



2011-11-14

The Effect of Sexblindness and Sexawareness on Workplace Related Gender Bias

Katie Nichol

Brigham Young University - Provo

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Nichol, Katie, "The Effect of Sexblindness and Sexawareness on Workplace Related Gender Bias" (2011). *All Theses and Dissertations*. 2882.

<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/2882>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

Effect of Being Sexblind versus Sexaware on Workplace Related Gender Bias

Katie Nichol Hansen

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science

Jeffrey Reber, Chair
Robert D. Ridge
Sam A. Hardy

Department of Psychology

Brigham Young University

December 2011

Copyright © 2011 Katie Nichol Hansen

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

Effect of Being Sexblind versus Sexaware on Workplace Related Gender Bias

Katie Nichol Hansen
Department of Psychology, BYU
Master of Science

The present study was an adaptation of Richeson and Nussbaum's (2004) study of racism to gender bias. Two different gender ideologies were theoretically analyzed, then the influence of these ideologies on implicit and explicit forms of gender bias was examined. Psychology undergraduates were presented with a prompt promoting either a sexblind or sexaware approach to reducing gender bias. Participants then completed a measure of implicit (IAT Gender/Career) and explicit (MAWWWS) bias. Results suggested that, relative to the sexaware perspective, the sexblind perspective generated less implicit gender bias. There was no difference between ideological groups on the explicit measure. The findings of the present study increase the body of literature on the sexblind and sexaware ideologies and call into question the assumption that sexism and racism are analogous constructs.

Keywords: racism, sexism, sexblind, sexaware, IAT, MAWWWS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express gratitude to my advisor for his hours of patient mentorship, to my dad for always pushing me to get more education, to my mom for her help on the nitty-gritty of that education, and finally to my amazing husband who didn't let me give up.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----|
| Title Page | i |
| Abstract | ii |
| Acknowledgements | iii |
| Table of Contents | iv |
| List of Tables | v |
| Introduction | 1 |
| Statement of the Problem | 1 |
| Theoretical Analysis | 3 |
| Social Constructionism | 3 |
| Social Constructionism, Males and Females as Ontologically the Same | 4 |
| Genderless as Masculine | 5 |
| Difference Ignored | 6 |
| Essentialism | 6 |
| Essentialism, Males and Females as Ontologically Different | 7 |
| Sex and Gender as Essential | 8 |
| Genderful as Masculine and Feminine | 9 |
| Femininity Acknowledged and Valued | 9 |
| Previous Research | 10 |
| Present Study | 12 |
| Hypotheses | 13 |
| Method | 14 |
| Participants | 14 |
| Procedure | 14 |
| Results | 17 |
| Participant Demographics | 17 |
| Data Trimming | 18 |
| Implicit Gender Bias | 19 |
| Explicit Gender Bias | 20 |
| Additional Analyses | 20 |
| Discussion | 21 |
| Implicit Gender Bias | 21 |
| Explicit Gender Bias | 23 |
| Limitations | 23 |
| Future Research | 24 |
| Conclusion | 24 |
| References | 26 |
| Appendix A | 32 |
| Sexaware | 32 |
| Sexblind | 32 |
| Appendix B | 34 |
| Sexaware | 34 |
| Sexblind | 35 |
| Appendix C | 37 |
| Appendix D | 38 |

List of Tables

| | |
|---------------|----|
| Table 1 | 39 |
| Table 2 | 40 |

Introduction

Statement of the Problem

In 1964, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act made workplace discrimination based on “race, color, religion, sex, or national origin” illegal (§ 2000 e-2). Since that time researchers have studied racial and gender discrimination from many different angles, from group dynamics (Wolsko, Park, Judd & Wittenbrink, 2000; Carpenter, Zárate, & Garza, 2007; Czopp & Monteith, 2003) to the individual motivations behind discrimination (Norton, Vandello, & Darley, 2004; Bartlett, 2009; Klonis, Plant, & Devine, 2005). The recency of these studies suggests that discrimination still occurs for both sex and race. However, many would argue that there has been a shift from overt discrimination to more implicit forms, as social norms and legislation prohibit overt racism and overt sexism (Pearson, Dovidio, & Gaertner, 2009; Klonis et al., 2005; Firebaugh & Davis, 1988). Legislation may have decreased sexism in the workplace, but some would argue that this decline may have plateaued, reversed (Spence & Hahn, 1997), or transformed into subtler forms, such as gender-labeling of jobs (Ridgeway, 1997). Sexism continues to negatively impact women in the workplace, where women consistently make less than men, have lower status than men and are less likely to be hired and promoted than men (Lips, 2003; Luzadis, Wesolowski, & Snavey, 2008; Valentine & Mosley, 1998).

When considering implicit forms of race discrimination, researchers have found that a person’s ideological commitment may increase or decrease the amount of implicit bias he or she exhibits (Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004). Two ideologies have been considered, a color-blind ideology which advocates an emphasis on the individual rather than the group, while simultaneously minimizing, or ignoring group differences, and a multi-cultural ideology, which advocates considering and celebrating group difference (Koenig & Richeson, 2010; Schofield,

1986). Many researchers have found that the color-blind approach, when compared with multiculturalism, may actually increase implicit racial bias (Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004; Pearson et al., 2009).

In order to study the effects of these same ideologies on implicit gender discrimination, Koenig and Richeson (2010) coined the terms “sexblind” and “sexaware” to distinguish the gender based forms of these ideologies from their race based counterparts. “Sexblindness” is “the view that, in order to increase equality, the use of sex categories should be eliminated and everyone should be treated as an individual”; while “a *sexaware* ideology maintains that one should acknowledge and appreciate sex differences” (p. 186). Using these terms, Koenig and Richeson (2010) created the Sexblind versus Sexaware Scale to assess participant’s endorsement of either ideology. Using the Scale, they tested participant’s endorsement of each ideology in either a social or work settings. They then considered sexblindness and sexawareness in relation to individual’s motivation to respond without sexism and overall sexist attitudes. They found that “individuals may, indeed, construe sexblindness as a way to reduce sexism.” They also found that “participants endorsed sexblindness more (and sexawareness less) in work settings” (Koenig & Richeson, 2010, p. 189).

This may not come as a surprise when we consider 1) that the racial analog, color-blindness, has been encouraged and even made a part of policy in work and school settings (Schofield, 1986) and 2) that racism and sexism are often linked (Klonis et al., 2005; Koenig & Richeson, 2010; Norton et al., 2004; Bartlett, 2009). While color-blindness and sex-blindness may be viewed as a way to decrease discrimination, as for race at least, color-blindness may lead to higher racial bias when compared to multiculturalism (Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004). The question has not been examined in regards to gender, even though companies may have

established sexblind practices, such as removing the names of applicants from résumés and applications so that the gender does not affect the hiring decision (Carter, 2011). Therefore, for this study, the effect of sexblind and sexaware ideologies on implicit gender bias in the workplace will be considered (Melling, 2010).

Before addressing this question I will consider possible theoretical commitments pertaining to both sides of the argument. I ground sexblindness in the theoretical commitments of social constructionism and sexawareness in the theoretical commitments of essentialism. The purpose of this theoretical analysis is to consider the possible origins and implications of the “lay theories” (Koenig & Richeson, 2010, p. 186) of sexblindness and sexawareness.

Theoretical Analysis

Social Constructionism

The social constructionist maintains that there is no way of gaining access to detached, objective truth, if objective truth exists at all, but that all concepts of reality and truth are created by social interaction (Gergen, 1997, 2009; see also Bohan, 1993). All truth claims, for the social constructionist, are seen as “intended or unintended product[s] of social practice” (Haslanger, 1995, p. 97). Claims of absolute or universal truth and knowledge are simply a “best understanding” backed by social consensus; however, these “best understandings” of universal truth and knowledge are generated in the context they are trying to circumvent (Bohan, 1993, pg. 13). A social constructionist argues that one cannot make accurate statements about the universal nature of anything from a fixed, finite position because such statements are not testable across space and time. Furthermore, a constructionist would say, there is no way to escape said fixity and finity because of our cultural embeddedness. Even when we are completely alone, we exist in the socially constructed space of our temporal milieu (Gergen, 1985). We are a “nexus” of

social interactions where ever we go. Each “nexus” or person may not be consistent over time, but the fact that individuals are socially constructed is consistent.

Social Constructionism, Males and Females as Ontologically the Same

Gender, when understood as a socially constituted phenomenon, cannot be ontological. Ontology is that which is most fundamental: a universal or structuring truth. Some proponents of social constructionism would like to avoid making ontological claims altogether, claiming that there is no “Truth” but that truth is a social construction “all the way down” (Haslanger, 1995, p. 96). However, this idea itself is an ontological claim, where the universal truth, or ontology, is social construction. If social construction is ontological, then gender cannot be an essential aspect of persons. If people are, at the core, a series of social interactions then, categories such as gender or race become irrelevant; there are no lasting individual traits. Indeed individuals and traits are themselves constructions. A person’s “individuality” is a unique ordering of social transactions, any of which are shared with others. Therefore, masculinity and femininity are constructions and are not ontological. Males and females, therefore, are ontologically the same.

Social Construction of Sex and Gender

Because the social constructionist sees gender as created in the context of social interactions, people are seen as genderless. Masculinity and femininity are the product of social interaction and are not biologically rooted (Haslanger, 1995). While male and female reproductive organs differ, a social constructionist would argue that we attend to these differences, not others, like eye color, because we have constructed and agreed upon meanings for sex differences, but not for these other differences. As Bohan stated, “The factors defining a particular transaction as feminine or masculine are not the sex of the actors but the situational parameters within which the performance occurs.” (1993, p. 13). Psychologists have come to

title the constructed meanings associated with physiological differences gender; and the physiological differences themselves as sex.

This does not mean that sex becomes irrelevant for the social constructionist. Rather, sex becomes the observable cue that creates gendered interactions. Men and women, based on sex differences, then participate in gendering interactions that exclude the other gender, creating a society where gender seems to be based on sex differences but is, according to the social constructionist, only an artifact of ongoing interactions (Wood & Eagley, 2002). Therefore, for the social constructionist, a male infant is genderless until exposed to interactions labeled “masculine.” As Gergen (2009), a vocal proponent of social constructionism, stated, “depending on the occasion... with a little prompting I could do a fair job as a woman, a black, a homosexual, Gary Cooper, an Asian, a therapist, Billy Graham, an Italian mobster, a Nazi officer, my editor, and my dog.” (p. 137). The “promptings” of society are what differentiate male and female, not physiology. Human beings are genderless.

Genderless as Masculine

This idea of genderlessness, for many feminists, was seen as the beginning of the fight for equality. Feminists fought against the dichotomizing of men and women because it was viewed as sexist (Willis, 1984, p. 91). However, when the dichotomy of gender is eliminated, genderlessness does not surface, but a one sided polarity, where the gender in power is viewed as superior (Spence & Helmreich, 1972). As Rudy (2001) stated, “[a]n unintentional association takes place between being genderless, being powerful and aggressive, and being male” (p. 216). Therefore the feminine is rejected in favor of those masculine characteristics that may allow women to gain “superior status” (Spence & Helmreich, 1972, p. 211). Women mimicked those masculine traits necessary to move forward in a male dominated world, all in the guise of

neutrality (Donnell & Hall, 1980). The social constructionist ideal of genderlessness, it seems, actually masks the feminine voice in favor of those traits typically associated with males.

Difference Ignored

When the dichotomy of gender is eliminated by silencing the female voice, (Rudy, 2001) differences between men and women are seen as unimportant and artificial. In the workplace, in an effort to avoid discrimination, proscriptive norms have been established where the differences between men and women are minimized and ignored (Koenig & Richeson, 2010 p. 186). In fact, Powell (1990) in an issue of *the Executive*, after establishing that managerial styles of men and women do not differ, states that: “If there are no differences between male and female managers, companies should not act as if there are.” He then suggest companies “follow two principles in their actions: 1. To be gender-blind in their decisions regarding open managerial positions and present or potential managers, except when consciously trying to offset the effects of past discrimination. 2. To try to minimize differences in the job experiences of their male and female managers, so that artificial sex differences in career success do not arise” (Powell, 1990, p. 71). This example shows how social constructionism, or in lay terms, sexblindness, may inform decisions made in the workplace. I will now consider essentialism and the lay theory of sexawareness.

Essentialism

Essentialism in the broadest sense is the idea that there is an underlying essence that is constant amid change (Groenhout, 2002). For example, the construct of personality in psychology is considered constant by some, and could be seen as part of the essence of a person. Essence is inherent in the individual rather than external to her or him (Bohan, 1993). Biological essentialism allows us to categorize plants and animals in to genus, phylum, kingdom, class,

order, etc. (Gelman & Hirschfeld, 1999). Characteristics of each living organism are shared within the group and are unique to that group. The social psychology analogs to biological classification are the ideas of essentialism of human nature and essentialism of the group (Holma, 2007). According to an essentialist view of human nature, all human beings share a unique essence that sets human nature apart from animal nature (Holma 2007; Groenhout, 2002). All human beings share some universal traits that are discoverable across race, culture, and gender divisions. Just as genus comes before phylum, so too does a universal human essentialism come before group essentialism. Group essentialism, then, is the idea that people can be grouped into different categories based on shared essences within each group (Holma 2007; Groenhout, 2002; Bohan, 1993). This assumes a certain amount of homogeneity within each group, which is of concern for the social constructionist, because differences with the labeled group may be devalued or ignored (Bohan, 1993). However, an essentialist views gender, for example, as an internal, unchangeable trait of either the male or female experience (Bohan, 1993), asserting that, individual differences notwithstanding, there are some in-group commonalities.

Essentialism, Males and Females as Ontologically Different

What is ontological to the essentialist depends upon what is considered essential. If gender is considered essential, it is also ontological, not only to individuals but to society. As Rudy (2001), a radical feminist and former member of an exclusively lesbian community stated, “[e]ssentialism saw female [and male] identity as an ontological ground, a truth about nature itself” (p. 205). Males and females are fundamentally different to the essentialist. For a male, the masculine gender is the beginning of self-understanding; for a female, the feminine gender is the beginning of self-understanding. Gender is the idea upon which all other ideas are built.

Sex and Gender as Essential

An essentialist perspective on gender gives rise to an understanding of the self and the mind as gendered. Gender resides in the individual as a part of personality, morality and cognition (Bohan, 1993, p. 6). Gender is fundamental and inherent in the individual. Context may alter how one acts out one's gender, but gender is stable over time and does not vanish given a particular context. Essentialism rejects the dualism of mind and body, stating that the gendered mind and the sexed body cannot be separated from each other. One's gender is one's sex. Even when considering cases where gender has been assigned, such as with ambiguous or mutilated genitalia, we find that individuals either accept or reject the assignment based on their own understanding of their gender (Lips, 2008). This suggests that one's gender is one's sex. For the essentialist, the terms sex and gender are synonymous. One cannot divide the two. A genderless mind in a sexed body is an impossibility (Gelman & Hirschfeld, 1999).

One major concern with this viewpoint is that the focus on separateness may lead to an inflation of difference, to the point where men and women are seen as alien to one another (Bohan, 1993). An essentialist would respond that rather than dividing males and females, essentialism sees gender as two essential halves of humanity's whole. Both male and female are necessary for the perpetuation of the species, not only in terms of sexual reproduction; but in terms of the healthy functioning of society and individuals. As Agacinski (2000), a French feminist philosopher, put it: "The existence of both sexes puts each person to a finiteness test which prevents one from considering oneself alone to be the incarnation of "man" and which forces one to coexist with the other" (p. 33). The differences between men and women are acknowledged as necessary and are celebrated by the essentialist.

Genderful as Masculine and Feminine

As stated above, genderlessness was the guiding idea behind many early forms of feminism (Dietz, 2003). However, as time went on, leading feminists have rejected this idea in favor of a genderful view of humanity, where “[u]niversal humanity is not singular, but double, [and] must be heard as the humanity of man and women, on the same grounds” (Agacinski, 2000, p. 30). Essentialists argue for this position, where men and women are seen as different but necessary to one another. Even evolutionary psychology, the least morally proscriptive and ideological of essentialist standpoints, views both masculine and feminine as essential not only for the propagation of the species, but for its survival, where gender roles are seen as essential and are based on physiology (Groenhout, 2002, pp. 52-53). Other, more morally focused views see masculinity and femininity as essential capacities of our character that stabilize each other (Rudy, 2001). When male and female experiences are valued equally women do not have to become like men to be valued (Donner, 1993, p. 156).

Femininity Acknowledged and Valued

Many feminists today view previous efforts for equality based on sexblindness as necessary, perhaps, but damaging, in that they led women to devalue femininity and other women in order to compete in a “man’s” world (Rudy, 2001, Donner, 1993). Many feminine traits have been associated with weakness. Some feminists seek to rectify this situation by attempting to forward feminine traits as not only valuable, but essential to the healthy functioning of society. As one author put it, “[s]eeing ‘women’s work’ as engaging, important work throughout history will reshape the landscape of our own lives today” (Rudy, 2001, p. 220). This feminist author, and many others, advocates increased sexawareness in the way we legislate.

The essentialist view of genderful minds may lead to a greater equality of men and women where traits such as nurturing and caring are valued as much as assertiveness and will to succeed.

Previous Research

The theoretical commitments of the social constructionist and the essentialist may have given rise to the ideologies of sexblindness and sexawareness. These ideologies and their possible relationship to gender bias are the focus of the current study. This study, like many others, follows the precedent of modeling gender studies on racism studies (Klonis et al., 2005; Koenig & Richeson, 2010). To that end I will be adapting the 2004 study of Richeson and Nussbaum entitled “The impact of multiculturalism versus color-blindness on racial bias” to study sexism. A summary of that study follows.

Richeson and Nussbaum (2004) present two different ideologies used to approach other races, multi-culturalism and color-blindness. They argue that the current approach, in schools and in the workplace, of ignoring racial difference may in fact lead to an increase in racist feelings. They tested both explicit racism and implicit racial bias in order to discover which ideology created more overall bias. They randomly assigned 52 white undergraduate students (30 female) to a color-blind or multicultural ideological prompt condition. Each participant was told that the study was designed to examine the current state of racial relations in the United States. They were informed that during the study they would first read a statement about interethnic relations and then complete several tasks and answer questions about different groups.

The one page statement on interethnic relations advocated either a multicultural or colorblind approach to race relations. After reading the statement, participants were given two tasks designed to “induce” them into the ideology presented. The first task required them to write five reasons why “multiculturalism (or colorblindness) is a positive approach to interethnic

relations” (Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004, p. 419). In the second task, participants were given a list of 21 responses provided by earlier participants (this list was actually generated by the researchers) and were asked to circle the responses most similar to their own. Upon completion of the induction exercises, participants were given the IAT for race. The four categories for this IAT are White names, Black names, Pleasant concepts and Unpleasant concepts. Upon completion of the IAT participants were asked to complete “thermometer-like warmth ratings” (Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004, p. 420) on several different groups, such as college students, men and women; with four different racial groups, Black, White, Asian and Latino, being the ratings of concern. Participants were then debriefed. As part of the debriefing, they were asked to indicate their agreement with the ideology they had been assigned. They were also asked several other questions, such as party affiliation and years of residence in the United States. Participants were then thanked and told they could leave.

Richeson and Nussbaum (2004) assessed implicit racial bias by generating IAT effect scores for each individual. This is done by log transforming raw scores and finding the mean for key blocks, in this case “White-Good” and “Black-Good” pairings. The mean of the “White-Good” pairing is then subtracted from the “Black-Good” pairing; creating a difference score that indicates the amount of pro-white bias for each participant, with higher scores indicating greater pro-white bias. They found a “robust” pro-white bias for both the multicultural and colorblind conditions, however, “participants exposed to the color-blind prompt revealed a larger pro-white bias compared to participants in the multicultural prompt condition” (Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004, p. 420), suggesting that a color-blind approach to race relations may lead to greater implicit racial bias when compared to multiculturalism. When explicit bias was considered, Richeson and Nussbaum (2004) found a statistically significant greater bias against Asians for

participants exposed to the color-blind prompt compared to those in the multicultural prompt condition. While ratings of the two other ethnic groups, Black and Latino, showed greater bias in the color-blind condition than the multicultural condition, the differences were non-significant. Richeson and Nussbaum (2004) also considered correlations between implicit bias and explicit bias. A moderate, non-significant correlation was discovered. Finally, participant ratings of their ideological prompt were considered. They discovered that individuals in the multicultural condition tended to agree with their prompt more than those in the colorblind condition. In light of these findings, they reanalyzed the racial bias data, controlling for agreement with the prompt. The results for implicit bias did not change. However, on the explicit ratings, the difference between the color-blind and multi-cultural conditions on pro-white bias emerged as statistically reliable; suggesting that mere exposure to the color-blind ideology, regardless of agreement, may generate greater racial bias.

Overall, Richeson and Nussbaum (2004) conclude that “relative to the multicultural perspective, exposure to the color-blind perspective generated greater automatic racial bias” (p. 421). In light of these conclusions, and considering the emphasis of sexblindness in the workplace, it may be important to consider these same types of ideological commitments in relation to gender.

Present Study

The gender analog to the ideologies of color-blindness and multiculturalism studied by Richeson and Nussbaum (2004) are sexblindness and sexawareness respectively. In the current study I will be replicating Richeson and Nussbaum (2004) study using these gender ideologies in an effort to determine the influence of sexblindness and sexawareness on gender bias. The

method of this study will vary only slightly from Richeson and Nussbaum's (2004) study and changes in method will be addressed as they arise.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses have been generated based upon the hypotheses and conclusions of the Richeson and Nussbaum (2004) study. While these hypotheses are similar, some changes have been made and are addressed as the hypotheses are presented.

1. Consistent with previous research (Nosek, Banaji, & Greenwald, 2002), participants will have an implicit bias against females and career (Ridgeway, 1997; Lips, 2008; Luzadis et al., 2008; Valentine & Mosley, 1998).
2. Participants will exhibit greater implicit bias against females and career in the sexblind condition compared to the sexaware condition. This hypothesis is based on Richeson and Nussbaum's (2004) conclusion that persons exposed to the color-blind condition demonstrated greater racial bias.
3. Participants will exhibit the same amount of explicit bias regardless of the ideological prompt. This hypothesis is given in light of the fact that Richeson and Nussbaum (2004) found no difference in explicit bias between the colorblind and multicultural ideological groups.
4. When agreement with a sexblind or sexaware ideological prompt is controlled for, participants in the sexblind condition will demonstrate more implicit bias (as per hypothesis two) and less explicit bias than those in the sexaware condition. Koenig and Richeson (2010) found that those motivated to respond without sexism viewed sexblindness as a way to reduce sexism. Therefore those who endorse sexblindness will demonstrate less explicit bias because of their motivation to respond in an unbiased way.

Method

Participants

Seventy seven undergraduate students attending Brigham Young University, 35 male and 37 female, ages 18-51 participated in this study. Students were recruited through psychology courses.

Procedure

This study was computer based and was administered on the Brigham Young University campus in a computer lab. Participants were seated at a computer where they read and signed an informed consent form. Upon receipt of the consent form, the researcher started the survey program on their computer. Participants were asked to provide their age and gender. Both age and gender were used in data analysis; age, because older generations may hold more explicitly negative views of working women, and gender because females tend to be more open to women working than men (Larsen & Long, 1988). They were also asked their political position on a scale from liberal to conservative, to determine if this sample was extremely conservative due to the religious culture of Brigham Young University. Finally participants were asked to report on their employment status from a list of full-time, part-time, and not currently employed. This question was included because this study deals with gender in the workplace and employment status may have an effect participants responses. Participants then read that they are part of a study to better understand the current status of gender relations in the United States. This statement has been modified for use with gender from Wolsko, et al. (2000) original participant packet, used in the Richeson and Nussbaum (2004) study. For example, the sentence “We are interested in people’s impressions of various ethnic groups in the United States” became “We are interested in people's impressions of various issues pertaining to gender in the United States.”

Ideological prompts. Following the introduction, participants were randomly assigned to read a prompt based on a sexblind (14 male, 16 female) or sexaware (21 male, 21 female) ideology. These statements were modified from those used in the Wolsko's, et al. (2000) study (see Appendix A). Modifications were kept to a minimum and no sentences were eliminated.

Ideology adoption. After reading the prompt participants were asked to write five reasons why being sexblind or sexaware is the best approach to gender relations. Each participant was then provided with a list of sentences defending the sexblind or sexaware ideology (see Appendix B). These sentences were modified from Wolsko's, et al. (2000) study. Some sentences were not compatible with gender and were replaced by others. For example, the phrase "learn new cultures" became "learn skills that aren't considered appropriate for either men or women" and the phrase "enables the settling of future immigrants" became "enables more women in the workplace in future generations." The participant was asked to select sentences similar to their own. The purpose of this portion of the experiment was to increase each participants agreement with the ideology they were assigned (Wolsko et al., 2000; Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004). Following this portion of the study, participants took the IAT for gender and career, the Multidimensional Aversion to Women who Work Scale and a measure of social desirability.

Implicit Association Test for Gender and Career. The IAT for gender and career is the primary dependent variable for the study. Participants were directed to the IAT administration page after they completed the ideology adoption exercises. The IAT is a timed word sorting exercise. Category titles, such as "male names" and "female names" are present in the top left or right corner of the computer screen. The "E" and "I" keys on the keyboard correspond with the left and right category titles respectively. A word appears in the middle of the screen and

participants are told to sort the word into the correct category as quickly as possible. For instance, if the trial word “Marriage” appeared in the middle of the screen and the category label “Family” was in the top left of the screen and the category label “Career” was in the top right, the participant would press E as quickly as possible to sort “Marriage” into the category of “Family”.

The test consists of seven blocks (see Table 1) of word presentations, five practice blocks and two test blocks. Practice blocks are not included in the data analysis. Test blocks include the stereotypical pairing of career and male and family and female, and the nonstereotypical pairing of career and female and family and female. The stereotypical and nonstereotypical test blocks are alternated for each participant to control for order effects. The difference in response time between the test blocks indicates the extent to which a bias is present. This difference can be presented as a mean difference, or as an IAT effect score (D) score similar to a Cohen’s d (see Greenwald, Nosek, & Banaji, 2003 for complete explanation of scoring, see Table 2 for scale for evaluating IAT effect scores).

Multidimensional Aversion to Women Who Work Scale (MAWWWS). This scale was created by Valentine (2001) as an alternative to long, dated and overly general tests of gender bias in the workplace. It was expanded from five items created for the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (Valentine & Mosley, 1998). It is designed to measure traditional gender role attitudes and stereotypes (Valentine, 2001). It has high convergent validity with the widely used Attitudes towards Women Scale (AWS) at a $p < .001$ (Valentine, 2001). This scale replaces the original warmth ratings of the Richeson and Nussbaum scale, because, unlike race, gender bias has both positive and negative components, making warmth ratings difficult to interpret (Klonis et al., 2005). This scale was selected because 1) it parallels the implicit measure of gender and career, 2) it is recent enough to capture current stereotypes, 3) it is about working

women in general, rather than female managers, or attitudes towards women in general. This test is a ten item scale, items are rated on a four point likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) and 4 (strongly agree). None of the items are reversed scored on the original scale (Valentine, 2001). High scores indicate endorsement of traditional roles, and low scores indicate endorsement of more liberal roles (see Appendix C for complete scale).

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. This scale is designed to measure a participant's need "to respond in culturally sanctioned ways" (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960, p. 354). Participants will be asked to complete Reynolds' (1982) short form A of this scale, by responding either true or false to 11 statements as they pertain to the participant. The socially desirable answer for each statement is indicated in Appendix D. Socially desirable answers receive one point, with a score of 11 indicating a strong desire to respond in socially approved ways (Leite & Beretvas, 2005). This form of the scale has high correlation, $r=.91$ with the 33 item long form of the scale (Reynolds, 1982) and a cronbach's alpha of $\alpha =.59$ (Loo & Thorpe, 2000).

Debriefing. Upon completion of the study, participants were debriefed. As part of the debriefing they were asked to indicate how much they agreed with the ideology to which they were assigned using a 7- point likert scale with 1) strongly disagree and 7) strongly agree.

Results

Participant Demographics

Seventy seven students participated in this study. Of these students, three participants did not follow the researcher's instructions, making it impossible to link their IAT scores with their scores on the other measures; therefore, their data was eliminated from the analysis. Two participant's scores on the primary dependent variable (the IAT) were extreme outliers within

their ideological group; $z=-2.66$ and $z=-2.745$, the data from these participants was eliminated based on the criteria established by Greenwald, McGhee and Schwartz (1998) to “not us[e] data from respondents for whom average latencies appear to be unusually high for the sample being investigated” (Greenwald et al., 2003, p. 197). Of the original seventy seven participants, seventy two were used in the following data analysis.

The mean age of participants was $M=21.68$ with a standard deviation of $SD=6.07$ with a range from 18 to 51. Age was considered in the analysis, but did not correlate significantly with the implicit measure, $r=.18$, $p=.13$; therefore no participants were excluded from analysis based on age. A two way analysis of gender with ideological condition was conducted to determine if there was an interaction effect, results were not significant $F(1,72)=1.04$, $p=.31$, $\eta^2=.02$. The mean political position of participants on a scale from 1 (conservative) to 100 (liberal) was $M=35.11$ with a standard deviation of $SD=18.55$ with a range from 3 to 97 indicating that participants in the sample were conservative, when tested against a hypothesized mean of political neutrality (50), $t(71)=-6.811$, $p<.001$, $d=.80$. Finally, of the 72 participants included in this study 6 were employed full-time, 20 were employed part time and the remaining 36 participants were not employed. An analysis was performed to determine if employment had a significant effect on the primary dependent variable (IAT for gender and career), results were not significant $F(2, 71)=.246$, $p=.783$, $\eta^2=.00$.

Data Trimming

Data obtained from the IAT were trimmed using the guidelines outlined by Greenwald et al.,(1998) in order to create IAT effect scores (D). This process is integrated into the test administration software, where log transformations and data trimming occur automatically. IAT effect scores will be use in the following analysis.

Results from the Social Desirability Scale short form A were compared with the mean obtained in the original study ($M=4.81$, $SD=2.80$). The mean of this sample ($M=4.96$, $SD=2.47$) did not differ significantly from the original data, $t(71)=.51$, $p=.61$. No further analyses were performed using the social desirability scale, because results were not significant.

Implicit Gender Bias

Consistent with Hypothesis 1 participants showed a moderate automatic preference for male and career over female and family ($M=.44$, $SD=.42$) regardless of ideological condition according to the criteria established by Greenwald et al. (2003) (see Table 2). Participants completed the trials faster during the stereotypical male and career pairing block, compared to the nonstereotypical female and career pairing block, suggesting an automatic bias towards males and career. This pattern of moderate bias was evident in both the sexaware ($M=.57$, $SD=.33$) and sexblind conditions ($M=.35$, $SD=.45$). In order to determine if this bias was statistically significant, the mean from the implicit measure for both conditions was compared to a hypothesized mean of no bias (0, see Table 2). Participants had a statistically significant preference for male and career, regardless of ideological condition on the IAT, $t(71)=9.05$, $p<.001$, $d=1.05$. This was true for both the sexaware, $t(29)=9.47$, $p<.001$, $d=1.73$, and sexblind, $t(41)=5.08$, $p<.001$, $d=.78$, conditions. These findings suggest that this sample of participants has a moderate implicit bias against women and career.

Contrary to Hypothesis 2, when the means of the sexaware condition ($M=.57$, $SD=.33$) and sexblind condition ($M=.35$, $SD=.45$) were compared, participants in the sexaware condition exhibited less implicit bias against females and career than those in the sexblind condition, $t(70)=2.26$, $p=.03$, $d=.54$. Additionally, when agreement with the ideological prompt was controlled for the difference between groups continued to be significant, $F(2, 69)=5.02$, $p=.03$,

$\eta^2=.07$. The results suggest that sexawareness may lead to less implicit bias against women and career.

Explicit Gender Bias

An analysis of the explicit attitudes as measured by the MAWWWS revealed that participants exhibit the same amount of explicit bias regardless of the sexaware ($M=20.47$, $SD=4.04$) or sexblind ($M=20.60$, $SD=3.70$) ideological prompt condition (as measured on a scale from 10-40), as was stated in Hypothesis 3, $t(70)=-.14$, $p=.89$, $d=.03$. Additionally, means near 20 indicate that, on average, participants did not endorse traditional roles. Most either selected strongly disagree (1) or disagree (2) concerning traditional statements on a Likert-type scale. When agreement with the ideological prompt was controlled for, participants in the sexblind condition ($M=20.60$, $SD=3.70$) did not differ from those in the sexaware condition ($M=20.47$, $SD=4.04$) in terms of amount of explicit bias demonstrated $F(2, 69)=.021$, $p=.88$, $\eta^2<.00$. This suggests that ideological condition has no effect on explicit bias against women in the workplace.

Additional Analyses

As this was a study of gender, a statistical analysis of the effect of gender, independent of ideological condition, was performed. An independent samples t test was performed to compare scores on the implicit measure for males ($M=.34$, $SD=.43$), and females ($M=.54$, $SD=.38$). Results indicate that females exhibited a higher implicit bias against women and career than did men, $t(70)=-2.17$, $p=.03$, $d=.47$. Men ($M=22.00$, $SD=4.04$), on the other hand, had a higher explicit bias against working women, than did women ($M=19.16$, $SD=3.05$), $t(70)=3.38$, $p=.001$, $d=.80$. This latter finding was consistent with an international study using the explicit measure (MAWWWS) that included Euro-American males ($M=22.40$, $SD=5.10$) and females ($M=18.20$, $SD=5.30$) (Valentine & Mosley, 1998). These findings are also consistent with a

national study done by Nosek et al. (2002) who found that “[w]omen appear to endorse some combination of career and family for women more than men do, but they appear not to go along with the conviction on the implicit measure. Rather, on the implicit measure, women show the culturally prescribed associations that link their group to family more than with career” (p. 109). This combination of outward commitment to equality combined with an inward gender bias may reflect women’s conflict about being encouraged to be wives and mothers while at the same time being told to seek success in an economic sphere (Lips, 2008). These seemingly conflicting messages may be the origin of an explicit acceptance of women in the workplace and an implicit rejection of the same idea.

Discussion

The intent of this study was to explore the impact of two ideological commitments on gender bias in the workplace.

Implicit Gender Bias

I found that there was a significant implicit bias against women and career for this sample. This finding is consistent with previous research using the IAT for gender and career (Nosek et al., 2002), and suggests, as was stated in the introduction, that sexism may have shifted from the overt to the implicit (Pearson et al., 2009; Klonis et al., 2005; Firebaugh & Davis, 1988). I also found that those in the sexaware condition exhibited more implicit bias against women and career than those in the sexblind condition. The data did not support the hypothesis that participants would exhibit greater implicit bias against females and career in the sexblind condition compared to the sexaware condition. One possible theoretical explanation of this finding may be that as participants adopted the sexblind ideology, they may have also adopted the associated masculinized neutrality leading them to associate career (which is stereotypically

masculine) equally with men and women. In the theoretical analysis I argue that lay theory of sexblindness originates from a theoretical commitment to social constructionism, where males and females are ontologically the same, and sex and gender are social constructions (Wood & Eagley, 2002). This conception of gender leads to genderlessness, which may actually silence the feminine in favor of the masculine (Spence & Helmreich, 1972). If this argument is true, when participants in the sexblind condition were encouraged to ignore sex differences by “remember[ing] that we are all first and foremost human beings” and citizens, they may actually have been guided to ignore the feminine side of gender, which is stereotypically associated with interpersonal relationships and family. Participants may have then been more likely to associate career with both men and women, leading to the appearance of less implicit gender bias in the sexblind condition (Glick & Fiske, 1996). An exploration of implicit bias and the idea of genderlessness could yield important information about sexism.

Another possible explanation of these unanticipated results arises from legislation against sexism (§ 2000 e-2). Employers, in an effort to avoid legislation, have adopted a sexblind approach to gender (Koenig & Richeson, 2010, Powell, 1990). This approach to sexism is widespread and may lead people to endorse sexblindness in the workplace regardless of how they feel about sex differences in other spheres. The pervasiveness of this ideology may be the origin of the participants demonstrating less bias against females and career in the sexblind condition.

This study was based on racism research done by Richeson and Nussbaum (2004). They found that colorblindness, the racial analog to sexblindness, generated more implicit bias than multiculturalism. This was the basis for Hypothesis 2 of this study: that sexblindness would generate more implicit bias than sexawareness. The inverse of this hypothesis was found to be

true. The fact that these findings are so different may call into question one of the underlying assumptions of this study: that racism and sexism are linked. This assumption has been the basis for several studies on sexism (Klonis et al., 2005; Koenig & Richeson, 2010; Norton et al, 2004; Bartlett, 2009), and may not be theoretically justified, as pointed out by Klonis et al. (2005), who argue that gender bias is different than other types of bias in that it is a mix of both positive and negative stereotypes, rather than simply negative. Further research could be done on the link between racism and sexism to determine the extent of their similarities.

Explicit Gender Bias

This sample, overall, is not generally averse to women in the workplace as indicated by the sample mean for the MAWWWS measure of explicit bias. As hypothesized, there was not a significant difference between ideological conditions on the MAWWWS. This is consistent with the Richeson and Nussbaum's (2004) findings of no significant difference, on the explicit measure of racism, between the ideological conditions of multiculturalism and colorblindness. Controlling for agreement with ideological prompt did not result in a significant difference between the sexblind and sexaware conditions. These findings provide support for the hypothesis that overt sexism is decreasing (Pearson et al, 2009; Klonis et al., 2005; Firebaugh & Davis, 1988). These findings are especially compelling when we consider that this sample of participants are from a culture that emphasizes traditional gender roles (Toney, Keller, & Hunter, 2003). In spite of this cultural influence, these participants indicated that they were not averse to women who work.

Limitations

This study was conducted in what Toney et al., (2003) describe as the "Mormon Culture Region" (MCR). Utah is the primary boundary of the MCR and is seen as the "nation's most

distinct religious-based culture region” (Toney et al, 2003, p. 432). There is a greater “emphasis on traditional gender roles in the MCR” than in other culture regions (Toney et al., 2003, p 440-441). This may be the reason that this sample was found to be conservative. However, as was stated above, participants did not exhibit more overt sexism than participants in other studies in other culture regions (Valentine & Mosley, 1998). Additionally, social desirability, which is often associated with religiosity (Leak & Fish, 1989; Watson, Morris, Foster, & Hood, 1986), did not have a significant effect on the primary dependent variable. These results suggest that the culture of the university did not affect the outcome of this study; however, future research could include other universities in other culture regions, to determine what impact, if any, the MCR may have had on the results of this study.

Future Research

Future research should be focused on the link between racism and sexism to determine the similarities and differences of these biases. This research should focus on whether the adaptation of racism research to sexism is justified, and should examine past studies to determine if conclusions made based on this assumption are warranted, as these studies provide much of the information we have about sexism. Additional research needs to be done in the field of sexism on the ideology of sexblindness, especially as it relates to genderlessness, in order to determine if feminine characteristics are indeed being marginalized in the workplace. Finally, replications of this study should include other universities in other culture regions to determine if the results of this study are unique to this region due to the emphasis on traditional gender roles (Mauss, 1994).

Conclusion

In conclusion, I believe that the results of this study, when seen from a theoretical perspective, call for further research on the effects ideologies of sexblindness and sexawareness

on gender bias; especially because sexblindness is currently endorsed in the workplace (Powell, 1990). While this ideology may lead to equal treatment of men and women, this equality may mean that both genders are receive the same masculine treatment. We must consider the implications of what we value in workers and how those values may be marginalizing half of the workforce, and creating a working environment that is detrimental to both men and women.

References

- Agacinski, S. (2000). The turning point of feminism: Against the effacement of women. *Journal of the Twentieth-Century/Contemporary French Studies*, 4(1), 29-36.
- Bartlett, K. A. (2009). Making good on good intentions: The critical role of motivation in reducing implicit workplace discrimination. *Virginia Law Review*, 95, 1893-1971.
- Bohan, J. S. (1993). Regarding gender: Essentialism, constructionism and feminist psychology. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 17, 5-21. doi: 0361-6843/93
- Carpenter, S., Zárate, M. A., & Garza, A. A. (2007). Cultural pluralism and prejudice reduction. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 13(2), 83-93. doi: 10.1037/1099.9809.13.2.83
- Carter, S. (2011, April 26). How to avoid discrimination when hiring. Retrieved from <http://www.howtodothings.com/business/how-to-avoid-discrimination-when-hiring>
- Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U. S. C. A. § 2000e *et seq.* (1964).
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 24, 349-354.
- Czopp, A. M., & Monteith, M. J. (2003). Confronting prejudice (literally): Reactions to confrontations of racial and gender bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 532-544. doi: 10.1177/0146167202250923
- Dietz, M. (2003). Current controversies in feminist theory. *Annual Review Political Science*, 6, 399-431. doi: 10.1146/annurev.polisci.6.121901.085635

- Donnell, S. M., & Hall, J. (1980). Men and women as managers: A significant case of no significant difference. *Organizational Dynamics*, 8, 60-77. doi: 10.1016/0090-2616(80)90049-2
- Donner, W. (1993). John Stuart Mill's liberal feminism. *Philosophical Studies: An International Journal for Philosophy in the Analytic Tradition*, 69(2/3), 155-166. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4320378>
- Firebaugh, G., & Davis, K. E., (1988). Trends in anti-Black prejudice, 1972-1984: Region and cohort effects. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 94, 251-272. doi: 0002-9602/89/9402-00
- Gelman, S. A., & Hirschfeld, L. A., (1999). How biological is essentialism? In S. Atran, & D. Medin (Eds.), *Folkbiology* (pp. 432-468), Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Gergen, K. J. (1985). The social constructionist movement in modern psychology. *American Psychology*, 40, 266-275. doi: 0003-066X/85/500.75
- Gergen, K. J. (1997). The place of psyche in a constructed world. *Theory & Psychology*, 7, 723-746. doi: 10.1177/0959354397076001
- Gergen, K. J. (2009). *Relational being: Beyond self and community*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 491-512. doi: 0022-3514/96
- Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., & Schwartz, J. L. K. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: The implicit association test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 1464-1480.

- Greenwald, A. G., Nosek, B. A., & Banaji, M. R. (2003). Understanding and using the Implicit Association Test: I. an improved scoring algorithm. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*, 197-216. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.85.2.197
- Groenhout, R. E. (2002). Essentialist challenges to liberal feminism. *Social Theory and Practice, 28*(1), 51-75.
- Haslanger, S. (1995). Ontology and social construction. *Philosophical Topics, 23*, 95-125.
- Holma, K. (2007) Essentialism regarding human nature in the defense of gender equality in education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education, 41*(1), 45-57
- Inquisit 1.33 [Computer software]. (2003). Seattle, WA: Millisecond Software.
- Koenig, A. M., & Richeson, J. A. (2010). The contextual endorsement of sexblind versus sexaware ideologies. *Social Psychology, 41*(3), 186-191. doi: 10.1027/1864-9335/a000026
- Klonis, S. C., Plant, E. A. & Devine, P. G. (2005). Internal and external motivation to respond without sexism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*, 1237-1249.
doi:10.1177/0146167205275304
- Larsen, K. S., & Long, E. (1988). Attitudes toward sex-roles: Traditional or egalitarian? *Sex Roles, 9*(1/2), 1-12.
- Leak, G. K., & Fish, S. (1989). Religious orientation, impression management, and self-deception: Toward a clarification of the link between religiosity and social desirability. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 28*, 355-359.
- Leite, W. L., & Beretvas, S. N. (2005). Validation of scores on the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale and the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding. *Education and Psychological Measurement, 65*, 140-154. doi: 10.1177/0013164404267285.

- Lips, H. M. (2003). The gender pay gap: Concrete indicator of women's progress toward equality. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 3, 87-109. doi: 10.1111/j.1530-2415.2003.00016.x
- Lips, H. M. (2008). *Sex and gender*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Loo, R., & Thorpe, K. (2000). Confirmatory factor analyses of the full and short versions of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 140, 628-635.
- Luzadis, R., Wesolowski, M., & Snavely, B. K. (2008). Understanding criterion choice in hiring decisions from a prescriptive gender bias perspective. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 20 (4), 468-484.
- Mauss, A. L. (1994). The Mormon struggle with assimilation and identity: Trends and developments since midcentury. *Dialog: A Journal of Mormon Thought*, 27(1), 129-149.
- Melling, B. S. (2010, August). *Personality and gender: Gender flattening increases gender bias*. Poster presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Diego.
- Norton, M. I., Vandello, J. A. & Darley, J. M. (2004). Casuistry and social category bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87, 817-831. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.87.6.817
- Nosek, B. A., Banaji, M. R., & Greenwald, A. G. (2002). Harvesting implicit group attitudes and beliefs from a demonstration web site. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 6, 101-115. doi: 10.1037//1089-2699.6.1.101
- Pearson, A. R., Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (2009). The nature of contemporary prejudice: Insights from aversive racism. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 3, 314-338. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-9004.2009.00183.x

- Powell, G. N. (1990). One more time: Do female and male managers differ? *The Executive*, 4(3), 68-75. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4164966>
- Reynolds, W. M. (1982). Development of reliable and valid short forms of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 38, 119-125.
- Richeson, J. A., & Nussbaum, R. J. (2004). The impact of multiculturalism versus color-blindness on racial bias. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40, 417-423. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2003.09.002
- Ridgeway, C. L. (1997). Interaction and conservation of gender inequality: Considering employment. *American Sociological Review*, 62, 218-235. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2657301>
- Rudy, K. (2001). Radical feminism, lesbian separatism, and queer theory. *Feminist Studies*, 27, 190-222. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3178457>
- Schofield, J. W. (1986) Causes and consequences of the colorblind perspective. In J.F. Dovidio and S. L. Gaertner's (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination and racism*. Florida: Orlando, Academic Press.
- Spence, J. T., & Hahn, E. D. (1997). The attitudes towards women scale and attitude change in college students, *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21, 17-34. doi: 0361-684319
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. (1972). Who likes competent women? Competence, sex-role congruence of interests, and subjects; attitudes towards women as determinants of interpersonal attraction. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 2, 197-213.
- Toney, M. B., Keller, C., & Hunter, L. M. (2003). Regional cultures, persistence and change: A case study of the Mormon Culture Region. *The Social Science Journal*, 40, 431-445. doi:10.1016/S0362-3319(03)00040-5

- Valentine, S. (2001). Development of a brief Multidimensional Aversion to Women Who Work Scale. *Sex Roles, 44*, 773-787. doi: 0360-0025/01/0600-0773
- Valentine, S., & Mosley, G. (1998). Aversion to women who work and perceived discrimination among Euro-Americans and Mexican-Americans. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 86*, 1027-1033.
- Watson, P. J., Morris, R. J., Foster, J. E., & Hood, R. W. (1986). Religiosity and social desirability. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 25*, 215-232.
- Willis, E. (1984). Radical feminism and feminist radicalism. *Social text 9/10*, 91-118. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/466537>
- Wolsko, C., Park, B., Judd, C. M., & Wittenbrink, B. (2000). Framing interethnic ideology: Effects of multicultural and color-blind perspectives on judgments of groups and individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*, 635-654. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.78.4.635
- Wood, W., & Eagly, A. H. (2002). A cross-cultural analysis of the behavior of women and men: Implications for the origins of sex differences. *Psychological Bulletin, 128*, 699-727. doi:10.1037//0033-2909.128.5.699

Appendix A

Ideological Prompts**Sexaware**

Sociologists, psychologists, economists, and political scientists all agree that gender issues are a #1 concern for the United States. We are in the unique position of having both males and females in the workplace. This could potentially be a great asset. Each gender can bring a different perspective to life, providing a richness in styles of interaction and problem solving strategies. Each gender group within the United States can contribute in its own unique way. Recognizing this diversity would help build a sense of harmony and complementarity between genders. Each gender has its own talents, as well as its own problems, and by acknowledging both these strengths and weaknesses, we validate the identity of both males and females and we recognize the existence of gender and its importance to the social fabric. We can allow each gender to utilize its assets, to be aware of its own particular problems or difficulties, and overall to live up to its potential. Thus, social scientists argue that understanding both the similarities and differences between males and females is an important part of long-term social harmony in the United States.

Sexblind

Sociologists, psychologists, economists, and political scientists all agree that gender issues are a #1 concern for the United States. At the present time, we are experiencing a great deal of conflict between genders. Social scientists note that it is extremely important to heed our creed in the Declaration of Independence that "all men (and women) are created equal." That is, in order to overcome gender conflict and fighting, we must remember that we are all first and foremost human beings, and second, we are all citizens of the United States. In order to make the U.S. as strong and successful as possible, we must think of ourselves not as two independent

gendered factions, but instead as parts of a larger whole. We must look beyond gender and understand the person within, to see each person as an individual who is part of the larger group, "Americans." Currently, we are spending a great many resources on conflict between men and women. If we can recognize our "sameness" we will be able to rechannel those resources to work on other difficult and important problems within our society such as poverty, caring for the elderly, and medical reform. Thus social scientists encourage us to see the larger picture, to appreciate that at our core, we really are all the same.

Appendix B

Sentences Defending the Ideology**Sexaware**

1. Work together better.
2. Understand each other.
3. Less fighting.
4. Learn skills that aren't considered appropriate for either men or women.
5. By interacting with the opposite sex we are more able to understand stereotypes associated with each gender.
6. Exposed to new ways of communicating.
7. Women don't feel that they are unimportant.
8. Helps with personal relationships.
9. Make society less boring.
10. Educate people in the working environment about the need for equality.
11. Might help cut down on crime.
12. Increase awareness of how each gender is treated.
13. Awareness of gender differences brings to light different viewpoints and methods of dealing with issues. One situation might be explained or dealt with in two separate ways by two different groups. This enhances our pool of ideas.
14. Being aware of gender differences gives way to diverse activities that one would not experience otherwise.
15. Helps groups with communication. Differing viewpoints can be hard to grasp and explaining these logically can be beneficial to all groups.
16. It refines people's sense of what being human is all about.

17. With all the knowledge present in our nation we could have a government which accommodates the needs of a larger spectrum of the population.
18. Provides diversity in the workplace.
19. Gives people an open mind; that their gender's way of doing things isn't always the best or only way.
20. Encourages compassion about gender issues.
21. Enables more women in the workplace in future generations

Sexblind

1. More productive in business when people work well together.
2. A sense of patriotism when people are in one group.
3. Diminishes a barrier between genders that blocks good communication.
4. Would solve many of the social problems and injustices that hurt us today.
5. There would be fewer hate crimes.
6. Less time and money used towards lawsuits due to sexual harassment issues.
7. Simplify politics.
8. Would not need to spend as much government money on groups that help enforce the rights of men and women.
9. We might become a more prosperous country with everyone working together.
10. More cooperation with other countries if they see that we are one not different genders.
11. Less violence.
12. We will finally do what our constitution says, "all men (and women) are created equal."
13. Better sense of National Pride.

14. Free flow of ideas between genders resulting in faster technological advances.
15. No more gender tensions would result in a happier and more productive society.
16. We would be stronger as a nation if U.S. citizens got along instead of turning everything into a gender issue.
17. Not having to focus on gender issues frees up resources to focus on other issues.
18. Equal access to work/other positions or facilities --wouldn't have to produce extra facilities for separate but equal type policies.
19. People would be nicer to one another.
20. There would be less fighting between genders.
21. People could worry less about getting what they deserve and more about doing a good job.

Appendix C

Multidimensional Aversion to Women Who Work Scale (MAWWWS)

1. Traditional husband/wife roles the best
2. Women are happier in traditional roles
3. An employed wife leads to juvenile delinquency
4. Women with families do not have time for other employment
5. A woman's place is in the home
6. Women's personal characteristics make life at work difficult
7. Women lack the skills and abilities needed at work
8. Women are not suited for work outside of the home
9. Women frequently find the demands of work difficult
10. I am skeptical about women's effectiveness in the workplace

Appendix D

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale

1. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged. (F)
2. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way. (F)
3. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener. (T)
4. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone. (F)
5. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake. (T)
6. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget. (F)
7. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable. (T)
8. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own. (T)
9. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others. (F)
10. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me. (F)
11. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings. (T)

Table 1

Sequence of Trial Blocks in the IAT for Gender and Career

| Block | No. of Trials | Function | Items assigned to left-key response | Items assigned to right-key response |
|-------|---------------|----------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1 | 20 | Practice | Career | Family |
| 2 | 20 | Practice | Male Names | Female Names |
| 3 | 20 | Practice | Career and Male Names | Family and Female Names |
| 4 | 40 | Test | Career and Male Names | Family and Female Names |
| 5 | 20 | Practice | Family | Career |
| 6 | 20 | Practice | Family and Male Names | Career and Female Names |
| 7 | 40 | Test | Family and Male Names | Career and Female Names |

Note. For half the subjects, the positions of Blocks 1, 3, and 4 are switched with those of Blocks 5, 6, and 7, respectively. The procedure in Blocks 3, 4, 6, and 7 is to alternate trials that present either a male or female name with trials that presented either career or family words. These strategies were used successfully to reduce the typical effect of order in which the two combined tasks are performed (Greenwald et al., 2003, p. 198).

Table 2

Scale for the Evaluation of IAT Effect Scores

| (D) score | Interpretation |
|---------------|--|
| $\geq + 0.65$ | Strong association of male with career and female with family |
| $> + 0.35$ | Moderate association of male with career and female with family |
| $> + 0.15$ | Slight association of male with career and female with family |
| 0 | Equal association of male with family and career and female with family and career |
| $> - 0.15$ | Slight association male with family and female with career |
| $> - 0.35$ | Moderate association of male with family and female with career |
| $\geq - 0.65$ | Strong association of male with family and female with career |

(Inquisit 1.33 [Computer software]. (2003). Seattle, WA: Millisecond Software.)