.

- Rosenkrantz, P., Vogel, S., Bee, H., Broverman, I., & Broverman, D. M. (1968). Sex-role stereotypes and self-concepts in college students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 32(3), 287-295.
- Schein, V. E. (1973). The relationship between sex-role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics. Journal of Applied Psychology, 57(2), 95-100.
- Schein, V. E. (1975). Relationships between sex-role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics among female managers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60(3), 340-344.
- Schein, V. E. (1977). Think manager--Think male. In D. O. Jewell (Ed.), Women and management: An expanding role. Atlanta: Publishing Services Division, Georgia State University.
- Schein, V. E. (1978). Sex-role stereotyping, ability, and performance: Prior research and new directions. Personnel Psychology, 31(2), 259-268.
- Schoonover, J. W. (1977). Why men fear women in business. In D. O. Jewell (Ed.), Women and management: An expanding role. Atlanta: Publishing Services Division, Georgia State University.
- Schuler, R. S. (1979). Male and female routes to managerial success. Personnel Administrator, 24(2), 35-37, 43-44.
- Segal, J. (1981). Profiles of successful women working in nontraditional occupations with special reference to their androgynous characteristics. Dissertation Abstracts International, 41(11-A), 4852-4853.

- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. (1972). Who likes competent women? Competence, sex-role congruence of interests, and subjects' attitudes toward women as determinants of interpersonal attraction. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 2(3), 197-213.
- 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., & Stapp, J. (1974). The personal attributes questionnaire: A measure of sex-role stereotypes and masculinity-femininity. JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 4(43).
- Stead, B. A. (Ed.). (1985). Women in management (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Swatko, M. K. (1981). What's in a title? Personality, job aspirations, and the nontraditional woman. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 18(2), 174-183.
- Tangri, S. S. (1972). Determinants of occupational role innovation among college women. Journal of Social Issues, 28(2), 177-199.
- Terborg, J. R. (1977). Women in management: A research review. Journal of Applied Psychology, 62(6), 647-664.
- Terborg, J. R., & Ilgen, D. R. (1975). A theoretical approach to sex discrimination in traditionally masculine occupations. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 13(3), 352-376.
- Terborg, J. R., Peters, L. H., Ilgen, D. R., & Smith, F. (1977). Organizational and personal correlates of attitudes toward women as managers. Academy of Management Journal, 20(1), 89-100.

- Tyer, Z. E., & Erdwins, C. J. (1979). Relationship of sex role to male- and female-dominated professions. Psychological Reports, 44, 1134.
- Van Dusen, R. A., & Sheldon, E. B. (1977). The changing status of American women: A life cycle perspective. In D. O. Jewell (Ed.), Women and management: An expanding role. Atlanta: Publishing Services Division, Georgia State University.
- Waters, C. W., Waters, L. K., & Pincus, S. (1977). Factor analysis of masculine and feminine sex-typed items from the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. Psychological Reports, 40(2), 567-570.
- Welch, R. (1979). Androgyny and derived identity in married women with varying degrees of nontraditional role involvement. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 3(3), 308-315.
- Welsh, M. C. (1979). Attitudinal measures and evaluation of males and females in leadership roles. Psychological Reports, 45, 19-22.
- Wertheim, E. G., Widom, C. S., & Wortzel, L. H. (1978). Multivariate analysis of male and female professional career choice correlates. Journal of Applied Psychology, 63(2), 234-242.
- Whitehead, J. L., Jr. (1968). Factors of source credibility. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 54(1), 59-63.
- Wood, M. M. (1975). What does it take for a woman to make it in management? Personnel Journal, 54(1), 38-41, 66.
- Wood, M. M. (1976). Women in management: How is it working out? Advanced Management Journal, 41(1), 22-30.
- Yanico, B. J., & Hardin, S. I. (1981). Sex-role, self-concept, and persistence in a traditional versus nontraditional college major for women. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 2, 219-227.

Appendix A
INSTRUMENT FOR MANIPULATIONS CHECK

Below is a set of descriptive words and phrases commonly used to characterize people in general. Use this list to tell what you think a masculine person is like.

On the rating sheet, five (5) choices are available for each word and phrase. They range from "not characteristic" to "characteristic." Please rate each word or phrase in terms of how characteristic it is of a masculine person. Put an X on one of the five (5) blanks for each word or phrase.

1. strong personality
2. willing to take a stand
3. eager to soothe hurt feelings
4. helpful
5. assertive
6. warm to others
7. tactful
8. active
9. hides emotions
10. intuitive
11. forceful
12. independent
13. does not hide emotions
14. objective
15. compassionate
16. gentle
17. aggressive
18. considerate
19. emotional
20. not excitable
21. acts like a leader
22. aware of the needs of others
23. competitive
24. logical
25. talkative
26. cooperative
27. analytical
28. sympathetic
29. understanding
30. unemotional
31. self-confident
32. dominant
33. aware of the feelings of others
34. ambitious

Below is a set of descriptive words and phrases commonly used to characterize people in general. Use this list to tell what you think a feminine person is like.

On the rating sheet, five (5) choices are available for each word and phrase. They range from "not characteristic" to "characteristic." Please rate each word or phrase in terms of how characteristic it is of a feminine person. Put an X on one of the five (5) blanks for each word or phrase.

1. strong personality
2. willing to take a stand
3. eager to soothe hurt feelings
4. helpful
5. assertive
6. warm to others
7. tactful
8. active
9. hides emotions
10. intuitive
11. forceful
12. independent
13. does not hide emotions
14. objective
15. compassionate
16. gentle
17. aggressive
18. considerate
19. emotional
20. not excitable
21. acts like a leader
22. aware of the needs of others
23. competitive
24. logical
25. talkative
26. cooperative
27. analytical
28. sympathetic
29. understanding
30. unemotional
31. self-confident
32. dominant
33. aware of the feelings of others
34. ambitious

Below is a set of descriptive words and phrases commonly used to characterize people in general. Use this list to tell what you think an androgynous person is like. An androgynous person is equally masculine and feminine.

On the rating sheet, five (5) choices are available for each word and phrase. They range from "not characteristic" to "characteristic." Please rate each word or phrase in terms of how characteristic it is of an androgynous person. Put an X on one of the five (5) blanks for each word or phrase.

1. strong personality
2. willing to take a stand
3. eager to soothe hurt feelings
4. helpful
5. assertive
6. warm to others
7. tactful
8. active
9. hides emotions
10. intuitive
11. forceful
12. independent
13. does not hide emotions
14. objective
15. compassionate
16. gentle
17. aggressive
18. considerate
19. emotional
20. not excitable
21. acts like a leader
22. aware of the needs of others
23. competitive
24. logical
25. talkative
26. cooperative
27. analytical
28. sympathetic
29. understanding
30. unemotional
31. self-confident
32. dominant
33. aware of the feelings of others
34. ambitious

FORM _____

SEX M F

	Not Characteristic	Characteristic
1.	_____	_____
2.	_____	_____
3.	_____	_____
4.	_____	_____
5.	_____	_____
6.	_____	_____
7.	_____	_____
8.	_____	_____
9.	_____	_____
10.	_____	_____
11.	_____	_____
12.	_____	_____
13.	_____	_____
14.	_____	_____
15.	_____	_____
16.	_____	_____
17.	_____	_____
18.	_____	_____
19.	_____	_____
20.	_____	_____
21.	_____	_____
22.	_____	_____
23.	_____	_____
24.	_____	_____
25.	_____	_____
26.	_____	_____
27.	_____	_____
28.	_____	_____
29.	_____	_____
30.	_____	_____
31.	_____	_____
32.	_____	_____
33.	_____	_____
34.	_____	_____

Appendix B
RESULTS OF MANIPULATION CHECK

Responses were given a numerical value between one and five. The two-tailed t test for planned comparisons was used in order to compare the male responses on the masculine preliminary form with male responses on the feminine preliminary form. The statistics were also obtained for the comparison of the female responses on the masculine form with the female responses on the feminine form. The masculine form was administered to 34 subjects and the feminine form was administered to 34 subjects. Thirty usable forms were obtained for the masculine form and 30 for the feminine form. Each of these 30 usable forms consisted of 15 male subjects and 15 female subjects. Table B-1 shows the results of these tests. Those statistics that were found to be significant showed that: (a) the male subjects agreed on those items that describe a masculine person and those that describe a feminine person; and (b) the female subjects agreed on those items that describe a masculine person and those that describe a feminine person. Those items that were found statistically significant by both male and female subjects were included on the final masculine and feminine descriptions.

Twelve feminine items were found to be statistically significant by both male and female subjects at $p \leq .05$. Only five masculine items were found to be statistically significant by both male and female subjects at $p \leq .05$. To equalize the number of items on the final masculine description with the number of items on the final feminine description, the acceptable significance level was lowered in order to include 10 masculine items.

Table B-1
t Test for Masculine and Feminine Items by
 Male and Female Subjects

Item	Male	p	Female	p
1. strong personality	2.49	.02	.47	ns
2. willing to take a stand	2.23	.05	1.23	ns
3. eager to soothe hurt feelings	-4.38	.001	-3.29	.01
4. helpful	-2.96	.001	-3.59	.01
5. assertive	1.52	.20	1.90	.10
6. warm to others	-2.46	.05	-4.87	.001
7. tactful	-1.06	ns	-1.53	.20
8. active	3.57	.01	1.66	.20
9. hides emotions	5.70	.001	1.88	.10
10. intuitive	.66	ns	-4.09	.001
11. forceful	2.81	.01	5.09	.001
12. independent	4.48	.001	-.59	ns
13. does not hide emotions	-6.30	.001	-3.22	.01
14. objective	.96	ns	.20	ns
15. compassionate	-6.15	.001	-3.19	.01
16. gentle	-5.52	.001	-4.89	.001
17. aggressive	4.50	.001	2.88	.01
18. considerate	-3.30	.01	-3.64	.01
19. emotional	-4.80	.001	-6.33	.001
20. not excitable	1.84	.10	2.55	.02
21. acts like a leader	3.43	.01	1.50	.20
22. aware of the needs of others	-4.04	.001	-3.63	.01
23. competitive	3.64	.01	4.46	.001
24. logical	1.69	.20	-.12	ns
25. talkative	1.88	.10	-3.70	.001
26. cooperative	-1.37	.20	-3.92	.001
27. analytical	1.26	ns	-1.75	.10
28. sympathetic	-5.61	.001	-3.42	.01
29. understanding	-4.03	.001	-3.14	.01
30. unemotional	5.08	.001	2.97	.02
31. self-confident	4.42	.001	1.05	ns
32. dominant	3.83	.001	4.08	.001
33. aware of the feelings of others	-2.68	.02	-4.87	.001
34. ambitious	1.36	.20	-.19	ns

The androgynous preliminary form was administered to 42 subjects. Thirty-two usable forms were obtained. Half of the subjects were male and half were female. The mean values were calculated separately for the male subjects and the female subjects. Table B-2 shows these results. Six masculine items had mean values of at least 3.5 for both male and female subjects. Seven feminine items had mean values of at least 3.5 for both male and female subjects. These 13 items were included on the final androgynous description.

Table B-2
Mean Values for Androgynous Items
by Male and Female Subjects

Item	Male	Female
1. strong personality	3.38	3.94
2. willing to take a stand	3.63	4.06
3. eager to soothe hurt feelings	4.0	3.13
4. helpful	4.0	3.31
5. assertive	3.13	3.63
6. warm to others	3.94	3.38
7. tactful	3.44	3.44
8. active	3.69	4.0
9. hides emotions	2.56	2.60
10. intuitive	3.50	3.25
11. forceful	2.75	3.19
12. independent	4.0	4.31
13. does not hide emotions	3.13	3.50
14. objective	3.69	3.63
15. compassionate	4.0	3.94
16. gentle	3.81	3.44
17. aggressive	2.94	3.50
18. considerate	3.88	3.44
19. emotional	3.50	3.44
20. not excitable	2.69	2.50
21. acts like a leader	3.31	3.88
22. aware of the needs of others	3.56	3.94
23. competitive	3.50	3.63
24. logical	3.63	3.63
25. talkative	3.50	3.81
26. cooperative	3.63	3.75
27. analytical	3.19	3.31
28. sympathetic	3.94	3.75
29. understanding	3.88	3.69
30. unemotional	2.19	2.50
31. self-confident	3.31	3.63
32. dominant	2.88	3.13
33. aware of the feelings of others	3.94	3.69
34. ambitious	3.31	3.88

Appendix C
MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENT

I would like to get your opinion about the appropriateness and effectiveness of various personality types of women in management. It may be helpful to imagine that you are the personnel director. You are to choose one of the following women to be promoted.

Read each of the three descriptions that follow, one at a time. Fill in the scale after reading each description. Please do not go back to the previous description(s) and scale(s) after you have completed them.

Each row of the scale has seven (7) blanks bounded by opposite terms. The center blank is a neutral position. Place an X on the blank that best describes each woman. Please mark one blank only for each row and do not skip any rows.

Please circle your sex at the bottom of this page and proceed.

SEX M F

Mary Andrews joined Universal Insurance Company as a department manager approximately two years ago. While in this capacity, she has ensured efficient production of her department's services and maintained the stability of her department in changing environments. She is now being considered for a promotion to middle management. She has been described by her peers and subordinates as eager to soothe hurt feelings, helpful, warm to others, does not hide her emotions, compassionate, gentle, considerate, emotional, aware of the needs and feelings of others, sympathetic, and understanding.

just	:	:	:	:	:	:	unjust
objective	:	:	:	:	:	:	subjective
unselfish	:	:	:	:	:	:	selfish
fair	:	:	:	:	:	:	unfair
ethical	:	:	:	:	:	:	unethical
experienced	:	:	:	:	:	:	inexperienced
skilled	:	:	:	:	:	:	unskilled
informed	:	:	:	:	:	:	uninformed
intelligent	:	:	:	:	:	:	unintelligent
qualified	:	:	:	:	:	:	unqualified
bold	:	:	:	:	:	:	timid
active	:	:	:	:	:	:	passive
aggressive	:	:	:	:	:	:	meek
emphatic	:	:	:	:	:	:	hesitant
forceful	:	:	:	:	:	:	forceless

Kathy Smith joined Universal Insurance Company as a department manager approximately two years ago. While in this capacity, she has ensured efficient production of her department's services and maintained the stability of her department in changing environments. She is now being considered for a promotion to middle management. She has been described by her peers and subordinates as aware of the feelings and needs of others, willing to take a stand, active, understanding, sympathetic, independent, objective, compassionate, competitive, logical, talkative, and cooperative.

just _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ unjust
 objective _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ subjective
 unselfish _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ selfish
 fair _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ unfair
 ethical _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ unethical
 experienced _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ inexperienced
 skilled _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ unskilled
 informed _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ uninformed
 intelligent _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ unintelligent
 qualified _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ unqualified
 bold _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ timid
 active _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ passive
 aggressive _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ meek
 emphatic _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ hesitant
 forceful _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ forceless

Jane Alexander joined Universal Insurance Company as a department manager approximately two years ago. While in this capacity, she has ensured efficient production of her department's services and maintained the stability of her department in changing environments. She is now being considered for a promotion to middle management. She has been described by her peers and subordinates as assertive, active, hides her emotions, forceful, aggressive, not excitable, acts like a leader, competitive, unemotional, and dominant.

just _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ unjust
 objective _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ subjective
 unselfish _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ selfish
 fair _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ unfair
 ethical _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ unethical
 experienced _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ inexperienced
 skilled _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ unskilled
 informed _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ uninformed
 intelligent _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ unintelligent
 qualified _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ unqualified
 bold _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ timid
 active _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ passive
 aggressive _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ meek
 emphatic _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ hesitant
 forceful _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ forceless

Appendix D
FACTOR ANALYSIS AND RELIABILITY ANALYSIS

A reliability analysis was run on the masculine, feminine, and androgynous scales and on the safety, qualification, and dynamism factors of each scale. The reliability coefficients are presented in Table D-1. These results supported the use of Falcione's credibility scale as a reliable instrument.

The safety, qualification, and dynamism factors of the masculine, feminine, and androgynous scales were submitted to a principal-axis factor analysis with varimax rotation. Table D-2 presents those results for the masculine scale. This was the only scale in which an item (emphatic) loaded as a fourth factor. Table D-3 presents the results of the factor analysis for the feminine scale. This was the only scale which loaded as expected. Table D-4 presents the results of the factor analysis for the androgynous scale. Objective loaded with the qualification factor rather than with the safety factor. Ethical loaded with the safety factor, as expected, but it also loaded with the dynamism factor. Emphatic loaded with the dynamism factor, as expected, but it also loaded with the qualification factor. With a few exceptions, then, the above results supported the factor analysis done by Falcione.

Table D-1
Reliability Coefficients for Masculine, Feminine, and
Androgynous Scales and for Safety, Qualification,
and Dynamism Factors

Scale	alpha	Factor		
		Safety	Qualification	Dynamism
Masculine	.83	.81	.89	.77
Feminine	.89	.71	.92	.90
Androgynous	.89	.70	.92	.82

Table D-2
Principal-Axis Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation
for the Masculine Scale

Expected Factor	Items	Factor			
		1	2	3	4
Safety	just-unjust			.81	
	objective-subjective			.53	
	unselfish-selfish			.71	
	fair-unfair			.85	
	ethical-unethical			.66	
Qualification	experienced-inexperienced	.79			
	skilled-unskilled	.84			
	informed-uninformed	.83			
	intelligent-unintelligent	.75			
	qualified-unqualified	.76			
Dynamism	bold-timid		.77		
	active-passive		.78		
	aggressive-meek		.84		
	emphatic-hesitant				.94
	forceful-forceless		.84		

Table D-3
Principal-Axis Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation
for the Feminine Scale

Expected Factor	Items	Factor			
		1	2	3	4
Safety	just-unjust			.63	
	objective-subjective			.48	
	unselfish-selfish			.67	
	fair-unfair			.79	
	ethical-unethical			.64	
Qualification	experienced-inexperienced		.82		
	skilled-unskilled		.82		
	informed-uninformed		.79		
	intelligent-unintelligent		.79		
	qualified-unqualified		.87		
Dynamism	bold-timid	.88			
	active-passive	.76			
	aggressive-meek	.85			
	emphatic-hesitant	.68			
	forceful-forceless	.87			

Table D-4
Principal-Axis Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation
for the Androgynous Scale

Expected Factor	Items	Factor			
		1	2	3	4
Safety	just-unjust			.65	
	objective-subjective	.46			
	unselfish-selfish			.78	
	fair-unfair			.80	
	ethical-unethical	.42		.47	
Qualification	experienced-inexperienced	.79			
	skilled-unskilled	.84			
	informed-uninformed	.76			
	intelligent-unintelligent	.85			
	qualified-unqualified	.80			
Dynamism	bold-timid		.76		
	active-passive		.66		
	aggressive-meek		.83		
	emphatic-hesitant		.50	.59	
	forceful-forceless		.82		