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Gender-based discrimination hinders the economic advancement of women due to the perceived incompatibility between femininity and the idealized masculine standards of an employee. To understand the gender discrepancy in the labor market, the current study compared men’s and women’s perceptions of personal career barriers following a masculine, feminine, and gender-neutral priming condition. Data were collected from 129 undergraduate students, 67 males and 62 females, ranging in age from 18 to 26 years. Analysis revealed a significant difference in the perception of personal career barriers across priming conditions. Specifically, participants in the feminine priming condition reported the highest level of personal career barriers, and participants in the masculine priming condition reported the lowest. Regardless of priming condition, women reported higher levels of personal career barriers than did men. Further investigation is suggested to better understand how contemporary definitions of masculinity and femininity relate to men’s and women’s perceptions of personal career barriers.
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CHAPTER 1
NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY

Purpose of the Study

The primary objective of the current research was to examine men’s and women’s perceptions of personal career barriers, or “external conditions or internal states that may make career progress difficult” (Swanson, Daniels, & Tokar, 1996, p. 236), in order to understand the current gendered environment of the labor market in the United States (U.S.). Although previous research has investigated personal career barriers that women currently experience in the workforce, such as the “lack of fit” hypothesis (Lyness & Thompson, 2000), men have typically been excluded from such research. To wholly explore the unique impediments that women encounter in the process of career advancement, the current research included both men and women. The inclusion of men provided a more complete picture of the gender discrepancy in the labor market by directly comparing men’s and women’s perceptions of personal career barriers on a career or career goal.

An additional objective of the current research was to establish a connection between men’s and women’s perceptions of personal career barriers and traditional definitions of masculinity and femininity. Traits associated with masculinity, such as agency, are valued by the labor market as indicative of a successful employee. In contrast, traits associated with femininity, such as communality, are discredited based on an organizational “lack of fit,” especially in relation to positions, such as chief executive officer (CEO), that inherently provide the employee a level of authority and power in the corporate system (Lyness & Thompson, 2000). Instead of entering a cut-throat “man’s world” characterized by board meetings, flow charts, and pant suits, women typically select careers that exemplify the “soft edges” of femininity (i.e., “women’s work”), such as nursing, elementary education, and library science. According to Freedman
(2010), “women’s work” disproportionately reflects careers associated with the lowest wages and advancement opportunities in the U.S.

Based on the impact of traditional definitions of masculinity and femininity in the determination of men’s and women’s career compatibility in the labor market, the current research examined masculinity, femininity, and gender neutrality in relation to men’s and women’s perceptions of personal career barriers. Masculinity, femininity, and gender neutrality were manipulated via a priming procedure designed to increase the availability of gender stereotypes, as produced by masculine, feminine, and gender-neutral stimuli.

**Rationale**

The moment an infant is born, the child is labeled a “boy” or “girl” based on his or her genitalia. The sex of the child, or the combination of genitalia, sex hormones, chromosomes, and type of reproductive system, is pivotal in shaping future personality characteristics, clothing preferences, and occupational type, among other factors (West & Zimmerman, 1987). Although the term “sex” exclusively refers to biological markers of maleness and femaleness, “gender,” a term referring to the social, cultural, psychological, and behavioral traits that are “linked to males and females through…social contexts,” is commonly used interchangeably with sex (Lindsey, 2005, p. 4). The misconception that sex and gender are one and the same encourages individuals to assume that observed differences between men and women, such as social roles, are due to “natural” causes. For example, femininity, or traits that are traditionally associated with women, such as communality, are typically viewed as an extension of females’ capacity to bear children (Rudman & Glick, 2001). Masculinity, or traits that are traditionally associated with men, such as agency, are often explained as a byproduct of hormones, specifically testosterone, and the inability to bear children. In addition, the association of biological males with masculinity and biological females with femininity is furthered by gender socialization, or the integration of
knowledge regarding gender categories in order to produce gender consistent behavior, in which
gender consistent behavior is reinforced (e.g., via compliments) and gender inconsistent behavior
is punished (e.g., via social ostracism) (Brzuzy & Lind, 2008). Based on the interchangeable
nature of sex and gender in common usage, as well as the process of gender socialization, it was
hypothesized that men would be more likely to identify as masculine, and women would be more
likely to identify as feminine.

Contrary to popular opinion, the U.S. is not the gender egalitarian society that is
publicized via legislation, workforce participation, graduation rates, and popular success stories.
The structure of the American corporate system strategically blocks women from economic
advancement at every employment stage, ranging from hiring practices to promotional
opportunities (Freedman, 2010). Protective legislation, such as Title VII of the Civil Rights Act
of 1964, penalizes overt gender discrimination, such as unwanted physical contact of a sexual
nature, but previous research has suggested that the corporate world has adapted by employing
covered discriminatory practices, such as occupational segregation, that can be disguised as an
organizational “lack of fit” problem, rather than a calculated move to maintain a gender status
quo that is ruled by men, for men (Lyness & Thompson, 2000; Zimmer, 1988).

Even when employed full-time, the expectation that women are inherently more
proficient than men in performing childcare and household responsibilities forces women
employees to work a constant “double shift,” characterized by a first shift in the workplace,
immediately followed by a second shift in the household (Greenhaus & Buetell, 1985; Shally-
Jensen, 2011). In addition to the strain of a “double shift,” the predominance of dual-earner
family systems in the U.S. has not managed to discredit the prevailing societal message that the
healthy development of children requires a stay-at-home mother. The stigmatization of full- and
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part-time working mothers, especially in the formative period of child development (i.e., birth to eight years of age), creates a toxic environment of overwhelming stress, guilt, and anger for employed mothers who “choose” to spend valuable time and energy on a career rather than a family (Greenberg & Avigdor, 2009; Shally-Jensen, 2011). According to Hodges and Park (2013), a further pressure that increases women’s perception of conflict between career and family roles is shifting oppositional identities. The perpetual shift between the identity of “mother and wife” versus “employee” depletes cognitive resources due to the different “selves” (e.g., the nurturing personality expected of a mother and wife in the home versus the assertive personality required of an employee in the office) that are required depending upon the social context. In contrast, it has been proposed that men experience significantly less opposition between career and family identities due to congruence in personality characteristics expected from both fathers and professionals, such as independence (Hodges & Park, 2013). Although barriers within the career and family initially present as distinct and separate, Swanson et al. (1996) specified that career barriers (i.e., “external conditions or internal states that may make career progress difficult”) include those related to both organizational practice (e.g., gender discrimination in promotion) and familial obligation (e.g., childcare and household responsibilities combined with full- or part-time employment) (p. 236). Based on the disproportionate amount of organizational and familial career barriers that uniquely impede women’s career advancement, it was hypothesized that women would perceive higher levels of personal career barriers than would men. In addition, based on the perceived “lack of fit” between characteristics associated with femininity (e.g., communality) and the masculine characteristics (e.g., agency) valued in employees, it was hypothesized that men and women who identified as more feminine than masculine would perceive higher levels of personal career barriers than would those who identified as more
masculine than feminine.

Automatic gender stereotypes, such as woman as “homemaker” and man as “breadwinner,” begin to form by two years and increasingly become more rigid with age, particularly during adolescence (Bem, 1981; Oswald & Lindstedt, 2006). Moreover, previous research has demonstrated that priming, or the unconscious effect of previous exposure to stimuli on responses to subsequent stimuli, can unconsciously mold perceptions of gender (Tulving, Schacter, & Stark, 1982). For example, Dasgupta and Asgari (2004) found that priming women with famous female leaders, such as Meg Whitman (i.e., CEO of e-Bay), reduced women’s automatic association of men with leadership roles and women with supportive roles due to an increased activation of counterstereotypic gender beliefs. Additionally, Rudman and Phelan (2010) demonstrated that priming women with traditional gender roles (e.g., male surgeon and female nurse) increased the automatic association of men with power and women with warmth, effectively reducing women’s interest in masculine occupations. Based on previous research indicating that automatic gender stereotypes can be modified by gender priming, it was hypothesized that men and women primed with masculine-gendered words, such as “soldier,” “suit,” and “bravery,” would identify as more masculine than those primed with gender-neutral or feminine words. Furthermore, it was hypothesized that men and women primed with feminine-gendered words, such as “pink,” “doll,” and “dress,” would identify as more feminine than those primed with gender-neutral or masculine words.

Despite previous research indicating that gender priming can unconsciously alter automatic gender stereotypes, gender priming has not been examined in relation to the perception of personal career barriers. In consideration of research conducted by Rudman and Phelan (2010) in which priming of traditional gender roles reduced women’s interest in masculine gender-typed
occupations, such as building construction, it was hypothesized that priming of feminine-gendered words would increase the salience of femininity, thereby increasing both women’s and men’s perceptions of personal career barriers. In contrast, it was hypothesized that priming of masculine-gendered words would increase the salience of masculinity, thereby decreasing both women’s and men’s perceptions of personal career barriers.

**Hypotheses**

*(Priming on Masculinity/Femininity)*

Hypothesis 1

It was hypothesized that priming from masculine-gendered words would result in men and women reporting higher levels of masculinity than priming from gender-neutral or feminine words.

Hypothesis 2

It was hypothesized that priming from feminine-gendered words would result in men and women reporting higher levels of femininity than priming from gender-neutral or masculine words.

*(Priming on Career Barriers)*

Hypothesis 3

It was hypothesized that priming from masculine-gendered words would result in men and women reporting lower levels of personal career barriers than priming from gender-neutral or feminine words.

Hypothesis 4

It was hypothesized that priming from feminine-gendered words would result in men and women reporting higher levels of personal career barriers than priming from gender-neutral or
masculine words.

(Masculinity/Femininity)

Hypothesis 5

It was hypothesized that men would report higher levels of masculinity than would women, and women would report higher levels of femininity than would men.

(Career Barriers)

Hypothesis 6

It was hypothesized that women would report higher levels of personal career barriers than would men.

Hypothesis 7

It was hypothesized that higher levels of femininity would be associated with higher levels of personal career barriers for both men and women.

Hypothesis 8

It was hypothesized that higher levels of masculinity would be associated with lower levels of personal career barriers for both men and women.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Sex and Gender

Consequences of Synonymous Usage.

Hair length, makeup, clothing, height, bone structure, and breasts comprise a small subset of physical features that automatically stir unconscious whisperings of “It's a woman/girl” or “It's a man/boy.” How do we know that underneath the fabric of that pink, floral print skirt there is a vagina or a penis? The simple answer is: we don't. Public display, as indicated by physical appearance and behavioral cues (e.g., style of gait), is assumed to accurately represent the presence of a vagina or penis, dependent upon the portrayed content (West & Zimmerman, 1987). The color pink, a skirt/dress, breasts, and heels equate to a vagina, whereas bulging biceps, a crew cut, a love of sports, and a deep voice correspond to a penis. The logic underlying the assumption that performance (i.e., gender) matches genitalia inherently implicates the penis and vagina as the source of masculinity and femininity, respectively.

The misuse and interchangeability of the terms “sex” and “gender” establish a commonsense, but mistaken, connection between biological indicators of maleness and femaleness, such as a penis or vagina, and psychological and/or behavioral characteristics, such as personality traits. The consequence of the linkage is that any observed difference between men and women, such as societal position, is assumed to be “natural” (Holmes, 2007). If societal roles, such as “homemaker” and “breadwinner,” are inherent to femaleness and maleness, the power differential between men and women can be conveniently attributed to biology, not societal barriers. Thus, why should women be given opportunities to excel in society when men are “naturally” better suited for work outside of the home?

The “natural” placement of women in subordinate positions and men in dominant
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positions is implicitly promoted by essentialism, which claims that male-female differences, such as personality characteristics, are produced by biology (Holmes, 2007; Smiler & Gelman, 2008). According to Smiler and Gelman (2008), essentialists propose that the static nature of biology indicates the existence of a stable and inflexible nature that is “essential” to males and females, resulting in societal positions that are best suited to the male or female “essence” (Smiler & Gelman, 2008, p. 864). The inherent danger in assuming that male-female differences, or “essential natures,” are exclusively due to biological factors is that the current economic system, exemplified as a patriarchy, is excused as a natural byproduct of biological sex, rather than recognized as a social construction created by societal forces that reward masculinity and punish femininity.

The label, “male” or “female,” acquired in the first stages of life is erroneously understood as a genetic blueprint that influences every detail of daily life from picking out a shirt hanging on a rack in a department store to choosing a career as a biochemist or a nurse. The notion that “Anatomy is destiny,” originally proposed by Sigmund Freud (1961), captures the popular opinion that sex (i.e., biology) is essential to human nature as the motivation behind every thought, decision, movement, belief, emotion, and preference that separates men and women. Lindsey (2005) noted that the reliance of society on biology in determining our “destiny” removes all human blame for the existing power differential between men and women, but the cost is slavery to one’s “anatomy.”

Sex.

Definition.

Due to the common mistake, as well as the serious consequences, of confusing the terms “sex” and “gender,” it is necessary to begin by attempting to disentangle the connection that has
been inextricably formed between the two. Sex constitutes biological markers, such as genitalia, sex hormones (e.g., levels of testosterone and estrogen), chromosomes (e.g., XY or XX), and reproductive systems, that distinguish biological males from females (Lindsey, 2005; West & Zimmerman, 1987). Sex is an ascribed status due to the static, rather than adaptable, nature of biology, as well as categorization as a male or female upon, or before, birth (Lindsey, 2005). Sex categorization as a male or female is considered “ascribed” because an infant is not required to do anything more than display a penis or vagina to obtain a label (West & Zimmerman, 1987).

**Charles Darwin: Sexual Selection.**

Charles Darwin, the father of evolutionary theory, famously advocated that reproductive functions, namely the production of sperm and eggs, are the evolutionary mechanisms that forced the development of males and females into men and women (1897). According to Darwin (1897), sexual selection, the primary mechanism of gender differentiation, is a method of natural selection that is based on the production of offspring to ensure survivability not of the individual organism, but of genetic material. Moreover, reproductive statuses determine the types of sexual strategies employed by men and women to secure mates, resulting in maximization of genetic survival. Darwin (1897) hypothesized that continual production of copious amounts of sperm and the lack of a gestation period historically shaped a sexual strategy for men that included copulation with as many women as possible. Intrasexual competition, such as male-male combat and honor earned from hunting or warfare, was the primary sexual strategy utilized by men to attract potential mates because success indicated the ability to provide for mates and offspring, as well as genetic viability (Darwin, 1897). Women face unique reproductive challenges, such as a limited production of eggs, a gestation period lasting approximately nine months, and the length of time required to nurture an infant, which necessitated sexual strategies, namely intersexual
According to Darwin (1897), sexual selection strategies designed to maximize reproduction and genetic survivability not only resulted in the propagation of humanity, but also profoundly shaped the physical and psychological development of men and women. For men, the demands of intrasexual competition required the development of specific characteristics, such as an “aggressive streak” and a lack of emotional expressivity, which have been carefully adapted and refined through centuries into the ultimate form of genetic survivability: masculinity. In contrast, Darwin (1897) claimed that intersexual selection, or the ability to pick and choose a mate, bred the passive and dependent woman that exemplifies contemporary femininity due to the lack of effort required to obtain mates throughout history. To survive as a male, winning a mate involved a combination of strategy and physical prowess. To survive as a female, winning a mate meant simply flicking a wrist at a group of males and gesturing at the most attractive, largest, or most glorified.

Darwin (1897) publicly validated male superiority and female inferiority as a natural outcome of sexual selection due to the advanced “deviations,” or environmental adaptations, of males (e.g., intelligence, spatial ability, body size, etc.) that evolved from the demands of competition for genetic survival (p. 227). In a telling glimpse of the inequality perceived to be a product of sexual selection, Darwin wrote, “Man is more powerful in body and mind than woman, and in the savage state he keeps her in a more abject state of bondage than does the male of any other animal; therefore it is not surprising that he should have gained the power of selection” (p. 597).

Alice Eagly: Social Structural Theory.

Is anatomy destiny? Do a penis, semen, and testosterone shape the destiny of a man? Do a
vagina, ova, and estrogen serve as the makings of a woman? Evolutionary theory would reply with a resounding, “Yes! Biology is the guiding force behind every difference that separates men from women.”

Although biology, namely the physical size and strength of men and the gestation and lactation period of women, play a central role in distinguishing the sexes, social structural theory suggests that psychological attributes, such as the communal personality type of women and the agentic personality type of men, are consequences of the sexual division of labor (Eagly & Wood, 1999). Social structural theory posits that the reproductive statuses of men and women prompted the establishment of a division of labor, in which men specialized in positions of power, wealth, and status, such as hunter and/or soldier, and women occupied positions of submission and dependence, such as caregiver and/or gatherer (Eagly & Wood, 1999).

In the process of assimilating to dominant and subordinate positions within society, men and women adopted role-specific “skills and resources linked to successful…performance” by adapting to “role requirements” (Eagly & Wood, 1999, p. 413). To accommodate to the role of “breadwinner,” men adopted marketable skills in the “paid economy,” such as an agentic personality type characterized by assertive, dominant, and independent behavior, idealized by the corporate system as a formula for successful employees (Eagly & Wood, 1999, p. 413). Similarly, the acceptance of the “homemaker” role required women to develop domestic skills associated with childcare and household responsibilities, motivating the acquisition of a communal personality type characterized by superior interpersonal skills and nonverbal communication, as well as the ability to nurture and foster the growth of an individual (Eagly & Wood, 1999). This leads back to the question, is anatomy destiny? According to social structural theory, anatomy is not destiny, but the division of labor is. It is not what we are (i.e., males and
females) that defines us as men and women; it is what we do.

**Different is as Different Does.**

*Men are from Mars, Women are from Venus* (Gray, 1992) is a popular piece of literature that mirrors the universal assumption that men and women are distinct, or different, separated by biological, psychological, and social roles. Classification of individuals into two separate categories, man or woman, primarily based on the presence of a vagina or penis operates to instill the public with the subtle message that men and women are practically two different species of human. Despite origin theories, such as evolutionary and social structural theory, proclaiming that the social constraints enforced by genetic and environmental factors resulted in “sex-differentiated” behavior that can still be seen today, are men and women really different (Eagly & Wood, 1999)?

The layperson might agree that men are tough and women are gentle, men are mathematical and women are verbal, men are dominant and women are submissive, men are stoic and women are emotional, men are competitive and women are cooperative, and the list goes on and on. Despite widespread acceptance of the gender differences hypothesis, or the assumption that men and women are fundamentally different, data collected from hundreds of meta-analyses have proposed an alternative hypothesis known as the gender similarities hypothesis (Zell, Krizan, & Teeter, 2015). For example, Hyde (2005) conducted a meta-synthesis of 46 meta-analyses that examined differences between men and women, including mathematical performance (Hyde, Fennema, & Lamon, 1990), self-esteem (Kling, Hyde, Showers, & Buswell, 1999), and personality (Feingold, 1994), and found that 48% of the meta-analytic effects were small and 30% of the meta-analytic effects were close to zero. The few exceptions included motor performance, such as throwing distance and velocity, and various aspects of sexuality,
such as masturbation and instances of casual sex (Hyde, 2005). Additionally, Zell and colleagues (2015) conducted a meta-synthesis of 106 meta-analyses, which produced 386 meta-analytic effects, as compared to the 124 meta-analytic effects obtained by Hyde (2005). Of the 386 meta-analytic effects, 39.4% were very small, 46.1% were small, 11.9% were medium, 1.8% were large, and 0.8% were very large (Zell et al., 2015). Although the majority of meta-analytic effects suggested very little difference between men and women, the 10 largest differences included men’s outperformance of women in “measures of masculinity, mental rotation ability, importance of physical attractiveness in mate selection, and aggression” and women’s outperformance of men in “reactivity to painful (noxious) stimuli, peer-attachment, and interest in people as opposed to things” (Zell et al., 2015, p. 14).

The presence of a penis or vagina, the occupation of positions associated with “homemaker” and “breadwinner,” and the assumption of skills and responsibilities related to societal position have not created man and woman as distinct, separate forms of human as common knowledge would have us believe. Instead, meta-analytic research performed by Hyde (2005) and Zell et al. (2015) suggests that men and women are more similar than different, diverging on only a minor subset of psychological and physical indicators. If men and women are more similar than different, why is the assumption of difference the norm, rather than the exception? The answer lies in considering status and power. The gender difference hypothesis provides an explanation and, more importantly, validation of a patriarchy in the U.S., in which difference entitles men to power, status, and wealth and women to enslavement. If the gender similarities hypothesis were publicized in the same manner and breadth as the gender differences hypothesis, society might begin to question why men represent the ruling class and women the underclass.
Gender.

The term “gender” can be found while paging through almost any piece of literature published in the twenty-first century that so much as mentions a difference between men and women. However, the term “gender” was not widely used until the 1970s due to an upsurge in feminist theory, effectively replacing the phrase “sex roles” as a means to distinguish the biological markers of maleness and femaleness (i.e., sex) from the social aspects of masculinity and femininity (i.e., gender) (Holmes, 2007; West & Zimmerman, 1987). The replacement of the phrase “sex roles” with the term “gender” in “soft science” literature, namely sociology and psychology, functioned as a strategic maneuver to discredit the role of sex, specifically the “biology as natural” argument, in the production and maintenance of masculinity and femininity (Holmes, 2007).

Definitions.

When filling out forms for admission to a university or an application for a job, “gender” is usually printed in a little box with two options from which to select: male or female; however, male and female are classifications of biological sex, not gender. Gender is a slippery concept that is not only inaccurately used interchangeably with sex, but is typically defined in terms of sex. For example, the online American Heritage Dictionary defines gender as “a grammatical category, often designated as male, female, or neuter…based on characteristics such as sex” (Gender, 2014, p.1). Thus, it is not surprising that many individuals lack a clear understanding of the term “gender” when the meaning continues to be overshadowed by references to sex.

For the current thesis, a working definition of gender is the social, cultural, psychological, and behavioral traits that are “linked to males and females through…social contexts” (Lindsey, 2005, p. 4). Gender, as compared to sex, is an achieved status, requiring an
individual to learn, as well as display, social cues (e.g., presence/absence of makeup) that can be classified by the social environment as masculine or feminine (Lindsey, 2005; West & Zimmerman, 1987). Masculinity refers to traits that are culturally accepted as an extension of “maleness,” such as participating in sports that involve high levels of physical contact (e.g., football), and is typically associated with agentic personality characteristics, such as independence, assertiveness, and aggression (Rudman & Glick, 2001). In contrast, femininity refers to traits that are traditionally associated with “femaleness,” such as wearing high heels and a dress, and is associated with communal personality characteristics, such as gentleness, nurturance, and emotional expressivity (Rudman & Glick, 2001).

Despite the advent of sex-reassignment surgery (i.e., surgical procedures that alter genitalia and secondary sex characteristics to physically resemble the opposite sex), sex is relatively stable across time and culture (Holmes, 2007; Lindsey, 2005). With some exceptions, the penis and vagina have been universally accepted as biological indicators of maleness and femaleness. However, gender is constantly in flux and seems to take on a new identity across historical time periods and geographical locations (Holmes, 2007). For example, jean pants are currently a popular type of women’s clothing in the U.S.; however, pants were not considered a socially acceptable form of garment for women to wear until the twentieth century (Holmes, 2007). The shifting definition of gender that is apparent in historical and cultural cross-comparisons hints to the underlying problem with relying on sex as an explanation for masculinity and femininity. If biological sex remains static and unchanging, why do men and women behave differently now than they did twenty years ago? If biological sex is the answer, how are cultural, or even regional, differences between men and women explained? Although biology has the capacity to change (i.e., via evolution), the amount of time necessary to create
even a minute genetic alteration effectively negates sex as the explanatory factor behind the
differentiation of men and women (West & Zimmerman, 1987). In contrast, the social
environment that constructs gender is adaptable, easily allowing the possibility of constant
definitional changes of what constitutes masculinity and femininity across time and space (West
& Zimmerman, 1987).

**Gender Binary.**

Imagine standing in line at a checkout counter and absent-mindedly glancing at the
cashier. Short hair, flat chest, and slim hips would suggest that the cashier is a man, but the slight
frame, delicate face, and long eyelashes hint at a woman. Your interest piqued, you find a
nametag with “Alex” printed in neat, block letters. As you approach the counter, anxiety begins
to build. How do you address the cashier? You cannot call the cashier a “sir” or “ma’am” without
risk of embarrassment and insult. While the cashier scans the groceries, you listen to the
cashier’s voice hoping for a clue. However, by the time the last bag is placed in your shopping
cart, the cashier has remained unidentified as either male or female. Chances are that even after
the store has been left behind, the cashier will remain in your head as you desperately try to
figure out if the cashier was a man or woman. Why?

The world is a scary place subject to events outside of human control, such as death,
natural disasters, and weather patterns, but categorization provides humans a false sense of
comfort. Categorization is a process that involves organization based on the principle of
“likeness,” which means that objects with similar properties are placed together into categories
(Category, 2014). According to West and Zimmerman (1987), the essentialness of categorization
to the human psyche in creating order out of chaos is apparent in the automatic and rigid manner
that every detail of life is placed into neat, separate boxes. What does this mean for gender?
In the U.S., sex is a binary categorization, male or female, despite evidence indicating that “nature” produces individuals, referred to as intersexed, with a combination of biological markers that do not clearly identify one sex (Boyle, Smith, & Liao, 2005). For example, an intersexed individual could have an XY chromosome, indicating male, but produce more estrogen than typical males and display a vagina. In addition, the term “hermaphrodite” refers to a type of intersex in which an individual is born exhibiting both a penis and vagina or ambiguous genitalia, such as an enlarged clitoris that resembles a penis (Boyle et al., 2005). Although estimates range from 1 to 17 in 1000 infants that are classified as intersexed at birth, common practice involves sex reassignment surgery (SRS), or the surgical alteration of genitalia, to clearly “match” the infant to one sex, which is typically determined by the parents (Holmes, 2007). Although sex is not naturally confined to male or female, technological advancements, such as SRS, provide a method to override nature and force individuals into only one of two socially accepted sex categories: male or female.

Sexual dimorphism, or the separation of sex into two categories, provides a natural basis for a synonymous gender binary, consisting of two distinct genders: masculinity and femininity (Lindsey, 2005; West & Zimmerman, 1987). Although not every interest, personality characteristic, or preference results in a 100% match with only one gender category (e.g., a woman that enjoys playing football), the majority of society can be accurately classified as masculine or feminine simply based on appearance (Goffman, 1976). West and Zimmerman (1987) claimed that categorization into a gender binary is not based on a rigid set of criteria, but rather on an “if, can” basis: if an individual appears to be a member of a category, then he/she can be placed into one of two categories (p. 133).

According to Goffman (1976, p. 69), appearance is a primary component of gender
display, which is a “perfunctory, conventionalized act” that not only indicates the “essential nature” (i.e., sex) of the individual(s), but also establishes the type of interaction appropriate given various social situations (Helgeson, 2002). Long hair, makeup, breasts, and the curve of hips or a short buzz haircut, bulging biceps, and the bump of an Adam's apple dictate the type of discourse that individuals select during interaction. The display of a masculine identity commands a dominant position in social interaction, such as frequent interruption of feminine individuals, controlling the course of conversation, and the strict maintenance of emotional composure (Helgeson, 2002). In contrast, the display of a feminine identity serves a more supportive function in facilitating social interaction, such as increased smiling, proficiency in decoding nonverbal cues, and reframing declarative sentences as tag questions (e.g., “You shouldn't eat take-out foods, should you?”). Goffman (1976) claimed that appearance is paramount to social interaction because a mere glance at an individual can automatically determine the appropriate verbal and nonverbal cues to be used during a potential interaction.

The fundamental flaw with an interaction system based on an arbitrarily designed gender binary is that not every individual fits neatly into one gender category. Androgyny refers to the integration of both stereotypical masculine and feminine characteristics (e.g., a man that enjoys knitting and contact sports). The combination of gender traits in one individual challenges the validity of a mutually exclusive gender binary, resulting in societal discomfort (West & Zimmerman, 1987). How can men and women be completely distinct and separate if some individuals seem to bridge the divide by possessing equal aspects of masculinity and femininity? If Goffman (1976) is correct in assuming that gender categorization shapes the environment in which social interaction occurs, then androgyny could potentially tear down the fragile system.

Hegemonic Masculinity and Emphasized Femininity.
The constriction of human gender identity into a binary is not an innocent classification system that purposelessly assigns men and women to discrete categories. Under the surface of “girly-girls” frivolously prancing around with painted faces and “manly-men” flexing bulging muscles, a power hierarchy characterized by various levels of masculinity and femininity has been firmly established, successfully infiltrating the social and economic structure of the U.S. (Connell, 1987). According to Connell (1987), the status and power that are synonymous with masculinity stem from a gender hierarchy that is based on a central tenet of “global dominance of men over women,” characterized by men assuming dominant societal roles as compared to the subordinate roles of women, such as husband and wife, doctor and nurse, and CEO and secretary (p. 183).

Although the gender binary strictly allows only two genders, masculinity and femininity, Connell (1987) stated that masculinity consists of two ranked levels: hegemonic masculinity and other subordinate forms of masculinity. According to Connell (1987), the structure of the gender hierarchy juxtaposes hegemonic masculinity, the dominant form of masculinity, in relation to alternative gender expressions, namely subordinate masculinities (i.e., males that adopt and display feminine characteristics and traits) and femininity. Hegemonic masculinity, commonly conceptualized as “real men” in U.S. culture, is epitomized by an emotional straitjacket that limits the range of emotional expression to aggression, a massive hulk of a body built to tower over subordinate masculinities and femininities, and an insatiable desire to accumulate wealth and power. Hegemonic masculinity is often portrayed in the media by movie characters, such as the gun-slinging American icon John Wayne, strategically designed by script writers, film directors, and actors to provide exemplar models of masculinity. Exposure to media representations of masculinity influences the expression of masculinity in the U.S. due to
The widespread acceptance that assuming the role of a “man” results in success, power, respect, and the obtainment of women, which is strengthened by idolization and identification with characters that exemplify hegemonic masculinity, such as Indiana Jones, Rocky, and James Bond (Connell, 1987). Although the typical image of hegemonic masculinity is publicly depicted as an idealized fantasy figure, such as Captain America, Wolverine, and Han Solo, real models of masculinity, such as Michael Phelps, Mike Tyson, and Peyton Manning, are publicized to create an illusion that masculinity can pave the way to fortune and fame for any man, resulting in mass acceptance of “an unattainable ideal” (Connell, 1987, p. 185).

The concept of hegemonic masculinity is based on the term “hegemony,” which refers to “a social ascendancy...that extends beyond...brute power into the organization of private life and cultural processes” (Connell, 1987, p. 184). Rather than hegemonic masculinity globally conquering the gender hierarchy with violence and bloodshed, hegemonic masculinity is insidiously integrated into “religious doctrine and practice, mass media content,” corporate structure, and government policy, thereby gaining “ascendancy” via consent, not force (Connell, 1987, p. 184; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). Although only a minority of men strictly adheres to the doctrine of hegemonic masculinity, the majority recognize hegemonic masculinity as an idealized normative that legitimates subordination of women, which provides men, even subordinate masculinities, power over roughly half the global population (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005).

According to Connell (1987), hegemonic masculinity constructs a patriarchal hierarchy that does not allow a hegemonic form of femininity; therefore, all forms of femininity, ranging from the “girly-girl” to the “tomboy,” serve as a gender expression that supports the global subordination of women in relation to men, including subordinate masculinities. Although the
gender hierarchy is in a “state of play,” allowing the option of resistance, emphasized femininity, the idealized expression of femininity, operates in compliance with hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 1987, p. 184). Emphasized femininity, the dominant form of femininity, is typically represented by women, such as June Cleaver from Leave It to Beaver, who forfeit a career to pursue homemaker and caregiving roles while, at the same time, maintaining an idealized feminine appearance. Connell (1987) compressed the entire spectrum of emphasized femininity into two overarching themes: “sexual receptivity in relation to younger women and motherhood in relation to older women” (p. 187). Specifically, patterns of emphasized femininity are strategically utilized by younger women to attract a mate, such as speaking quietly in the company of men, and by older women to comply with the demands of motherhood, such as caring for the needs of children. Due to the necessity of women’s compliance to subordination, emphasized femininity is publicized on a more intensive and far-reaching scale than hegemonic masculinity, appearing in magazines (e.g., Cosmopolitan), soap operas (e.g., Days of Our Lives), sitcoms (e.g., The Big Bang Theory), movies (e.g., Snow White and the Seven Dwarves), game shows (e.g., Wheel of Fortune), and so on (Connell, 1987). Emphasized femininity is essentially a form of slavery that women consensually maintain by driving off alternative forms of femininity, such as masculine women derogated as “butch,” and continuously reproducing behavior learned from parents, teachers, peers, and media that preserve the gender hierarchy of masculine dominance and feminine subordinance.

**Gender Socialization: The Makings of Men and Women**

Even before birth, the discovery of the sex of an infant is pivotal in the development of a gender identity, spurring parents to select names that would appropriately identify sex and gender, such as John for a male and Mary for a female. In addition, the preparation for the arrival...
of an infant typically includes the decoration of a nursery based on a theme that will display the
gender of the infant (e.g., trains/car theme for a male), the careful selection of clothing that will
allow society to correctly categorize the infant as a male or female (e.g., pink clothing for a
female), and the designation of items that will be associated with the infant to facilitate the
acquisition of a gender identity (e.g., dolls for a female).

The moment an infant is born, the doctor immediately proclaims “It’s a boy!” or “It’s a
girl!” based on a cursory glance at genitalia, effectively dictating the course of an infant’s gender
identity development simply based on the presence of a penis or vagina. Based on the gender
label conferred by the attending obstetrician, the parents and the surrounding society perceive the
infant in terms of gender stereotypical characteristics, such as describing a female infant as
“delicate” or “gentle” and a male infant as “strong” and “playful,” despite the lack of any
differentiating physical markers, save the genitalia, that indicate the sex of the infant (Zosuls et
al., 2009). Parental application of gender, rather than gender-neutral, labels to describe the
appearance or behavior of an infant enhances the salience of “gender category information,”
allowing the formation and usage of gender categorization before the age of two years (Zosuls et
al., 2009, p. 688). According to Zosuls et al. (2009), the ability to understand the gender
categorization system at the age of two years permits accuracy in labeling the self and others
according to a gender category (e.g., man, woman, boy, girl) based on appearance and behavior.

The ability to accurately categorize gender signifies the beginning stages of gender
identity development, allowing a child to internally recognize him/herself as a gender (“I am a
girl” or “I am a boy”) and produce behavior that publicly displays that gender. Children primarily
learn gender consistent behavior through observation of parents, which facilitates the selection
and modelling of observed behavior (Brzuzy & Lind, 2008). For example, a female child may
observe her mother cooking and, based on similar gender categorization, model that behavior by “cooking” mud pies. In addition, parents explicitly influence gender identity development through a system of punishment and reward (i.e., operant conditioning), which is commonly perceived as simply reflecting “natural” differences in the behavior and personality characteristics of male and female children. Atypical gender behavior (i.e., biological male or female displaying gender inconsistent behavior) is punished and gender stereotypical behavior (i.e., biological male or female displaying gender consistent behavior) is rewarded via direct and indirect mechanisms, such as positive or negative verbal feedback, which reduce undesired behavior (i.e., atypical gender behavior) and increase desired behavior (i.e., stereotypical gender behavior) (Brzuzy & Lind, 2008). The most common methods parents employ to teach children gender consistent behavior include manipulation (i.e., describing and treating males and females differently), channeling (i.e., exposing males and females to gender consistent objects), verbal appellation (i.e., describing identical behavior of males and females differently), and activity exposure (i.e., exposing males and females to gender consistent activities) (Yarber, Sayad, & Young, 2010). According to Brzuzy and Lind (2008), the process of integrating knowledge of gender categories and learning to produce behavior that corresponds to the appropriate gender is referred to as gender socialization. Although parents serve as the primary agent of socialization during childhood, teachers, peers, and the media become important secondary agents of socialization as participation in the social world increases.

The Historical Role of Women in the Workforce

A massive giant of a man with long tangled hair, dark tanned skin, and bulging muscles throwing a spear at a woolly mammoth and dragging a half-clothed woman by the hair is typically one of the first images that surface in everyday discussions of prehistoric gender roles:
man, the hunter, and woman, the prey. The idealization of prehistory as a period of time characterized by men forming small bands to hunt large, dangerous beasts for both sport and necessity and women walking countless miles, often with a baby in tow, to forage for edible nuts, berries, and roots to prepare and serve men has been granted credence in evolutionary theory, primarily in literature published and disseminated by Charles Darwin (1897).

Although archeological and anthropological evidence indicate that the proposed division of labor was typical of prehistory based on reproductive status and genetic survivability, the majority of prehistoric societies relied on foraging patterns of food collection due to variability of migratory patterns, species depletion, an inability to store food, and primitive forms of technology (Barnett & Rivers, 2004). The elevated risk and limited benefit of hunting required both males and females to engage in foraging behavior as the primary food collection method in order to supply members of the hunting-gathering society adequate nutrition and essential plant-based material (e.g., nettle was a primary ingredient used in the production of textiles) to ensure survival (Barnett & Rivers, 2004). According to Barnett and Rivers (2004), prehistoric hunter-gatherer societies exhibited patterns of gender egalitarianism due to dependence on one pattern of food collection: gathering.

A sexual division of labor, characterized by male dominance and female subordinance, did not begin to appear until the advent of the agricultural revolution, which resulted in the replacement of nomadic migration with permanent settlements (Barnett & Rivers, 2004). The technological advancements and agricultural knowledge necessary to successfully farm a plot of land allowed for the accumulation of possessions, the ability to form crude property lines, the security of a reliable food source, and the capacity to domesticate livestock (Barnett & Rivers, 2004). More importantly, the innovation of agriculture transformed the burden of children into
commodities. More children equated to more hands that could plant, weed, plow, and harvest crops, as well as raise, butcher, and cook livestock. The value of children as a source of free labor effectively reduced women to the role of “baby maker.” The increased demand for children produced a sexual division of labor, characterized by limiting women to the private sphere (e.g., childcare and household responsibilities) and encouraging men to participate in the public sphere (e.g., farming, raising livestock, and trading). However, Freedman (2010) stated that the division of labor typical of an agrarian lifestyle was not strictly enforced, allowing minor overlap of gender roles, such as butchering livestock.

In the period of time between 1760 and 1840, the Industrial Revolution swept the globe, introducing new and improved manufacturing processes, such as steam and water power, that relied on machinery as a form of labor (Shally-Jenson, 2011). Masses of people uprooted from small, rural farmland and flooded overpopulated cities, vying for positions in manufacturing companies that promised stability and equity. Prominent businessmen and industrialists flourished and the opportunity for advancement fostered the creation of a new economic status: the middle class. However, 10 hour work shifts and wages below an acceptable standard of living forced a life of squalor upon the lower class and working poor, characterized by crowded shantytowns, unsanitary conditions, and malnutrition (Shally-Jenson, 2011).

The pronounced gap of separation between the affluent and poor mirrored the separation that existed between men and women by enforcing separate, strict spheres of living. According to Shally-Jenson (2011), an “ideology of separate spheres” based on perceived strengths and weaknesses prompted the sexual division of labor during the Industrial Revolution (p. 957). Specifically, the inhospitable working conditions typical of factory life and the increased opportunity to profit reinforced widespread acceptance that women were too fragile to succeed in
a “man’s” world replete with dangerous machines, stringent work schedules, and physical demand. Instead, women were safely tucked away in the home performing childcare and household responsibilities, allowing men the ability and means to control the paid economy. Despite the prominence of child labor during the industrial revolution, only ethnic/racial minority women, single women, and men participated in the labor force. Freedman (2010) asserted that the transition from the farm to the city did not alter the perception that children were commodities. Therefore, children, often as young as four years, were shoved into factories to earn a meager salary to support the family, necessitating the responsibility of women to stay at home cooking, cleaning, and, more importantly, bearing children.

Although the sexual division of labor established during the Industrial Revolution strictly enforced the role of men in the workforce and women in the home, single women, racial/ethnic minority women, and occasionally lower class married women were reportedly employed in approximately 500 feminine trades, such as the seamstress trade, by the 19th century (Freedman, 2010). Despite the relative advancement of women in the workforce, women were prohibited from applying for occupations associated with a higher salary based on the preconceived notion that women were only temporary employees that could trapse off at any moment to get married or pregnant (Freedman, 2010). In addition to the economic limitation of women’s employment, affluent society considered the participation of upper and middle class married women in the workforce socially unacceptable, compromising the social position of the family due to the suggestion that the husband was an inadequate provider (Freedman, 2010).

In the U.S., the segregation of women, specifically married women, from the workforce abruptly changed on December 7, 1941, immediately following a military strike on Pearl Harbor by the Imperial Japanese Navy (Freedman, 2010). The outbreak of World War II (WWII) initially
began in 1939 between Great Britain, China, and the Soviet Union (Allies) and Japan, Germany, and Italy (Axis); however, the U.S. had publicly declared neutrality in the global conflict until escalation in 1941 forcibly pulled the U.S. in the middle of the fray (Freedman, 2010; Shally-Jenson, 2011). A formal declaration of war compelled millions of able-bodied men over the age of 18 to enlist in the U.S. military and ship to warzones halfway across the world. The unstoppable leak of men out of the U.S. necessitated that empty labor positions, specifically in the munitions industry, be filled by what was left of the population: women. The iconic image of “Rosie the Riveter” served as a propaganda tool disseminated by the U.S. as an inspirational model to women, insinuating that the “new” role of women was serving the U.S. by creating and supplying the Allies munitions and aircraft equipment to “keep the boys safe.”

The U.S. plea for help did not go unheard. Women flooded the labor market, increasing workforce participation rates by 57% from 1940 to 1944 (Freedman, 2010). For example, Freedman (2010) reported that approximately 310,000 women were employed in the aircraft industry in 1943, representing approximately 65% of the total workforce, as compared to only 1% before U.S. involvement in WWII. According to Freedman (2010), workforce participation increased women’s self-confidence in their ability to perform “men’s work,” as well as their perception of freedom, by gaining a semblance of financial independence, despite earning wages that were rarely more than 50% of men’s wages. In an acknowledgement of the significant wage discrepancy between men and women, President Franklin D. Roosevelt established the National Labor War Board in 1942 and commissioned the dismantling of gender discrimination in the workforce by pressuring corporations to voluntarily equalize wages between men and women when performing the same job (Freedman, 2010). However, the majority refused to equalize wages, preferring to maximize profit by paying women employees as little as possible.
Following the defeat of the Axis in 1945, soldiers returned home, promptly requiring the displacement of women from the workforce and back into the home. The mass removal of women from the workforce via mechanisms of dismissal and preferential hiring was based on the perception that women, especially married women, only used the money to pay for luxuries, as compared to men who used the money to support a family. The significantly reduced role of women in the workforce was clearly apparent by 1956, in which women comprised roughly 35% of the workforce, typically earning 59 to 64 cents of every dollar earned by men (Freedman, 2010).

**Second-Wave Feminism.**

The small taste of freedom that women enjoyed during WWII was squashed the moment that Germany surrendered in 1945, abruptly reintroducing women to a life of domesticity, chained within the confines of four walls. The angry buzzing of women reached a cacophony following the publication of *The Feminine Mystique* (Friedan, 1963), which called into question the role of women as housewife and mother, recognizing that feminine ideals severely limited women’s opportunity for advancement. In addition to the public disclaimer that social roles of femininity practically ensured the slavery of women, the Presidential Commission on the Status of Women (PCSW), chaired by Eleanor Roosevelt, released a report in 1963 that criticized the widespread discrimination against women in a country that was supposedly defined as “free” (Barnett, 2004). The increased awareness of gender discrimination, as highlighted by *The Feminine Mystique* and the PCSW, launched a movement across the U.S. dubbed “second-wave feminism” (Barnett, 2010; Friedan, 1963).

First-wave feminism, or the period of feminist activity that occurred during the 19th and 20th centuries, primarily focused on women’s suffrage, involving the legal recognition that
women were citizens of the U.S. and, as citizens, deserved the rights and responsibilities, such as the legal right to vote in elections, enjoyed by men (Barnett, 2011; Freedman, 2010). However, the movement for gender equality died down upon the passage of the 19th amendment in 1920 granting women the right to vote. The quiet whispering of gender discrimination did not reach notice again until the 1960s, spurring women to broaden the range of issues to legally tackle, such as the rights of women as employees.

**Gender Legislation.**

The Equal Pay Act of 1963 (EPA), an amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, served as a milestone for second-wave feminism, representing one of the first legal victories of the women’s movement. The EPA prohibits gender-based wage discrimination; specifically, employers are legally mandated to provide comparable wages to men and women employees who perform “jobs that require substantially equal skill, effort and responsibility under similar working conditions” (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, n.d., para. 1). Originally, the EPA did not pertain to executive, administrative, or professional positions; however, amendments to the legislation currently encompass previously exempt occupations (Freedman, 2010).

The legal success of second-wave feminism did not stop at the passage of the EPA, as compared to the premature halt in first-wave feminism following the first whiff of gender equality. Barely a year after the Equal Pay Act of 1963, a landmark piece of civil rights legislation, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, was passed by the U.S. Congress, which prohibited discrimination based on race, ethnicity, gender, religion, or national origin (Freedman, 2010). Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the key protective legislation of workplace equality, designates “unlawful employment practices” that discriminate and, thereby, limit employment
opportunities based on sex, race, religion, ethnicity, or national origin as illegal and subject to
Employment Practices,” section a). Although the U.S. had been previously criticized by second-
wave feminists, such as Betty Friedan, as a nation that relied on “saying but not doing,” the
words written on paper were combined with the development of an enforcement agency. In 1964,
the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) was tasked with the enforcement of
federal legislation that illegalized workplace discrimination based on a wide variety of
characteristics, including those not specifically protected under Title VII, such as pregnancy
status, “age (40 or older), disability, or genetic information” (U.S. Equal Employment
first five years following the establishment of the EEOC, approximately 50,000 complaints of
gender discrimination were reported.

Women’s Advancement…Or Not?

Media publicize the faces of the few exceptionally successful American women (e.g.,
Janet Yellen) in magazines and news broadcasts, research statistics report that men are quickly
becoming a minority on college campuses, and general observations of women “wearing the
pants in the relationship” are indiscriminately consolidated as indisputable evidence of gender
egalitarianism in the U.S. For example, the graduate and undergraduate enrollment rate in two-
and four-year degree programs is greater for women (72%) than men (66%), and the U.S.
Department of Commerce (2011) projects that women will account for approximately 60% of the
total undergraduate enrollment population in 2019. In addition to an increased presence in
undergraduate and graduate institutions, women have been flooding the employment sector since
the early 1940s when women were plucked from the home and unceremoniously dropped into
munitions factories to aid the U.S. during WWII. According to the U.S. Department of Commerce (2011), prior to 1950, approximately 33% of women reported full- and part-time employment statuses; however, the percentage of “working women” has skyrocketed to 57.5% in the 21st century (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2012).

Despite women’s increased visibility in the media, academia, and the workforce, the statistics and success stories that are selected for dissemination to the general public conceal the oppressive, yet invisible, inequality that continues to force women into “dead-end jobs.” For example, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2012) reported that women comprise approximately 50% of the U.S. labor force, which supports the rosy hued illusion of the U.S. as a “land of equal opportunity;” however, closer inspection reveals a striking disparity in the part- and full-time employment statuses of men and women. Specifically, 26.3% of women employees are employed part-time as compared to only 13.3% of men employees (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2012). Furthermore, despite the 31% wage increase of full-time women employees since 1979, full- and part-time women employees continue to earn 78.3 cents per dollar that men earn even when performing identical duties in a given occupation (U.S. Department of Commerce, 2011).

In 2013, the EEOC reported 93,727 claims of workplace discrimination, of which gender-based discrimination accounted for 29.7%, second only to race-based discrimination (35.3%) (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, n.d., “Charge Statistics,” Table 1). Therefore, despite the semblance of protection afforded by anti-discrimination legislation (e.g., Title VII) and enforcement agencies (e.g., EEOC), the gender disparity in full- and part-time employment and average hourly wages, as well as the proportion of gender-based discrimination claims annually filed with the EEOC, clearly indicate that workplace discrimination continues to
thrive despite the publicized imperative to eliminate inequality. According to Zimmer (1988), the EEOC and anti-discrimination legislation provide a false sense of comfort to women, publicizing the annually decreasing charges of gender-based discrimination as evidence that the workplace is progressively becoming a gender-egalitarian environment. Unfortunately, the decline in charges does not mean that gender-based discrimination is a thing of the past. Instead, Lyness and Thompson (1997) claim that the prosecution of overt forms of gender-based discrimination, such as unwanted physical contact, has forced employers to shift to covert discriminatory practices, such as occupational gender segregation, that maintain the gender hierarchy in the workforce under the radar of the EEOC. According to Jonnergard, Stafsuud, and Elg (2010), women are systematically hindered from employment opportunity, including hiring and promotion, due to gender-based discrimination that is disguised as gender-neutral organizational policies, such as performance evaluations, an inflexible schedule, and mentoring. Although contemporary workplace gender-based discrimination does not typically take the form of unwanted physical contact of a sexual nature or gender-related slurs, corporations create innumerable covert career barriers that prevent career advancement of women.

Mechanisms of Gender Discrimination in the Workforce.

Occupational Segregation.

At every stage of employment, women experience gender-based career barriers, such as occupational segregation, limited promotional opportunities, and reduced wages, from which men are exempt (Freedman, 2010). In relation to gender, occupational segregation refers to the differential distribution of men and women into occupational types and positions (Charles, 2003). Horizontal segregation, or the gender distribution across occupational types, concentrates women in traditionally feminine occupations, such as secretaries, and men in traditionally
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masculine occupations, such as construction workers (Charles, 2003; U.S. Department of Commerce, 2011). Horizontal segregation first begins to take root during secondary school, in which female students are steered toward advanced courses in English, foreign languages, fine arts, and social sciences and male students toward advanced courses in mathematics and science (e.g., physics, algebra, and calculus) (Barnett, 2004). The frequency of exposure and success in “appropriate” courses of study direct students to select undergraduate and graduate majors that reflect the notion that men “naturally” excel in degrees relating to mathematics and “hard science” and women to “soft science,” education, and nursing. For example, the U.S. Department of Commerce (2011) reported that women dominate education and health profession majors, earning approximately 77% of education degrees and 84% of health profession degrees. In contrast, women earn less than 50% of bachelor degrees in mathematics and physical science and less than 20% in engineering and computer science (U.S. Department of Commerce, 2011).

The gender segregation of undergraduate and graduate degrees is mirrored in the type of occupations that men and women fill in the labor market. According to the U.S. Department of Commerce (2011), 20% of women concentrate into one of five traditionally feminine occupations: secretaries, registered nurses, elementary school teachers, cashiers, and nursing aides. However, feminine occupations, such as teaching, are typically associated with lower wages than masculine occupations, such as engineering. Freedman (2010) termed feminine occupations, or “women’s work,” typically associated with low wages and a lack of promotional opportunities as a “pink collar ghetto” (p. 46). According to Freedman (2010), women who are employed in the “pink collar ghetto” are often forced to balance two or three jobs just to “make ends meet” (p. 46). In contrast, unskilled men are often able to find employment, such as mining, that offers higher wages than that of feminine occupations simply based on the need for
masculine characteristics associated with physical strength and fearlessness.

Vertical segregation, or the gender distribution across positions, regulates the career mobility of employees in a given occupation, allowing men to “coast” through the ranks to executive positions while limiting women to entry-level positions with restricted advancement opportunities (Charles, 2003). For example, 5.2% of Fortune 500 and 5.4% of Fortune 1000 CEOs are currently women, clearly demonstrating that women are limited and men are unlimited in relation to career advancement, especially in prestigious public corporations (Freedman, 2010). Even in traditionally feminine occupations, such as nursing, men tend to be promoted faster to management positions than equally qualified women. According to Rochlen, Good, and Carver (2009), the “glass escalator” is a term that refers to the ease with which men transition from entry-level to management-level positions in both masculine and feminine occupations.

Both vertical and horizontal occupational segregation appear to be objectively based on preference, college education, and previous work experience rather than the subjective devaluation of “women’s” work and the valuation of “men’s” work.

**Lack of Fit.**

According to Freedman (2010), not only are women filtered into minimum wage, entry-level positions derogated as “women’s work,” but in order to obtain even the lowest paid positions, such as a fast food employee, women must submit more resumes, respond to more job advertisements, and attend more interviews than men. In addition, prospective women employees that are mothers face an additional barrier to procuring and maintaining employment: the motherhood penalty. According to Correll, Benard, and Paik (2007), working mothers are punished by the corporate system via a 5% wage penalty per child based on the perceived incompatibility between the roles of “mother” versus “employee,” which results in decreased
employment opportunities, negative performance evaluations, and a lack of career advancement. For example, in 2011, the EEOC filed 5,797 complaints of pregnancy discrimination in the workplace, suggesting that the reproductive capabilities of women continue to be viewed as a liability despite protective legislation, such as the Pregnancy Discrimination Act (i.e., a federal statute that amended Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to prohibit discrimination on the basis of pregnancy), and workplace initiatives (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, n.d., “Pregnancy Discrimination Charges,” Table 1).

According to Lyness and Thompson (2000), the “lack of fit” associated with motherhood and employment includes not only mothers, but also potential mothers; therefore, the perception of incompatibility extends beyond motherhood to encompass womanhood, or femininity. The structure of the American corporate system was designed by male business leaders based on the attributes, capabilities, and role responsibilities of an ideal male employee, prompting the implementation of a rigid work schedule, an eight hour work shift, and a valuation of qualities associated with masculinity, such as agency, independence, and authority (Lyness & Heilman, 2006). A woman, automatically associated with feminine characteristics, such as empathy, communality, and nurturance, as well as potential motherhood, is perceived as lacking the capability and desire to succeed in an employment setting (Lyness & Heilman, 2006).

Even when women attempt to individually destroy the invisible wall that forcibly separates the roles of “woman/and or mother” and “employee” by demonstrating masculine attributes, such as agency, in the workplace, an organizational backlash ensues, shifting the perception of a masculine woman as warm and incompetent to cold and competent (Phelan, Moss-Racusin, & Rudman, 2008; Rudman & Glick, 2001). Although competency allows a small measure of occupational success, the characterization of a masculine woman as “cold” results in
negative social and economic consequences, or backlash effects, that impact advancement opportunity, such as poor performance evaluations, reduced organizational rewards (e.g., promotion), and social isolation (Heilman, Wallen, Fuchs, & Tamkins, 2004; Phelan et al., 2008). In contrast, men are allowed to display both feminine and masculine characteristics in the workplace without any associated repercussions.

_The Leadership Labyrinth._

“I don’t think a woman should be in any government job whatsoever…mainly because they are erratic. And emotional,” declared former President Richard Nixon in a 1971 debate regarding the appointment of women to the Supreme Court. According to Eagly and Carli (2007), the term “glass ceiling,” a reference to the invisible barrier that prevents women from career advancement, inappropriately describes the preferential practice of promoting men over women in response to the relatively recent increase in the opportunity and capacity for women, such as Mary Barra (i.e., CEO of General Motors), to obtain executive positions. According to Lyness and Thompson (2000), tokenism theory asserts that the trend of promoting a select few women to executive positions, especially in public corporations that receive high levels of publicity (e.g., General Motors), creates the appearance of gender egalitarianism in the labor market, thereby effectively deflecting accusations of gender discrimination. However, Eagly and Carli (2007) proposed that, despite the manipulation of tokenism, the invisible barriers that impede the progress of women in a career should be referred to as a “gender labyrinth,” implying that the goal of career advancement, while difficult, is attainable.

**Career versus Family Conflict**

The popularization of the “supermom” in media, such as Anne Juergens from _The Secret Life of the American Teenager_, portray a seamless balance between working eight hours in a full-
time career and coming home to cook, clean, and care for children, typically without help from a husband. The image of women “doing it all” is especially prevalent today due to a variety of economic and societal pressures that have necessitated women’s participation in the workforce, such as inflation, resulting in many families (41.5%) relying on both men and women as “breadwinners” (Vespa, Lewis, & Kreider, 2013). Although women have been a mainstay of the U.S. workforce since the 1940s, women’s traditional role as “homemaker” has not been eradicated, as indicated by the typical division of family-related tasks, in which women continue to perform the majority of household and childcare responsibilities (Lothaller, Mikula, & Schoebi, 2009). Why? Is it simply because women are more proficient than men at sweeping floors, changing dirty diapers, and scrubbing dishes? According to Lothaller et al. (2009), traditional definitions of masculinity and femininity are to blame for the continued imbalance of family-related tasks despite mutual involvement in the labor market. The motivation to display “proper” masculine or feminine gender roles, such as a male “breadwinner” and a female “homemaker,” increase, rather than decrease, upon deviation, such as a female “breadwinner” in a sole- or dual-earner household. For example, full- and part-time women employees typically cling to the traditionally feminine role of “homemaker” by voluntarily performing a “double-shift,” characterized by household and childcare responsibilities, as a form of overcompensation for “inappropriately” displaying masculinity in the workplace, and men who allow this deviation of gender roles, such as in a dual-earner household, will avoid the performance of “women’s work” for the same purpose (Lothaller et al., 2009). Specifically, Lothaller et al. (2009) reported that stronger adherence to traditional gender norms results in a more imbalanced division of family-related tasks due to the need to maintain a semblance of the traditional “breadwinner-homemaker family model” as it relates to the conception of masculinity and femininity (p. 144).
According to Greenhaus and Beutell (1985), the consistent upsurge of women in the workforce since the 1940s has had the detrimental impact of increasing women’s perceptions of work-family conflict, or “a form of interrole conflict in which role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible….participation in the work (family) role is made more difficult by virtue of participation in the family (work) role” (p. 77). Traditional gender norms dictate that feminine characteristics (e.g., compassion) correspond to the role of “homemaker,” characterized by the performance of family-related tasks within the household, and masculine characteristics (e.g., independence) correspond to the role of “breadwinner,” characterized by the performance of paid and unpaid labor outside the household. Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) stated that role pressures (i.e., work-family conflict) increase in tandem with the salience of work and family roles to the self-concept, as well as the strength of negative sanctions that result from deviations of role demands. Traditional gender norms serve to place men and women into fixed, rigid boxes that designate how an individual should behave in every aspect of life, such as selecting an undergraduate major, by utilizing positive (e.g. compliments) and negative (e.g. derogatory statements) sanctions (Duxbury & Higgins, 1991). The violation of traditional gender norms by women who participate in the workforce (i.e., women “breadwinners”) is accompanied by a host of internal and external negative sanctions that constantly push for fulfillment of a more traditionally feminine role, resulting in conflict when that cannot be accomplished.

According to Greenhaus and Beutell (1985), the juggling act of balancing work and family demands generates work-family conflict for both men and women due to a variety of factors that exacerbate the experience of stress, such as the amount of hours worked per week and an inflexible work schedule. However, men’s and women’s perceptions of work-family
conflict, while a relatively shared experience, differ in magnitude and strength based on their level of adherence to traditional gender norms. Weak adherence implies a more egalitarian household characterized by men and women sharing the responsibilities associated with “breadwinner” and “homemaker” roles, effectively reducing men’s and women’s perceptions of work-family conflict (Lothaller et al., 2009). In contrast, strong adherence to traditional gender norms implies an imbalanced family model typified by women performing the majority of childcare and household responsibilities even when employed part- or full-time, which significantly increases women’s perception of work-family conflict while reducing men’s due to the maintenance of gender roles despite deviation.

Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) stated that women commonly experience role overload in response to balancing demands associated with full- or part-time employment in the workforce and full-time household and childcare responsibilities in the home, also referred to as a “double shift” (p. 79). For example, Greenberg and Avigdor (2009) reported that full- and part-time women employees work approximately 92 hours per week, which includes hours spent in the workplace and performing household and childcare duties. In addition to role overload and stress, women’s perception of work-family conflict is further strengthened by an overwhelming sense of guilt for “choosing” to spend valuable time and energy on a career rather than the family (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Specifically, women’s strong adherence to traditional gender norms, combined with full- or part-time employment, precipitates the experience of guilt for shirking “her duty” as a woman and failing to perform the fundamental role of wife and mother.

According to Hodges and Park (2013), an additional strain that functions in a manner that increases women’s perception of work-family conflict is shifting oppositional identities (i.e., work versus family identity). Hodges and Park (2013) stated that women respond to the work-
family conflict by constantly shifting between oppositional, or work versus family, identities based on the identity that best corresponds to the situation; however, the constant shift between identities depletes cognitive resources, resulting in stress, mental exhaustion, and anxiety. In contrast, men experience significantly less opposition between work and family identities due to congruence in characteristics expected from both fathers and professionals, such as independence, self-reliance, and strength.

**Primed of Traditional Gender Norms**

At the beginning of the day, a woman may think of herself as strong, determined, and ready to take on the world; however, after eight hours sitting in an office surrounded by bossy managers and coming home to cook a hot meal for the family, throw in a load of laundry, and bathe the children, she may begin to think of herself as no more than a slave with little opportunity to advance. According to Dasgupta and Asgari (2004), gender socialization encourages the development of a gender identity beginning at the age of two years, resulting in the integration of gender consistent and gender inconsistent information to match one’s internal identity with external behavior. The importance of masculine and feminine categorization in the development of a gender identity encourages automaticity in gender attitudes and beliefs due to preconceived cognitive associations of gender concepts. Automaticity of attitudes and beliefs maximize cognitive resources due to minimal time and effort necessary to process stimuli. Unfortunately, gender beliefs and attitudes become further entrenched in the formation of cognitive processes and behavioral performance with age, resulting in an inability to reject or override automatic gender stereotypes (Rudman & Phelan, 2010). In fact, within milliseconds of exposure to stimuli, such as facial characteristics (e.g., chin, nose, and forehead), clothing (e.g.,
style, pattern, and color), or hair (e.g., texture, hair length, and hair style), individuals are capable of correctly classifying the gender category to which the stimuli belong (Li, Lian & Lu, 2012).

However, gender stereotypes, while automatic, are not “set in stone” despite years of “brainwashing.” Instead, gender stereotypes are subject to modification based on the social context, often without the knowledge of the individual. According to Dasgupta and Asgari (2004), gender stereotypes are constructed and maintained via observation of feminine roles that women occupy, such as mother, and masculine roles that men occupy, such as CEO; however, exposure to men and women that engage in atypical, or gender inconsistent, roles in society can produce a substantial change in previously held stereotypes. For example, research conducted by Blair, Ma, and Lenton (2001) found that women who were asked to imagine Amazonian women, characterized by power, aggression, and competency in masculine activities (e.g., hunting and warfare), were less likely to automatically associate men with strength and women with weakness, as compared to women who were asked to imagine a Caribbean vacation, including the locale and types of available activities (Blair, Ma & Lenton, 2001).

Priming, such as the manipulation of imagination described above, refers to an unconscious or implicit memory effect, in which previous exposure to a stimulus influences subsequent responses to stimuli presented later (Tulving, Schacter, & Stark, 1982). For example, in a groundbreaking study that examined priming effects on implicit memory, Tulving et al. (1982) asked participants to study a list of 96 words and complete a word-fragment completion test, varying the type of cues in the word-fragment completion test to include minimal or substantial overlap. A retesting period of the word-fragment completion test following a period of one hour or seven days suggested that substantial overlap of cues resulted in a strong, positive
correlation between the level of performance on both word-fragment completion tests, and minimal overlap resulted in no correlation.

In addition to the priming of simple learning processes, contemporary priming research has demonstrated that the malleability of automatic gender stereotypes allows priming the ability to unconsciously influence perceptions of gender. For example, Dasgupta and Asgari (2004) found that priming women with famous female leaders (e.g., Sandra Day O’Connor) reduced women’s automatic association of men with leadership roles and women with supportive roles due to an increased activation of counterstereotypic gender beliefs. Specifically, exposure to counterstereotypic women role models (e.g., Meg Whitman, former CEO of e-Bay) who have succeeded in a “man’s world” by occupying economic, political, social, and religious leadership positions increased women’s perception of the attainability of academic and career success and decreased women’s automatic gender stereotypes. In addition, Rudman and Phelan (2010) found that priming women with traditional (e.g., male surgeon and female nurse) versus nontraditional gender roles (e.g., female surgeon and male nurse) increased the automatic association of men with power and women with warmth, reducing women’s interest in masculine occupations. According to Rudman and Phelan (2010), exposure to traditional gender roles, such as a “breadwinner-homemaker” family system, directly increases the salience of automatic gender stereotypes; therefore, career aspirations, as an extension of gender roles, can be unconsciously molded by traditional gender roles via gender socialization processes or a priming procedure. When a child is asked by an adult, “What do you want to be when you grow up?,” the typical answer of a “doctor,” “veterinarian,” or “astronaut” should really be “whatever you tell me to be” because a gender-inconsistent response, such as a male child responding to the question with “ballerina,” will gradually be stamped out to conform to the wishes of both the parents and the
overall society. However, the malleability of automatic gender stereotypes also provides the opportunity to overcome traditional gender beliefs and develop counterstereotypic gender beliefs if exposed to men and women who bend the rules of gender, allowing true freedom in the selection of a lifelong career.

**Hypotheses**

The purpose of this research was to examine men’s and women’s perceptions of personal career barriers that could impede progress in the development of a career or career goals. To understand if personal career barriers uniquely present to men and women based on the assumption of traditional gender roles, a priming procedure was designed in an attempt to increase the salience of traditional gender norms associated with masculinity and femininity. The hypotheses for the current research were as follows: (1) priming from masculine-gendered words would result in men and women reporting higher levels of masculinity than priming from gender-neutral or feminine words; (2) priming from feminine-gendered words would result in men and women reporting higher levels of femininity than priming from gender-neutral or masculine words; (3) priming from masculine-gendered words would result in men and women reporting lower levels of personal career barriers than priming from gender-neutral or feminine words; (4) priming from feminine-gendered words would result in men and women reporting higher levels of personal career barriers than priming from gender-neutral or masculine words; (5) men would report higher levels of masculinity than would women, and women would report higher levels of femininity than would men; (6) women would report higher levels of career barriers than would men; (7) higher levels of femininity would be associated with higher levels of personal career barriers for both men and women; and (8) higher levels of masculinity would be associated with lower levels of personal career barriers for both men and women.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

Participants

An initial power analysis was computed via G*Power software to estimate the necessary sample size for the current study (Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner, & Lang, 2009; Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007). The power analysis estimated that a minimum of 128 total participants, including a minimum of 60 males and 60 females, was necessary to obtain adequate power (.80) to determine a medium effect size. Based on the power analysis estimation, 138 graduate and undergraduate students were recruited from the University of Central Missouri via SONA, an online registration system, and a voluntary participation signup sheet. Data from nine participants, seven males and two females, were eliminated from the data pool due to a nonnative English language status. The exclusion of data from nonnative English speakers was based on the acknowledgement that a language barrier could prevent comprehension of the materials presented in the experiment and detrimentally impact any data collected.

The resultant data pool consisted of data from 129 participants. Sixty-seven of the participants identified as male (51.9%) and 62 identified as female (48.1%). The participants ranged in age from 18 to 26 years ($M = 19.77$, $SD = 1.59$). One hundred and three of the participants identified as Caucasian (79.8%); 16 as Black or African American (12.4%); one as Asian or Pacific Islander (0.8%); three as Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish (2.3%); and six as multiracial (4.7%). Sixty-one of the participants were freshmen (47.3%), 43 were sophomores (33.3%), 14 were juniors (10.9%), 10 were seniors (7.8%), and 1 was a first-year graduate student (0.8%). In addition, 128 of the participants were single, never married (99.2%) and one was married (0.8%). Participants were compensated by course credit in fulfillment of a course requirement.
Twenty additional participants were recruited via SONA to participate in a pilot study related to the construction and development of the three priming instruments utilized in the current study. Specifically, these participants provided pilot rating values of masculine, feminine, and gender-neutral words. Three pilot participants identified as male and 17 identified as female. The pilot participants ranged in age from 18 to 32 years ($M = 20.6$, $SD = 3.22$).

**Materials**

**Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI)**

Participants completed the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI), originally designed by S.L. Bem (see Appendix A for the BSRI) (Bem, 1974). Preliminary construction of the BSRI included evaluation of 200 personality characteristics, 100 feminine and 100 masculine, for inclusion in the Masculinity scale and the Femininity scale, respectively. Inclusion of words into each scale was determined by data collected from two pilot studies, in which a total of 100 Stanford undergraduates rated each of the words as more desirable for a man or woman on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (*Not at all desirable*) to 7 (*Extremely desirable*) (Bem, 1974, p. 157). Twenty personality characteristics that were rated as significantly more desirable for men than women ($p < .05$), such as “aggressive,” “ambitious,” and “self-reliant,” were chosen to comprise the Masculinity scale (Bem, 1974, p. 156). Twenty personality characteristics that were deemed significantly more desirable for women than men ($p < .05$), such as “childlike,” “affectionate,” and “gentle,” were included in the Femininity scale (Bem, 1974, p. 156) (see Appendix B for items in the Masculinity and Femininity scales).

The BSRI consists of 60 items (20 masculine, 20 feminine, and 20 neutral personality characteristics) that are rated on a 7-point Likert scale indicating how descriptive the item is of one’s personality, ranging from 1 (*Never or almost never true*) to 7 (*Always or almost always true*).
true) (Bem, 1974, p. 158). Each participant receives a Masculinity score, a Femininity score, and an Androgyny score. Masculinity, the endorsement of masculine attributes and the rejection of feminine attributes, is found by calculating the mean of the twenty masculine items. Femininity, the endorsement of feminine attributes and rejection of masculine attributes, is found by calculating the mean of the twenty feminine items. The calculated means of the Femininity and Masculinity scores can range from 1 to 7. High scores on the Femininity scale indicates high feminine sex-typing, and high scores on the Masculinity scale indicates high masculine sex-typing. Conversely, low scores on the Femininity scale indicates low feminine sex-typing, and low scores on the Masculinity scale indicates low masculine sex-typing. Androgyny, or the equal endorsement of feminine and masculine attributes, is calculated by conducting a t-test to find the difference between Masculinity and Femininity scores. According to Bem (1974), a significant t-ratio of difference is indicative of a sex-typed individual, in which a positive score \((t \geq 2.025)\) relates to femininity and a negative score \((t \leq -2.025)\) relates to masculinity. In contrast, a nonsignificant t-ratio of difference suggests that the individual is androgynous; however, Bem (1974) noted that the closer the t-ratio of difference is to zero, the more androgynous the individual \((-1 \leq t \leq 1)\).

Internal consistency estimates of the BSRI have yielded Cronbach’s alpha coefficients demonstrating high reliability of the Masculinity scale (\(\alpha = .86, \alpha = .86\)), the Femininity scale (\(\alpha = .80, \alpha = .82\)), and the Androgyny scale (\(\alpha = .85, \alpha = .86\)) across two samples (Stanford University and Foothill Junior College) (Bem, 1974). Test-retest reliability over a period of four weeks revealed high reliability for the Masculinity scale \((r = .90)\), Femininity scale \((r = .90)\), and Androgyny scale \((r = .93)\) (Bem, 1974). In addition, validity of the Masculinity and Femininity scales as independent, rather than complementary, constructs was supported. Specifically, Bem
(1974) found weak, insignificant correlations between scores on the Masculinity and Femininity scales in both the Stanford (male \( r = .11 \), female \( r = - .14 \)) and Foothill (male \( r = - .02 \), female \( r = - .07 \)) samples.

In addition to its acceptable reliability and validity, the BSRI was chosen for the present study based on the conceptualization of masculinity and femininity as independent, rather than mutually exclusive, categories. The BSRI allows classification as masculine, feminine, and androgynous based on self-identification with personality characteristics considered socially desirable for men and women (Bem, 1974). Specifically, the BSRI calculates the extent to which cultural definitions of masculinity and femininity have become incorporated into the description of the self (Bem, 1974). The classification of masculinity and femininity in terms of socially desirable expressions that correspond to sex (i.e., maleness or femaleness) matches the discussion of traditional gender norms as investigated in the current study. The BSRI yields scores from the Masculinity and Femininity scales that range from low to high, which was necessary in discriminating between weak and strong adherence to traditional gender norms. In the present study, the strength of participants’ subscription to traditional gender norms was operationalized by the endorsement of sex-typed masculine and feminine personality characteristics as measured by scores on the BSRI scales (Bem, 1974).

The prevailing criticism directed toward the continued use of the BSRI claims that the measure may no longer be applicable to today’s society due to changes in cultural definitions of socially desirable representations of masculinity and femininity, or gender roles, in the past forty years (Holt & Ellis, 1998). Despite criticisms addressing the dynamic nature of gender, a recent assessment of the validity of the masculine-feminine constructs underlying the BSRI revealed continued applicability (Holt & Ellis, 1998). Specifically, 20 items from the Masculine scale
were rated as significantly more socially desirable for men than women, \( p < .001 \), and 18 of the 20 items from the Feminine scale were rated as significantly more socially desirable for women than men, \( p < .001 \). The remaining two items from the Feminine scale, “loyal” and “childlike,” were only marginally more socially desirable for women than men, \( p = .09 \) and \( p = .08 \), respectively. The same study also yielded high internal consistency reliabilities for the Masculinity scale (\( \alpha = .95 \)) and the Femininity scale (\( \alpha = .92 \)) (Holt & Ellis, 1998). In addition, in a recent U.S. sample, internal consistency estimates were high for measures of masculinity (\( \alpha = .87 \)) and femininity (\( \alpha = .85 \)) (Zhang, Norvilitis & Jin, 2001). Although the internal consistency alphas were not as high in a Chinese sample (masculinity \( \alpha = .81 \), femininity \( \alpha = .68 \)), the reliability estimates based on both samples are acceptable and comparable to the original reliability estimates published by Bem (1974) (Zhang et al., 2001). In summary, based on contemporary evaluations of the validity and reliability of the BSRI, the BSRI appears to remain applicable in determining the social desirability of current gender roles despite its construction in the 1970s.

**Carrier Barriers Inventory-Revised**

Participants completed the Career Barriers Inventory-Revised (CBI-R), originally designed by Swanson et al. (1996) (see Appendix C for CBI-R). The Career Barriers Inventory (CBI) was a first attempt by Swanson and Tokar (1991) to create a standardized measure of external and internal barriers that “might occur across a range of career-related events,” such as selecting a career (Swanson et al., 1996, p. 222). Preliminary construction of the CBI included the evaluation of 112 items, initially derived from previous literature examining perceptions of personally relevant career-related barriers. To determine the applicability of each of the 112 items, participants in the development, or pilot, sample (313 female and 245 male college
students) rated each item on a scale from 1 \((\text{Would not hinder at all})\) to 7 \((\text{Would completely hinder})\), indicating the potential impact of each presented barrier on a career or career goal, such as “Not being able to find a job after graduation” (Swanson et al., 1996, p. 222). Evaluation of the 112 items using principal-component analyses defined 18 factors that could be represented as separate types of barrier scales (Swanson et al., 1996). Internal consistency reliability estimates demonstrated high reliability for each of the 18 scales (median \(\alpha = .81\)).

Despite the contribution of a standardized measure of perceptions of personal career barriers, Swanson et al. (1996) acknowledged several shortcomings of the CBI, including its length and content. According to Swanson et al. (1996), the inclusion of 112 items diminished the practicality of the instrument, necessitating construction of a shorter form. In addition, Swanson et al. (1996) claimed that the content of the CBI required revisions, such as rewriting specific items to enhance clarity, deleting items due to content overlap, and reallocating items to more appropriate scales.

The first phase of the CBI revisions included the development of a shortened version of the instrument, the Career Barriers Inventory-Short (CBI-S). The primary revision involved the deletion of 28 items, reducing 112 items to 84 and 18 scales to 16 (Swanson et al., 1996). Factor analyses were conducted to analyze the structure of the CBI-S, revealing that a 16-scale instrument was appropriate in measuring the perception of personal career barriers. In addition, a sample of 222 college students (79 males and 143 females) was administered the CBI-S to provide preliminary support for the revisions. Secondary support was obtained through data collected from two additional samples (one sample of 177 college students consisting of 76 males and 101 females, and a second sample of 279 college females) who were administered the original CBI. According to Swanson et al. (1996), the data analyses yielded from the three
samples did not reduce the reliability estimates from the original CBI and, therefore, did not contradict the revisions.

The second phase of CBI revisions included a more extensive evaluation of the structure and definition of the scales, such as the incorporation of 12 new items to expand coverage of personally relevant career barriers (e.g., racial discrimination) (Swanson et al., 1996). The current version of the CBI, the Career Barriers Inventory-Revised (CBI-R), consists of 70 items represented in 13 scales (Swanson et al., 1996). CBI-R items are rated on a 7-point Likert scale indicating the extent to which each item would hinder, or negatively impact, progress in a career or career goals, ranging from 1 (Would not hinder at all) to 7 (Would hinder completely). The total score is derived by adding the points across all items, with possible scores ranging from 70 to 490. Similarly, subscale scores are calculated by adding the points across items within each subscale, with possible subscale scores ranging from 3 to 56 (Swanson et al., 1996). Higher scores for both the total and subscale scores indicate higher perceptions of personal career barriers and lower scores indicate lower perceptions of personal career barriers.

The Sex Discrimination subscale (α = .84) includes 7 items, such as “Experiencing sex discrimination in hiring for a job” (Swanson et al., 1996, p. 225). The Lack of Confidence subscale (α = .85) includes 4 items that relate to confidence and self-esteem, such as “Not feeling confident about my ability on the job” (Swanson et al., 1996, p. 225). The Multiple-Role Conflict subscale (α = .85) includes 8 items that relate to general conflicts between role demands, such as “Stress at work affecting my life at home” (Swanson et al., 1996, p. 225). The Conflict between Children and Career Demands subscale (α = .85) includes 7 items that specifically relate to conflict between the responsibilities associated with childcare and career maintenance, such as “Feeling guilty about working when my children are young” (Swanson et al., 1996, p. 226). The
Racial Discrimination subscale ($\alpha = .85$) includes 6 items, such as “Experiencing racial harassment on the job” (Swanson et al., 1996, p. 227). The Inadequate Preparation subscale ($\alpha = .85$) includes 5 items that relate to internal perceptions of preparedness for the demands of the job market, such as “Lacking the required skills for my job” (Swanson et al., 1996, p. 227). The Disapproval by Significant Others subscale ($\alpha = .64$) includes 3 items that focus on personal sources of disapproval, such as “My parents/family don’t approve of my choice of job/career” (Swanson et al., 1996, p. 227). The Decision-Making Difficulties subscale ($\alpha = .83$) includes 8 items, such as “Not being sure how to choose a career direction” (Swanson et al., 1996, p. 227). The Dissatisfaction with Career subscale ($\alpha = .79$) includes 5 items, such as “Being dissatisfied from pursuing fields which are nontraditional” (Swanson et al., 1996, p. 227). The Discouraged from Choosing Nontraditional Careers subscale ($\alpha = .75$) includes 5 items, such as “Being discouraged from pursuing fields which are nontraditional for my sex” (Swanson et al., 1996, p. 227). The Disability/Health Concerns subscale ($\alpha = .76$) includes 3 items, such as “Having a disability which limits my choice of careers” (Swanson et al., 1996, p. 227). The Job Market Constraints subscale ($\alpha = .68$) includes 4 items that specifically address external barriers related to a “tight job market,” such as “No demand for my area of training” (Swanson et al., 1996, p. 227). Finally, the Difficulties with Networking/Socialization subscale ($\alpha = .64$) includes 5 items, such as “Unsure of how to advance in my career” (Swanson et al., 1996, p. 227).

Internal consistency estimates of the CBI yielded Cronbach’s alpha coefficients indicating high reliability of longer subscales ($\alpha \geq .90$) and low reliability of shorter subscales ($\alpha \leq .60$) (Swanson, et al., 1996). However, subsequent revisions of the instrument produced higher internal consistency estimates of the CBI-R, ranging from a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .64 to .85 (median $\alpha = .77$). Although the internal consistency estimates are above an acceptable
standard for most of the CBI-R subscales, some are considerably lower than the corresponding subscale in the CBI, such as the Disapproval by Significant Others decreasing from a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .76 in the CBI to .64 in the CBI-R, despite a lack of revision (Swanson et al., 1996). Swanson et al. (1996) explained the decrease in alpha coefficients as a consequence of reorganizing the items in a random, as opposed to a scale (CBI), order in the construction of the CBI-R. Intercorrelations among the CBI subscales ranged from .27 to .80 (median $r = .60$).

According to Swanson et al. (1996), high correlations were found between the CBI and CBI-R scales upon analysis of seven data sets, representing approximately 1,700 college students. Based on the high correlations between the CBI and CBI-R, Swanson et al. (1996) noted that previous data sets from the original construction of the CBI could be used to further assess the construct of perceived career barriers. In addition, data analyses suggested that participants differentiated between the types of personal career barriers, such as racial discrimination versus disability impairment, represented across each CBI-R subscale. The variation of scores within and across the CBI-R validates the measurement of the CBI-R subscales as both independent (i.e., subscale score) and dependent (i.e., total score).

The construct validity of the CBI-R was determined by examining demographic data of a combined data set (60% female and 40% male) (Swanson et al., 1996). According to Swanson et al. (1996), female participants consistently scored higher on 7 of the 13 CBI-R subscales as compared to men, indicating an increased perception of personal career barriers. Specifically, females scored higher on “Sex Discrimination, Lack of Confidence, Multiple-Role Conflict, Conflict between Children and Career Demands, Inadequate Preparation, Decision-Making Difficulties, and Dissatisfaction with Career” (Swanson et al., 1996, p. 234). Swanson et al. (1996) noted that the results supported preliminary speculations and previous research (e.g.,
Luzzo, 1995) by indicating a gender discrepancy in the perception of personal career barriers, in which women perceived higher levels of personally relevant career barriers than men, especially in relation to familial responsibility (e.g., childcare) (p. 234). In addition to gender differences, significant racial differences were found on 8 of the 13 CBI-R subscales. Racial/ethnic minorities scored higher than Caucasians on the Racial Discrimination subscale; however, Caucasians scored higher than racial/ethnic minorities on “Lack of Confidence, Multiple-Role Conflict, Inadequate Preparation, Disapproval by Significant Others, Dissatisfaction with Career, Discouraged from Choosing Nontraditional Careers, and Disability/Health Concerns” (Swanson et al., 1996, p. 234).

The CBI-R was chosen for the present study based on the conceptualization of a career barrier as an internal or external barrier that hinders progress in a career or career goals for both men and women. For the current study, it was important that the CBI-R was capable of measuring career barriers as perceived by men and women, rather than only men or women, in order to examine gender in relation to the perception of personal career barriers. For example, Swanson et al. (1996) noted that the data set from initial validation samples indicated that women perceived higher levels of personal career barriers than did men. In addition, the incorporation of 13 subscales in the CBI-R permits examination of the impact of specific career barriers, such as gender discrimination, which may vary based on gender identification (Swanson et al., 1996). The CBI-R yields scores from each subscale that range from low to high, which is necessary in discriminating between high and low perceptions of personal career barriers. The strength of perceptions was operationalized by participants’ level of acknowledgement that career barriers presented in the CBI-R strongly or weakly impacted their career or career goals, as indicated by their scores on the CBI-R subscales (Swanson et al., 1996). Although Swanson et
al. (1996) noted that several CBI subscales yielded higher internal consistency estimates than corresponding subscales in the CBI-R, for the current study the CBI-R was selected as a more appropriate measure given the empirically and theoretically based revisions that occurred between the two versions and the strong internal characteristics, such as the internal consistency estimates, of the CBI-R (Swanson et al., 1996).

**Masculine, Feminine, and Gender-Neutral Word List for Priming Task**

A pilot study was conducted to develop three word lists, a masculine, feminine, and gender-neutral word list comprised of 15 words each, to be utilized during a word scramble priming task. To determine the masculine, feminine, and gender-neutral words for inclusion in the word scramble priming task, the researcher designed the Masculine, Feminine, and Gender-Neutral Word List (see Appendix D for the Masculine, Feminine, and Gender-Neutral Word List). Due to a lack of encompassing word lists in previous research, the researcher selected 20 masculine words and 20 feminine words based on personality characteristics, physical features, occupational types, individual preferences, and activities that are commonly associated with either masculinity or femininity. For example, the words “football,” “assertive,” and “strong” were selected for inclusion in the pilot study’s word list as descriptive of masculinity, and the words “ballet,” “emotional,” and “nurture” were selected as descriptive of femininity. In addition, the researcher selected 40 words that are typically considered gender-neutral, or words that are not commonly associated with either masculinity or femininity. For example, the words “rain,” “chair,” and “folder” were selected as descriptive of gender-neutrality.

The researcher also determined word inclusion based on word length. Each masculine, feminine, and gender-neutral word was matched according to the number of composite letters in each word. For example, a four letter feminine word, such as “pink,” was matched with a
corresponding four letter masculine (e.g., “blue”) and gender-neutral word (e.g., “star”). The matching of word length was included to ensure compatibility of word types (i.e., masculine, feminine, and gender-neutral) for the pilot study, as well as for the word scramble priming task.

For the pilot study, a blank next to each word was provided for participants to mark “M” for a masculine word, “F” for a feminine word, and an “N” for a gender-neutral word. Word categorization of pilot participants was analyzed to determine the frequency with which each word was selected as feminine, masculine, or gender-neutral. The 20 masculine words presented in the pilot study were reduced to 15 based on categorization as masculine by at least 65% of the pilot participants. Likewise, the 20 feminine words initially designated as feminine were reduced to 15 based on categorization as feminine by at least 75% of the pilot participants. In addition, the 40 gender-neutral words were reduced to 15 based on categorization as gender-neutral by at least 95% of the pilot participants.

**Word Scramble Test**

Based on the results of the pilot study, three word lists were developed as word scramble priming tasks. Word Scramble #1 consisted of 15 items, each of which could be unscrambled to form one correct response (see Appendix E for Word Scramble #1). The items presented in Word Scramble #1 included the 15 feminine-gendered words derived from the initial pilot study, such as “skirt,” “nurture,” and “pink.” Word Scramble #2 contained 15 items, which could be unscrambled to form 15 masculine-gendered words, such as “football,” “macho,” and “strong” (see Appendix F for Word Scramble #2). Word Scramble #3 was comprised of 15 items that could be unscrambled to form 15 gender-neutral words, such as “glass,” “celery,” and “bulletin” (see Appendix G for Word Scramble #3). In addition to 15 scrambled items, each word scramble task included a word bank consisting of 30 unscrambled words, 15 correct unscrambled words
and 15 incorrect unscrambled words (see Appendix H for the complete list of items in Word Scrambles #1-3). Word Scramble #1 primed participants with common stereotypes associated with traditional representations of femininity. Word Scramble #2 primed participants with stereotypes typically associated with traditional representations of masculinity. Word Scramble #3 served as a control by containing only gender-neutral words and did not prime participants with traditional representations of either masculinity or femininity.

**Demographic Questionnaire**

Demographic information regarding the sample was collected via a brief demographic questionnaire (see Appendix I for demographic questionnaire). The demographic questionnaire consisted of six questions. The first question asked participants to select an identified gender from three options: male, female, or other. Although “male” and “female” are acknowledged as descriptive of sex, rather than gender, the terms were selected as applicable in the current study based on common usage. The second question asked participants to record their age in years. The third question asked participants to record their first, or native, language. The fourth question asked participants to select their racial/ethnic identity from a list of multiple racial/ethnic categories, such as American Indian or Alaskan Native. A blank space was provided for participants to record a racial/ethnic identity not otherwise listed. In addition, participants were allowed to select multiple responses based on the presence of a growing multiracial (two or more racial/ethnic backgrounds) population in the U.S (Saulny, 2011). The fifth question asked participants to select their year in school from six options, ranging from undergraduate freshman to second-year graduate student. The sixth question asked participants to select their current marital status from four options: single, never married, married, divorced, or widowed.
Procedure

Small groups composed of one to eight participants were escorted into a conference room located on the University of Central Missouri (UCM) campus. The participants were provided two copies of the informed consent document, which detailed the rights of the participant, including the right to discontinue the experiment at any time without penalty, the right to anonymity, and the right to an explanation of the potential risks and benefits of participation (see Appendix J for consent form document). The participants were asked to sign and date both copies of the consent form, indicating consent to participate under the conditions specified. Participants were provided one of the consent documents to retain for their personal records. After returning the other consent form to the researcher, participants were randomly assigned to one of two priming conditions (i.e., masculine or feminine) or the control condition (i.e., gender-neutral).

Participants in the masculine priming condition completed a word scramble containing 15 masculine-gendered words, such as “macho,” “suit,” and “strong.” The masculine-gendered words were used to prime participants with common stereotypes associated with traditional representations of masculinity. Participants in the feminine priming condition completed a word scramble consisting of 15 feminine-gendered words, such as “dress,” “pretty,” and “compassion.” The 15 feminine-gendered words presented in the feminine priming condition were designed to prime participants with stereotypes typically associated with traditional representations of femininity. Participants were informed that the word scramble was a “standardized test of cognitive adaptability” to prevent participants from discerning the aim of the current study. The participants were provided 15 minutes to complete the word scramble task.
Following the word scramble task, the BSRI and CBI-R were presented to participants in a
counterbalanced order (Bem; 1974; Swanson et al., 1996). Approximately half of the participants
received the BSRI before the CBI-R, and half received the CBI-R before the BSRI (Bem, 1974;
Swanson et al., 1996).

The BSRI was explained to participants as a method of assessing for the presence or
absence of a variety of personality characteristics (Bem, 1974). When presented with the CBI-R,
participants were informed that the measure examined work-related concerns (Swanson et al.,
1996). After completion of the surveys, participants were asked to complete a brief demographic
questionnaire. The demographic questionnaire required participants to record an identified
gender (i.e., male, female, or other), age, first (or native) language, racial/ethnic identity, current
year in school, and marital status. After participants had returned all of the materials to the
researcher, participants were debriefed and provided the opportunity to ask questions. Afterward,
participants were thanked and awarded credit for participation.

The control condition followed the same general procedure as the two priming
conditions, except for the content of the word scramble task. The word scramble task in the
control condition contained 15 gender-neutral words. With the exception of the content of the
word scramble task, the remainder of the procedure was identical to that of the priming
conditions. Both the priming and control conditions lasted approximately 50 minutes.

**Pilot Study**

Inclusion of gender-neutral, masculine-gendered, and feminine-gendered words into the
priming and control word scramble tasks were determined by an initial pilot study. Small groups
of one to eight pilot participants were escorted into a conference room located on the UCM
campus. Participants were provided two copies of the informed consent document, which
detailed the rights of the participant, the purpose of the pilot study, and the risks and benefits of participation (see Appendix K for pilot consent form). The participants were asked to sign and date both copies of the consent form, indicating consent to participate under the conditions specified. Participants were provided one of the consent documents to retain for their personal records. After returning the other consent form to the researcher, participants were provided the Masculinity, Femininity, and Gender-Neutral Word List. The Masculinity, Femininity and Gender-Neutral Word List asked participants to categorize 80 words (i.e., 40 gender-neutral, 20 feminine, and 20 masculine) as masculine, feminine, and gender-neutral by marking an “M” for a masculine word, an “F” for a feminine word, and an “N” for a gender-neutral word in the blank space provided next to each item. For purposes of the pilot study, masculine words were defined as words that are traditionally associated with men, feminine words were defined as words that are traditionally associated with women, and gender-neutral words were defined as words that are associated with either men or women (or equally apply to both men and women). Upon completion of the word list, participants were asked to complete a brief demographic questionnaire (see Appendix L for pilot demographic questionnaire). The demographic questionnaire required participants to record their gender (i.e., male, female, or other) and age in years. After returning the completed materials, participants were debriefed, thanked for participation, and granted credit. The pilot study lasted approximately 20 minutes.

**Design**

The current study examined men’s and women’s perception of personal career barriers and level of adherence to traditional gender norms (i.e., masculinity or femininity) (dependent variables) following a priming procedure (independent variable). Gender identification (i.e., male, female, or other) was also included as a quasi-independent variable. Manipulation of a
priming procedure (i.e., control or experimental condition) occurred between subjects. Participants were randomly assigned to one of three conditions: control condition (i.e, gender-neutral priming task) \( n = 43 \), feminine experimental condition (i.e., feminine priming task) \( n = 44 \), or masculine experimental condition (i.e., masculine priming task) \( n = 42 \).
Hypothesis 1

It was hypothesized that priming from masculine-gendered words would result in men and women reporting higher scores on the BSRI Masculinity scale than priming from gender-neutral or feminine words. To test this hypothesis, a 2X3 two-way between subjects ANOVA was computed to compare the means of men’s and women’s Masculinity scores on the BSRI following a masculine, feminine, or gender-neutral priming procedure. The 2X3 ANOVA satisfied the statistical assumptions of interval/ratio data, a large sample size ($N \geq 30$), independent observations, and proportional cell sizes and violated the statistical assumption of homogeneity of variance. For men’s and women’s Masculinity scores, a Levene’s test revealed unequal variances across priming conditions, $p = .01$. However, any potential bias introduced by unequal variance was mitigated by proportional group sizes across priming conditions. The 2X3 two-way between subjects ANOVA showed a non-significant main effect of priming, $F(2, 123) = 0.80$, $p = .453$, partial $\eta^2 = .013$, and a non-significant interaction, $F(2, 123) = 1.89$, $p = .156$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$. A planned contrast that compared the masculine priming condition to the feminine and gender-neutral priming conditions was non-significant, $t(91.71) = 1.14$, $p = .26$.

Figure 1. BSRI Masculinity mean scores by gender and type of priming procedure.
Table 1.

Mean Masculinity Scores Based on Priming Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Feminine Prime</th>
<th>Masculine Prime</th>
<th>Neutral Prime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M(SD)</td>
<td>4.84(.70)</td>
<td>5.06(.72)</td>
<td>4.95(.96)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 2

It was hypothesized that priming from feminine-gendered words would result in men and women reporting higher scores on the BSRI Femininity scale than priming from gender-neutral or masculine words. To test this hypothesis, a 2X3 two-way between subjects ANOVA was computed to compare the means of men’s and women’s Femininity scores on the BSRI following a masculine, feminine, or gender-neutral priming procedure. The statistical assumptions of interval/ratio data, a large sample size ($N \geq 30$), independent observations, proportional cell sizes and homogeneity of variance were met. The 2X3 two-way between subjects ANOVA showed a non-significant main effect of priming, $F(2, 123) = 0.33, p = .723$, partial $\eta^2 = .005$, and a non-significant interaction, $F(2, 123) = 2.57, p = .081$, partial $\eta^2 = .04$. A planned contrast that compared the feminine priming condition to the masculine and gender-neutral priming conditions was non-significant, $t(126) = 1.03, p = .29$.

Figure 2. BSRI Femininity mean scores by gender and type of priming procedure.
Table 2.

Mean Femininity Scores Based on Priming Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Feminine Prime</th>
<th>Masculine Prime</th>
<th>Neutral Prime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M(SD)</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Femininity Mean</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.77(.83)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypotheses 3-4

It was hypothesized that priming from masculine-gendered words would result in men and women reporting lower levels of personal career barriers on the CBI-R than priming from gender-neutral or feminine-gendered words. In addition, it was hypothesized that priming from feminine-gendered words would result in men and women reporting higher levels of personal career barriers on the CBI-R than priming from gender-neutral or masculine-gendered words. To test these hypotheses, a 2X3 two-way between subjects ANOVA was computed to compare the means of men’s and women’s total CBI-R scores following a masculine, feminine, or gender-neutral priming procedure. The statistical assumptions of interval/ratio data, a large sample size ($N \geq 30$), independent observations, proportional cell sizes and homogeneity of variance were met. The 2X3 two-way between subjects ANOVA showed a significant main effect of priming, $F(2, 123) = 3.47$, $p = .034$, partial $\eta^2 = .53$, and a non-significant interaction, $F(2, 123) = 0.30$, $p = .74$, partial $\eta^2 = .005$. As demonstrated in Table 3, men and women in the feminine condition reported the highest total CBI-R scores ($M = 297.56$, $SD = 9.67$), and those in the masculine condition reported the lowest ($M = 264.16$, $SD = 9.9$). A planned contrast that compared the masculine priming condition to the feminine and gender-neutral priming conditions was significant, $t(126) = -2.54$, $p = .01$. An additional planned contrast that compared the feminine
priming condition to the masculine and gender-neutral priming conditions was non-significant, \( t(126) = 1.70, p = .09 \).

**Figure 3.** CBI-R mean scores by gender and type of priming procedure.
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### Table 3.

**Mean CBI-R Scores Based on Priming Condition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Feminine Prime</th>
<th>Masculine Prime</th>
<th>Neutral Prime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>( M(\text{SD}) )</td>
<td>( n )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall CBI-R Mean</strong></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>298.14(63.35)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis 5**

It was hypothesized that men would report higher scores on the BSRI Masculinity scale than women, and women would report higher scores on the BSRI Femininity scale than men. The 2X3 two-way between subjects ANOVA that compared the means of men's and women's Masculinity scores on the BSRI following a masculine, feminine, or gender-neutral priming procedure revealed a non-significant main effect of gender, \( F(1, 123) = 0.21, p = .645 \), partial \( \eta^2 = .002 \).
Table 4.

*Men’s and Women’s Masculinity Scores Based on Priming Condition*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Feminine Prime</th>
<th>Masculine Prime</th>
<th>Neutral Prime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M(SD)</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.69(.76)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.01(.60)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2X3 two-way between subjects ANOVA that compared the means of men’s and women’s Masculinity scores on the BSRI following a masculine, feminine, or gender-neutral priming procedure revealed a significant main effect of gender, $F(1, 123) = 32.11, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .207$. As demonstrated in Table 5, women ($M = 5.073, SD = .1$) reported higher Masculinity scores on the BSRI than men ($M = 4.29, SD = .01$), regardless of priming condition.

Table 5.

*Men’s and Women’s Femininity Scores Based on Priming Condition*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Feminine Prime</th>
<th>Masculine Prime</th>
<th>Neutral Prime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M(SD)</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.02(.84)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.49(.74)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis 6**

It was hypothesized that women would report higher levels of personal career barriers on the CBI-R than men. The 2X3 two-way between subjects ANOVA that compared men’s and women’s mean CBI-R scores following a masculine, feminine, or gender-neutral priming procedure revealed a significant main effect of gender, $F(1, 123) = 7.09, p = .009$, partial $\eta^2 = .055$. As demonstrated in Table 6, women ($M = 300.3, SD = 8.17$) reported higher CBI-R scores than men ($M = 270.15, SD = 7.84$), regardless of priming condition.
### Hypothesis 7

It was hypothesized that, for both men and women, higher scores on the BSRI Femininity scale would be associated with higher total scores on the CBI-R. To test this hypothesis, a Pearson $r$ was computed to assess the degree of linear relationship between men’s and women’s CBI-R and Femininity scores. The correlation was statistically significant, $r(127) = .228$, $p = .005$.

**Figure 4.** Scatterplot of the relationship between men’s and women’s total CBI-R (Career Barrier) and Femininity scores (Femininity Scores).

### Hypothesis 8

It was hypothesized that higher scores on the BSRI Masculinity scale would be associated with lower total scores on the CBI-R. To test this hypothesis, a Pearson $r$ was calculated.
computed to assess the degree of linear relationship between men’s and women’s CBI-R and Masculinity scores. The correlation was not statistically significant, $r(127) = - .13, p = .071$.

**Figure 5.** Scatterplot of the relationship between men’s and women’s total CBI-R (Career Barrier) and Masculinity scores (Masculinity Scores).
There are very few jobs that actually require a penis or vagina. All other jobs should be open to everybody” (F. Kennedy, personal communication, 1973). Although originally communicated in the 1970s in reference to the gross gender wage gap that separated the earnings ratio of men and women in the workforce, the question that was addressed in the current research was, Do men and women differ in their perception of personal career barriers despite 40 years of “change” towards gender egalitarianism within the labor market, and if so, why? Although previous research has provided irrefutable evidence that gender discrimination in both the labor market and academia is alive and well, such as discrepancies in men’s and women’s earnings ratios, part- and full-time employment, and career outcomes, it is important to investigate any differences that may exist between men and women, which may be linked to such gender-based discrepancies. In an attempt to extend previous research, the current study investigated men’s and women’s perceptions of personal career barriers in relation to traditional definitions of masculinity and femininity. Specifically, a priming procedure was designed to increase the salience of masculinity or femininity versus gender-neutrality to understand the role of traditional gender norms in shaping men’s and women’s perceptions of personal career barriers.

Although gender priming research (Blair et al., 2001; Dasgupta & Asgari, 2004; Rudman & Phelan, 2010) has demonstrated the mental pliability of men’s and women’s automatic gender beliefs following exposure to gender stereotypic and counterstereotypic priming procedures, results from the current study did not support hypotheses 1 and 2. Data analysis demonstrated that the type of priming (i.e., masculine, feminine, gender-neutral) did not result in different scores on a measure of masculine, feminine, and androgynous gender identification (i.e., BSRI; Bem, 1974). One possible explanation for these null findings is that the priming stimuli were
consciously, rather than unconsciously, processed due to an observable connection between the feminine, masculine, and gender-neutral words contained within the word scramble priming task and the feminine, masculine, and androgynous items included in the BSRI (Bem, 1974). Conscious processing may have rendered the prime ineffective, allowing participants the ability to override the unconscious “pull” to alter automatic gender stereotypes following exposure to the masculine and feminine priming procedures (Kiesel, Kunde, & Hoffmann, 2008).

A second possible explanation is that the BSRI and/or word scramble priming task may have been invalid for use with the population under investigation. A prevailing criticism of the continued use of the BSRI in psychological research is that the instrument may no longer be applicable in the U.S. due to fundamental changes in cultural definitions of masculinity and femininity that have occurred since the development and standardization of the BSRI in the 1970s (Holt & Ellis, 1998). For example, a validity study conducted by Myers and Gonda (1982) failed to support both the content and process validity of the instrument. According to Hoffman and Borders (2001), the BSRI has inspired decades of validity studies, which have both supported (i.e., Bem, 1974; Holt & Ellis, 1998) and refuted (i.e., Myers & Gonda, 1982; Spence, 1991) the validity of the instrument. Hoffman and Borders (2001) explained the mixed results of the validity studies as a product of “inconsistency,” in which Bem (1974) was criticized for “inadequately and inconsistently” defining masculinity and femininity within publications and instrument development (p. 42). Additionally, the word scramble priming task was created by the researcher for purposes of the current study. Although masculine, feminine, and gender-neutral stimuli were selected from the results of a pilot study, the word scramble priming task had not been standardized before use in the current study. Based on the lack of a standardization procedure, the word scramble priming task that was developed for this study might not have been
capable of activating traditional gender norms.

A third possible explanation for the lack of a priming effect on men’s and women’s BSRI scores is that by the age of eighteen years (the age range of participants in the current study was 18 to 26 years), a gender identity has been fully formed and seamlessly integrated into cognitive and behavioral processes, resulting in an inability to reject automatic gender beliefs (Bem, 1981). According to the gender intensification hypothesis, adolescents increasingly exhibit gender stereotypical characteristics, such as adolescent females displaying high levels of emotional expressivity, due to an acceleration in gender socialization via external social pressure from a myriad of sources, including parents, teachers, and peers (Hill & Lynch, 1983). Participants in the current study were predominantly late adolescents (i.e., the period of time between 18 to 21 years), which is a developmental period vulnerable to gender intensification, especially in the form of peer influence. Gender intensification processes might have strengthened the pre-existing gender identities of late adolescent participants, preventing the masculine and feminine priming stimuli from altering automatic gender beliefs.

Although a link between masculine and feminine gender priming and gender identification was not found in the current study, gender priming was found to alter men’s and women’s perceptions of personal career barriers. Highlighting the valuation of masculinity in U.S. culture (Connell, 2005), hypothesis 3 was supported by data indicating that priming from masculine-gendered words significantly reduced men’s and women’s perceptions of personal career barriers relative to priming from gender-neutral and feminine-gendered words. In contrast to hypothesis 4, priming from feminine-gendered words did not significantly alter men’s and women’s perceptions of personal career barriers relative to priming from gender-neutral and masculine-gendered words. This null finding conflicts with the results of research conducted by
Rudman and Phelan (2010), in which feminine priming increased women’s perception of a “lack of fit” between the feminine characteristics traditionally associated with womanhood and masculine-typed occupations, such as automotive technology. However, it is important to note that despite the null finding, men and women in the feminine priming condition reported the highest level of perceived personal career barriers relative to those in the masculine and gender-neutral priming conditions. As previously mentioned, one explanation for this null finding is that the feminine word scramble priming task was not able to produce feminine gender priming. A second explanation is that the gender identity of women is more fluid than that of men (Steinburg, 2011). Although the gender socialization process rewards gender consistent behavior and punishes gender inconsistent behavior indiscriminately, the strength of conformity pressure differentiates between men and women. Specifically, conformity pressure encourages women to adopt specific core traits of femininity, such as emotional expressivity, but also allows women the opportunity to develop and express masculine traits, such as independence, without punishment; therefore, “androgyny is a viable alternative to exclusive femininity” (Steinburg, 2011, p. 274). In contrast, conformity pressure forces men to “relinquish all elements of...femininity” or face serious social consequences, such as social ostracism (Steinburg, 2011, p. 275). The rigidity of a masculine gender identity may have prevented the feminine gender prime from altering men’s perception of career barriers based on an automatic aversion to feminine stimuli, rendering the feminine gender prime ineffective.

In an attempt to further understand the relationship between men’s and women’s perceptions of personal career barriers and traditional gender norms, the current study investigated secondary inquiries, including the normative gender identity of the sample, men’s and women’s perceptions of personal career barriers without consideration of priming, and the
relationship between a pre-established gender identity and men’s and women’s perceptions of personal career barriers. Traditional gender norms dictate a “match” between gender identity and gender expression; therefore, the gender identification of “man” equates to a gender expression of masculinity, and the gender identification of “woman” is associated with the gender expression of femininity. In partial support of hypothesis 5, participants who self-identified as a woman reported significantly higher levels of femininity than those who self-identified as a man. However, self-identification did not produce significantly different levels of reported masculinity between men and women. As previously stated, one explanation for only partial support of hypothesis 5 is that the BSRI may not be a valid measurement of masculinity with the population under investigation given the shift in traditional definitions of masculinity. A second possible explanation is that participants who self-identified as men in the sample may not have adhered to traditional definitions of masculinity due to enrollment as undergraduate students at the University of Central Missouri. The pursuit of higher education may have reduced adherence to traditional definitions of masculinity due to courses, events, and distributed material, resulting in an increased awareness of the consequences associated with masculine expression, such as modern sexism. According to Case (2007), the increased awareness of discrimination that is inherent to diversity courses, such as Multicultural Psychology, reduces overt hostility toward women and “even subtle forms of prejudice that are often more resistant to change” (p. 426).

In addition to analyzing the normativity of gender identity and expression in the sample, the current study also examined men’s and women’s perceptions of personal career barriers while disregarding any priming effect. As predicted by hypothesis 6, the current study found that women reported perceiving higher levels of personal career barriers than men. To further understand the discrepancy between men’s and women’s perceptions of personal career barriers,
the current study also examined the potential link between the perception of personal career barriers and a pre-established gender identity. In support of hypothesis 7, participants who reported higher levels of femininity (i.e., pre-established feminine identity) also reported higher levels of personal career barriers. However, masculinity (i.e., pre-established masculine identity) was not significantly related to the perception of personal career barriers.

As previously mentioned, one explanation for the lack of support for hypothesis 7 is that the BSRI may not have been a valid instrument based on development and standardization in the 1970s and, therefore, did not accurately measure masculinity, femininity, and androgyny in the 21st century. According to Steinburg (2011), the gender identity of women is more fluid, or more androgynous, than men’s due to a gender socialization process that encourages the expression of femininity without forbidding the dual expression of masculinity; however, the gender identity of men is more rigid, or more gendered, due to an intensive gender socialization process that forces the removal of all traces of femininity and demands loyalty to masculinity. A second possible explanation is that women may have predominantly expressed a feminine gender identity, resulting in an increased perception of personal career barriers based on the perceived “lack of fit” between femininity and the masculine characteristics valued in the workforce. However, a masculine gender identity, unlike a feminine gender identity, is not exclusive. Although men may have predominantly expressed a masculine gender identity, the potential inclusion of women may have negated the relationship between masculinity and the perception of personal career barriers due to a stratified group, in which masculine women perceived a significantly higher level of personal career barriers than masculine men (Steinburg, 2011).

The primary limitation of the current research is the questionable validity of two of the three instruments included in the methodology, the BSRI and the word scramble priming task. As
previously mentioned, the BSRI was initially developed and standardized by Sandra Bem in the 1970s. According to Holt and Ellis (1998), traditional representations of masculinity and femininity have changed considerably in the past forty years, perhaps rendering the BSRI an ineffective tool in the assessment of gender identity for the population under investigation. It is important to consider that in the case of an invalid BSRI, the results of hypotheses 1, 2, 5, 7, and 8 may have been contaminated. In addition, the word scramble priming task was constructed by the researcher due to a lack of preexisting masculine, feminine, and gender-neutral priming material available in psychological literature. Although word inclusion for the priming procedure was based on a pilot study, the word scramble priming task used in the study was not standardized and might not have been a valid tool for masculine, feminine, and gender-neutral priming. The potential invalidity of the word scramble priming tasks brings into question the accuracy of results obtained in hypotheses 1-4. A second limitation of the current research is the homogeneity of the sample. Although the sample consisted of a fairly equal gender ratio (i.e., 51.9% male, 48.1% female) and corresponded with recent census data of the U.S. population by race and ethnic composition (U.S. Census Bureau, 2014), the age range of the participants was severely limited (i.e., 18 to 26 years), 99.2% of the participants were single, never married, and the participants were all undergraduate students in the Midwest. In addition, lacking from the demographics gathered from participants was current socioeconomic status (SES), which was an unfortunate oversight considering the relatively recent increase in dual-earner households, especially in low SES populations (Vespa, Lewis, & Kreider, 2013).

Based on the limitations described above, future research would benefit from selecting an instrument, such as the Masculinity-Femininity Scale (Cleveland, Udry, & Chantala, 2001), that is more current in order to accurately assess contemporary definitions of masculinity and
femininity. In addition, future research might find that priming stimuli comprised of stereotypical and atypical representations of masculinity and femininity presented via visual (Rudman & Phelan, 2010) and/or auditory modalities are more or less effective than the word scramble priming task utilized in this study. Although the current research included a demographic questionnaire, questions regarding SES were excluded; therefore, it is recommended that future research include an item in the demographic questionnaire that assesses the SES of participants to obtain a more complete picture of each participant’s background, as well as provide an opportunity to examine SES in relation to other variables, such as the perception of personal career barriers. Furthermore, future research may benefit from recruiting a more heterogeneous sample than the one in the current research. The intersection of gender and race creates unique experiences for both men and women; therefore, race may interact with one’s gender identity to increase or decrease the perception of personal career barriers dependent on the type and strength of discrimination that the specific population typically experiences. According to Brown and Misra (2003), “race is ‘gendered’ and gender is ‘racialized,’ so that race and gender fuse to create unique experiences and opportunities for all groups” (p. 488).

In addition to expanding the racial/ethnic composition of future participant samples, heterogeneity could be further increased by broadening the age range to include older participants. The restricted age range of participants in the current study might have detrimentally impacted the findings due to a potential lack of work experience and an overwhelming single, never married relationship status. Although questions regarding previous work experience and current employment status were not included in the demographic questionnaire, the participants were undergraduate students with a mean age of 19.77 years; therefore, it is unlikely that many participants were currently, or had previously been, employed
full time. Without substantial work experience, participants might not have been able to accurately assess the degree to which each career barrier presented in the CBI-R might hinder personal advancement in a career or career goal. Furthermore, a status of single, never married may have further prevented accurate assessment of career barrier hindrance based on a lack of experience with juggling familial and career responsibilities.

In consideration of the limited participant age range in the current study, the strict focus on contemporary definitions of masculinity and femininity could be expanded upon in future research by comparing different age groups to determine any potential relationship between traditional gender norms expressed in the past half-century on men’s and women’s current perceptions of personal career barriers. Social, political, and economic changes have resulted from and resulted in the constant deconstruction and reconstruction of masculinity and femininity in the U.S. Based on the dynamic nature of gender, future researchers might not only find that different age groups operate according to entirely different conceptions of masculinity and femininity, but also that different age groups may perceive more or fewer personal career barriers as a result of differing gender norms.

One final suggestion for future research would be to alter the gender expression and identification of the researcher throughout experimentation. In the current study, the researcher and research assistant who collected data from participants were both women, which may have inadvertently altered participants’ gender expression and/or identification due to unintended exposure to a woman occupying a dominant position within the experimental conditions. According to Gurney (1985), women researchers may act as an unconscious trigger in experimental settings to increase, or intensify, the masculine expression of men as a form of retaliation to a situation that is controlled by a woman, rather than a man. Therefore, consistent
exposure to women researchers in the current study might have detrimentally impacted the validity of the BSRI and/or word scramble priming task by influencing men’s expression of masculinity.

According to Tulving and Schacter (1990), “priming represents a ubiquitous occurrence in everyday life,” but does that include the priming of masculinity and femininity (p. 302)? Furthermore, if so, what are the implications, or consequences, of exposure to gender priming in everyday life? Although previous research has demonstrated that priming can modify automatic gender stereotypes (Blair et al., 2001; Dasgupta & Asgari, 2004; Rudman & Phelan, 2010), no connection has been established between masculine and feminine gender priming on men’s and women’s perceptions of personal career barriers. In acknowledgement of this gap in psychological research, the current study attempted to provide a foundation for future research in this area by exploring the role of traditional definitions of masculinity and femininity in shaping men’s and women’s perceptions of personal career barriers.

This study is important not only because it attempted to investigate a new avenue of psychological research, but also because it highlights an issue that impacts approximately half of the U.S. population. For decades, the U.S. has thrived under a banner of “equal opportunity,” epitomized by broadcasting the rare faces of successful women (e.g., Oprah Winfrey) across media outlets, publicizing outrageous statistics of labor force participation rates of women, and praising the “supermom” model, which has only served to cover up the gender divide that continues to structure the U.S. labor market. The results of the current study indicate that the gender status quo has not been eliminated. In addition to expanding upon and creating new avenues of research, the findings of this study can be applied to the improvement of educational and vocational outcomes for both men and women.
An important piece of information that built upon previous research was that women reported significantly more personal career barriers than did men. Why? Is it because women are simply not “fit” for employment? Questions explored in the current study introduced the novel finding that men’s and women’s personal endorsement of femininity significantly related to increased perceptions of personal career barriers, underscoring the “lack of fit” hypothesis, in which characteristics associated with femininity (e.g., communality) are considered incompatible with the masculine characteristics (e.g., agency) valued in employees. Although masculinity and femininity are popularly conceptualize by the general public as “set in stone,” automatic gender stereotypes are malleable, which allow men and women the opportunity to overcome traditional, or stereotypic, gender beliefs and develop counterstereotypic gender beliefs. As discussed by Dasgupta and Asgari (2004), exposure to counterstereotypic stimuli, such as a female professor of physics, provides men and women the ability to select a career without undue influence from traditional definitions of masculinity and femininity. Although the current study did not find that feminine priming related to the perception of personal career barriers, masculine priming was found to decrease men’s and women’s perceptions of personal career barriers. Application of this finding to the improvement of educational and occupational outcomes for men and women might include efforts to increase men’s and women’s exposure to adaptive characteristics associated with masculinity, such as independence, agency, and leadership. One method of exposure might include leadership workshops, in which adaptive masculine characteristics associated with leadership skills might be taught to men and women with the goal of implementation, in which assertiveness, independence and agency are integrated into everyday decision-making, such as selecting a counterstereotypic undergraduate major, requesting a salary raise, or interviewing for a job. A second method of exposure might include early education programs, in which young
girls receive encouragement and instruction in the pursuit of STEM subjects. Early education programs may also take the form of general education, in which counterstereotypic role models (e.g., female astronauts, male nurses, etc.) are positively emphasized throughout coursework. It is important to educate and encourage children to resist boxing themselves into an either/or category (i.e., masculine or feminine) due to the negative consequences associated with strict conformity, such as the emotional straitjacket associated with extreme expressions of masculinity, which can detrimentally impact lifelong development.

Although this study attempted to examine the gender divide in the labor market as a byproduct of men’s and women’s level of adherence to traditional gender norms, many questions remain unanswered. Why were the masculine and feminine gender primes ineffective in altering men’s and women’s gender expression/and or identity? Why did men in the sample not identify as significantly more masculine than feminine? The attempt to investigate a new line of research in gender studies and the questions that remain unanswered pave the path for future researchers to expand upon in order to increase general awareness of gender discrimination in the labor market and provide solutions, such as gender education, that can foster the develop of a society that is truly equal.
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Appendix A

Bem Sex Role Inventory

Please rate how well you think each of the following items describe you, based on the scale below.

1 (Never or almost never true) to 7 (Always or almost always true)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-reliant</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Yielding</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Helpful</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Defends own beliefs</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cheerful</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Moody</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Independent</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Shy</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Conscientious</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Athletic</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Affectionate</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Theatrical</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Assertive</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Easily flattered</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Happy</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Strong personality</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Loyal</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Unpredictable</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Forceful</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Feminine</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Reliable</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Analytical</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Sympathetic</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Jealous</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Has leadership abilities</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Sensitive to others’ needs</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Truthful</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Willing to take risks</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Understanding</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Secretive</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Makes decisions easily</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Compassionate</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Sincere</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Self-sufficient</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Eager to soothe hurt feelings</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Conceited</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Dominant</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Soft-spoken</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Likable</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Masculine</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Warm</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Solemn</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Willing to take a stand</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Tender</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Friendly</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Aggressive</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Gullible</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Inefficient</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Acts as a leader</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Childlike</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Adaptable</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Individualistic</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Does not use harsh language</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Unsystematic</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Competitive</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Loves children</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Tactful</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Ambitious</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Gentle</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Conventional</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix B**

Items on the Masculinity and Femininity Scales of the BSRI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masculine Items</th>
<th>Feminine Items</th>
<th>Neutral Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. Analytical</td>
<td>32. Compassionate</td>
<td>60. Conventional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Athletic</td>
<td>35. Eager to soothe hurt feelings</td>
<td>15. Happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Forceful</td>
<td>47. Gullible</td>
<td>39. Likable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. As leadership abilities</td>
<td>56. Loves children</td>
<td>6. Moody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Individualistic</td>
<td>26. Sensitive to others’ needs</td>
<td>30. Secretive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Masculine</td>
<td>38. Soft spoken</td>
<td>42. Solemn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Self-sufficient</td>
<td>44. Tender</td>
<td>12. Theatrical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Strong personality</td>
<td>29. Understanding</td>
<td>27. Truthful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Willing to take a stand</td>
<td>41. Warm</td>
<td>18. Unpredictable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Willing to take risks</td>
<td>2. Yielding</td>
<td>54. Unsystematic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The number preceding each item reflects the position of each item as it appears in the BSRI.*
A "barrier" is a factor that interferes with progress in your job or career plans. Barriers can be "external" or "internal." External barriers are found in the environment -- for example, job discrimination or low salary. Internal barriers are more psychological in nature -- for example, low self-esteem. These barriers may occur regarding your choice of career, in finding a job, while you are working in your job or career, or in how you balance your career with other aspects of your life.

For each of the common barriers listed below, think about how much it would hinder your career progress. In other words, how much would this barrier interfere with your career progress, or make your progress difficult? Mark your answers onto the blank spaces provided by each item, using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would not hinder</th>
<th>Would hinder somewhat</th>
<th>Would completely hinder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Unsure of my career goals
2. Needing to take time off work when children are sick or on school breaks
3. Experiencing racial discrimination in hiring for a job
4. Needing to relocate because of my spouse's/partner's job
5. Changing my mind again and again about my career plans
6. Having a disability which limits my choice of careers
7. Discrimination by employer because I have, or plan to have, children
8. Unsure of how to "sell myself" to an employer
9. Becoming bored with my job/career
10. Being discouraged from pursuing fields which are nontraditional for my sex
    (e.g., engineering for women, nursing for men)
11. Feeling a conflict between my job and my family (spouse and/or children)
12. Having a boss or supervisor who is biased against people of my racial/ethnic group
13. Experiencing problems with my health that interfere with my job/career
14. Unsure of my work-related values
15. Allowing my spouse's desire for children to take precedence over my career goals
16. Difficulty in finding a job due to a tight job market

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would not hinder at all</td>
<td>Would hinder somewhat</td>
<td>Would completely hinder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Feeling pressure to "do it all" - expected to do well as parent, spouse, career person, etc.

18. Not feeling confident about my ability on the job

19. Not being able to find good day-care services for my children

20. My spouse/partner doesn't approve of my choice of job/career

21. Not feeling confident about myself in general

22. Not wanting to relocate for my job/career

23. Feeling guilty about working while my children are young

24. Experiencing racial harassment on the job

25. Experiencing discrimination in hiring for a job because I have a disability

26. Not being paid as much as coworkers of the opposite sex

27. Being undecided about what job/career I would like

28. Stress at home (spouse or children) affecting my performance at work

29. Lacking the required personality traits for my job (e.g., assertiveness)

30. Disappointed in my career progress (e.g., not receiving promotions as often as I would like)

31. Other people's beliefs that certain careers are not appropriate for people of my sex

32. Losing interest in my job/career

33. Difficulty in re-entering job market after taking time off to care for my children

34. Difficulty in planning my career due to changes in the economy

35. Lacking the required skills for my job (e.g., communication, leadership, decision-making)

36. Experiencing racial discrimination in promotions in job/career

37. Difficulty in maintaining the ground gained at my job after having children
38. Not being sure how to choose a career direction

May use the following scale and mark your answers on the blank space next to each item:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would not hinder at all</th>
<th>Would hinder somewhat</th>
<th>Would completely hinder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39. Unsure of what my career alternatives are

40. Conflict between marriage/family plans and my career plans

41. Lack of maturity interferes with my career

42. Not having a role model or mentor at work

43. Experiencing sex discrimination in hiring for a job

44. Not receiving support from my spouse/partner

45. Having low self-esteem

46. Discrimination due to my marital status

47. My parents/family don't approve of my choice of job/career

48. Having a boss or supervisor who is biased against people of my sex

49. People of the opposite sex receive promotions more often than people of my sex

50. No opportunities for advancement in my career

51. Not being paid as much as coworkers of another racial/ethnic group

52. My belief that certain careers are not appropriate for me because of my sex

53. Having children at a "bad time" in my career plans

54. People of other racial/ethnic groups receive promotions more often than people of my racial/ethnic group

55. Lacking information about possible jobs/careers

56. The outlook for future employment in my field is not promising

57. Being dissatisfied with my job/career

58. Unable to deal with physical or emotional demands of my job
59. Unsure of what I want out of life

Remember to use the following scale and mark your answers on the blank space next to each item:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would not hinder at all</th>
<th>Would hinder somewhat</th>
<th>Would completely hinder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

60. Having an inflexible work schedule that interferes with my family responsibilities

61. Unsure of how to advance in my career

62. Lacking the necessary educational background for the job I want

63. Experiencing sexual harassment on the job

64. Fear that people will consider me "unfeminine"/"unmasculine" because my job/career is nontraditional for my sex

65. Not knowing the “right people” to get ahead in my career

66. Lacking the necessary hands-on experience for the job I want

67. Lack of opportunities for people of my sex in nontraditional fields

68. No demand for my area of training/education

69. Stress at work affecting my life at home

70. My friends don't approve of my choice of job/career
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For the current study, masculinity refers to words that are traditionally associated with men. Femininity refers to words that are traditionally associated with women. Gender-neutral refers to words that are not traditionally associated with either men or women (or applies equally to both men and women). Keep in mind that masculinity and femininity may be described in relation to occupational preferences, personality characteristics, appearance, activities, or any other type of descriptor that is commonly used to describe men or women.

For each item listed below, think about how each word may be perceived as belonging to a particular gender category. If the word describes men, mark an “M” for masculine in the blank space provided. If the word describes women, mark an “F” for feminine. If the word does not describe men or women (or equally describes men and women) mark an “N” for gender-neutral.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Pink</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>22. Purse</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>40. Cold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Football</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>23. Liver</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>41. Fight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Assertive</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>24. Folder</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>42. Nurture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Soldier</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>25. Blue</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>43. Military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Duck</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>26. Decorate</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>44. Suit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Celery</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>29. Math</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>47. Submissive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Chair</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>33. Hunter</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>51. Fragile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Kitten</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>34. Glass</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>52. Chicken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Notation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Truck</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Dress</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Gentle</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Nation</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Beer</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Tomorrow</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Carpet</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Bravery</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Television</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Knife</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Giggle</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Timid</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Night</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Cloud</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Carrot</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Compassion</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remember to use the following notation when categorizing the 80 items in the word list:

- **M**: Words that are traditionally associated with men.
- **F**: Words that are traditionally associated with women.
- **N**: Words that are not traditionally associated with either women or men or equally describe men and women.
Appendix E

WORD SCRAMBLE #1

Instructions: Unscramble each item below and write the correct answer in the blank space provided. Each item may only be unscrambled to form one correct response.

Please refer to the word bank provided at the bottom of this form while completing the word scramble. The word bank contains thirty items. Fifteen of the items are correct unscrambled items, and fifteen of the items are incorrect unscrambled items.

Time Limit: 15 Minutes

1. tksir  
2. rspue  
3. sserd  
4. lodl  
5. kpin  
6. pmkaeu  
7. nmetoila  
8. yrpett  
9. rutnreu  
10. bilnaarir  
11. lablte  
12. gielraf  
13. tleeng  
14. recysetar  
15. sinocsmopa  

Word Bank #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>secret</th>
<th>fragile</th>
<th>emission</th>
<th>gentle</th>
<th>nature</th>
<th>rejection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nurture</td>
<td>doll</td>
<td>cloud</td>
<td>pink</td>
<td>makeup</td>
<td>purse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compass</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>librarian</td>
<td>laughter</td>
<td>bottle</td>
<td>emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skirt</td>
<td>forget</td>
<td>ballet</td>
<td>dress</td>
<td>pretty</td>
<td>clothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ballot</td>
<td>secretary</td>
<td>pick</td>
<td>compassion</td>
<td>assistant</td>
<td>student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WORD SCRAMBLE #2

Instructions: Unscramble each item below and write the correct answer in the blank space provided. Each item may only be unscrambled to form one correct response.

Please refer to the word bank provided at the bottom of this form while completing the word scramble. The word bank contains thirty items. Fifteen of the items are correct unscrambled items, and fifteen of the items are incorrect unscrambled items.

Time Limit: 15 Minutes

1. hocam
2. lfotolab
3. csuelm
4. truhne
5. itsu
6. sviegaserg
7. kurtc
8. dilsroe
9. ereb
10. ytirmali

11. gifht
12. rngost
13. tseearsiv
14. ryvreba
15. oicpel

Word Bank #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>suit</th>
<th>purple</th>
<th>beer</th>
<th>aggressive</th>
<th>hunter</th>
<th>folder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>trick</td>
<td>height</td>
<td>football</td>
<td>marriage</td>
<td>college</td>
<td>military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>museum</td>
<td>macho</td>
<td>aversive</td>
<td>soldier</td>
<td>fight</td>
<td>bravery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assertive</td>
<td>grieving</td>
<td>muscle</td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>nervous</td>
<td>police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>truck</td>
<td>polite</td>
<td>gift</td>
<td>machine</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>immersive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Word Scramble G**

**WORD SCRAMBLE #3**

**Instructions:** Unscramble each item below and write the correct answer in the blank space provided. Each item may only be unscrambled to form one correct response.

Please refer to the word bank provided at the bottom of this form while completing the word scramble. The word bank contains thirty items. Fifteen of the items are correct unscrambled items, and fifteen of the items are incorrect unscrambled items.

**Time Limit: 15 Minutes**

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>plsame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11. itlbnule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>marw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12. lyeerc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>inar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13. slags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>rlofde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14. ctipreu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>ievrl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15. kiechcn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>hirca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>uiiqld</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>ghtni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>roomtwor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>aguelagn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Word Bank #3**

| chair | quill | maple | kitchen | celery | pursue | liquid | circus | picture | warm | lodging | night | bullet | language | squid | river | rain | pencil | folder | rival | light | bulletin | liver | movie | clearly | sample | glass | tomorrow | chicken | grade |
### Appendix H

Word Scramble Priming Task Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word Scramble #1 (Feminine-Gendered Words)</th>
<th>Word Scramble #2 (Masculine-Gendered Words)</th>
<th>Word Scramble #3 (Gender-Neutral Words)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Skirt</td>
<td>1. Macho</td>
<td>1. Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Purse</td>
<td>2. Football</td>
<td>2. Warm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pink</td>
<td>5. Suit</td>
<td>5. Liver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Compassion</td>
<td>15. Police</td>
<td>15. Chicken</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I

Demographic Questionnaire

1. What is your gender? (Please circle the appropriate answer.)
   Male  Female  Other

2. What is your age in years? __________

3. What is your first (or native) language? __________________

4. What is your racial/ethnic identity? (Please circle the appropriate answer. You can select more than one option.)
   Caucasian
   Black or African American
   American Indian or Alaskan Native
   Asian or Pacific Islander (Chinese, Vietnamese, Japanese, Korean, Hawaiian, Asian Indian, Filipino, Vietnamese, etc.)
   Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish (Puerto Rican, Mexican American, Cuban, etc.)

   If your ethnic identity is not listed, please record the answer in the blank space provided.

   _______________________

5. What is your current year in school? (Please circle the appropriate answer.)
   Undergraduate:  Freshman  Sophomore  Junior  Senior
   Graduate:  First-Year  Second-Year

6. What is your marital status? (Please circle the appropriate answer.)
   Single, Never Married  Married  Divorced  Widowed
Appendix J

CONSENT FORM

Identification of Researchers: This research is being conducted by Adrionia Molder, a graduate student, under the supervision of Dr. Kim Stark. We are with the Department of Psychological Science at the University of Central Missouri (UCM).

Purpose of the Study: The purpose of the study is to understand how personality characteristics can influence a career or career goals.

Request for Participation: We are inviting you to participate in a student research project to determine how personality characteristics can influence a career or career goals. The decision to participate is voluntary. If you decide not to participate, you will not be penalized in any way. You can also decide to stop at any time without penalty. If you do not wish to answer any of the questions, you may simply skip them. You may withdraw your data at the end of the study. If you wish to do this, please inform the researcher before you submit your materials. Once you turn in the materials, we will not know which responses are yours.

Exclusions: You must be at least 18 years of age to participate in this study.

Description of Research Methods: This study involves the completion of a word scramble task consisting of 15 words, a survey measuring personality characteristics, a survey measuring work-related concerns, and a brief demographic questionnaire. This study will take 50 minutes to complete. Upon completion of the study, the researcher will explain the purpose of the study in more detail. You will also have a chance to ask questions. Please note that we cannot give you your individual results because the data are anonymous.

Privacy: All of the information collected will be anonymous. We will not record your name, student number, or any information that could be used to identify you.

Explanation of Risks: The risks associated with participating in this study are similar to the risks of everyday life. If you feel any distress as a result of this study please let us know and contact the University of Central Missouri’s Counseling Center at (660) 543-4060, or visit them at UCM Humphreys 131.

Explanation of Benefits: You will benefit from participating in this study by receiving firsthand experience in psychological research. You may also enjoy completing the word scramble task and surveys. We will provide you with 5 SONA credits that you may use if any of your instructors award credit for research participation.

Questions: If you have any further questions about this study, please contact the researcher, Adrionia Molder, at amm57640@ucmo.edu or the advisor, Dr. Stark, at stark@ucmo.edu. If you have any further questions about your rights as a research participant, please contact UCM’s Human Subjects Protection Program at (660) 543-4621.

If you would like to participate, please sign a copy of this document and return it to the researcher. The additional copy is for you to keep.

I have read this letter and agree to participate.

Signature: __________________________________________

Date: __________________________________________

Person Obtaining Consent: ___________________________
Appendix K

CONSENT FORM

Identification of Researchers: This research is being conducted by Adrionia Molder, a graduate student, under the supervision of Dr. Kim Stark. We are with the Department of Psychological Science at the University of Central Missouri (UCM).

Purpose of the Study: The purpose of the study is to provide pilot ratings of masculine, feminine, and gender-neutral words. Fifty (25 gender-neutral and 25 masculine/feminine, or “gendered”) words will be obtained from the pilot study to be used in a following thesis project.

Request for Participation: We are inviting you to participate in a pilot study to determine a set of 50 (25 gender-neutral and 25 “gendered”) words that will be used in a research project as part of the completion of a master’s degree. The decision to participate is voluntary. If you decide not to participate, you will not be penalized in any way. You can also decide to stop at any time without penalty. If you do not wish to answer any of the questions, you may simply skip them. You may withdraw your data at the end of the study. If you wish to do this, please inform the researcher before you submit your materials. Once you turn in the materials, we will not know which responses are yours.

Exclusions: You must be at least 18 years of age to participate in this study.

Description of Research Methods: This study involves a brief demographic questionnaire and the categorization of a list of 80 words as masculine, feminine, or gender-neutral. This study will take 20 minutes to complete. Upon completion of the study, the researcher will explain the purpose of the study in more detail. You will also have a chance to ask questions. Please note that we cannot give you your individual results because the data are anonymous.

Privacy: All of the information collected will be anonymous. We will not record your name, student number, or any information that could be used to identify you.

Explanation of Risks: The risks associated with participating in this study are similar to the risks of everyday life. If you feel any distress as a result of this study please let us know and contact the University of Central Missouri’s Counseling Center at (660) 543-4060, or visit them at UCM Humphreys 131.

Explanation of Benefits: You will benefit from participating in this study by receiving firsthand experience in psychological research. You may also enjoy completing the tasks. We will provide you with 2 SONA credits that you may use if any of your instructors award credit for research participation.

Questions: If you have any further questions about this study, please contact the researcher, Adrionia Molder, at amm57640@ucmo.edu or the advisor, Dr. Stark, at stark@ucmo.edu. If you have any further questions about your rights as a research participant, please contact UCM’s Human Subjects Protection Program at (660) 543-4621.

If you would like to participate, please sign a copy of this document and return it to the researcher. The additional copy is for you to keep.

I have read this letter and agree to participate.

Signature: _______________________________________

Date: __________________________________________

Person Obtaining Consent: _________________________
Appendix L

Demographic Questionnaire

1. What is your age in years? _________

2. What is your gender? (Please circle the appropriate answer.)

   Female          Male          Other