

Gender Differences in Psychological Functioning

The paper I am choosing to re-write:

Title: The Multiple Dimensions of Gender Stereotypes: A Current Look at Men's and Women's Characterizations of Others and Themselves.

Authors:

Tanja Hentschel

Madeline E. Heilman and

Claudia V. Peus

Introduction

Men and women behave differently mentally, from the way they communicate to the way they attempt to influence others. These gender differences in communication and persuasion methods have ramifications for gender differences in men's and women's leadership styles. As a result, this paper will concentrate on psychological gender variations in communication styles and influence tactics. This paper will also concentrate on gender disparities in leadership styles.

Men and women have different communication styles, but they also have different ways of influencing other people. Though the influence tactics employed by male and female managers or leaders fluctuate depending on the gender of the target person they are seeking to persuade, research shows that there are gender disparities in influence strategies. Gender variations in communication styles and persuasion methods have resulted in traditional gender roles that have influenced both men and women's workplace actions. Some of these preconceptions have had a negative impact on women's conduct and opinions of themselves as employees, managers, and leaders in the workplace.

Men and women differ not just in how they speak with one another, but also in how they try to influence one another. Persuade is a leader's capacity to motivate and influence their followers to change their behavior, beliefs, and attitudes, which is why one of the most popular ways to assess a leader's performance is to use influence strategies. However, the efficiency of these persuasion strategies varies from person to person, as well as from gender to gender.

Hypothesis

Gender differences in psychological functioning.

The prior literature and its relevance

In the prior literature, the authors used a multi-dimensional framework to investigate current male and female stereotypes. They decided to talk about the following topics:

- (1) How male and female raters categorize men and women,
- (2) How males and females define themselves, and
- (3) The degree to which self-characterizations and gender group characterizations are linked.

The researchers discovered that communality prejudices exist and are equally prevalent among male and female raters. With certain counterexamples, self-characterizations reflected gender stereotypes, with female raters judging themselves as less agentic than masculine raters and male raters evaluating themselves as less communal than feminine raters. Women tended to portray themselves in stereotyped ways as less aggressive and capable in leadership, according to studies of self-ratings and gender assessments in general. Men, on the other hand, described themselves as less stereotyped and more communal.

The most significant distinction between men and women in terms of communication style is that men and women have different perspectives on the goal of dialogues. Men utilize speech to exert dominance and obtain valued results, according to academic research on psychological differences between men and women (Maltz &orker, 1982; Leaper, 1991; Mason, 1994; Wood, 1996). According to Basow & Rubenfield (2003), in deliberations, women are more artistic, cautious, and courteous in general, whereas men are more confrontational and energy. Males and women have different attitudes about other people in society: women aim to be more social in their contacts with others, whilst men cherish their autonomy (Eagly, 1987). Men see discussions as a tool to establish and preserve status and control in relationships, but women see dialogues as a way to form and nurture an emotional relationship with the other side by talking about current difficulties and challenges that they are all facing (Gray, 1992; Tannen, 1990).

As children, women begin to act in stereotyped female roles, and as adults, they continue down the same road. Affectionate, emotional, kind, sympathetic, sensitive, and sentimental are some common feminine stereotype traits; stereotypic male features include domineering, assertive, aggressive, self-confident, rational, and unemotional (Schneider, 2005). These gender stereotypes portray women as missing the attributes that people generally identify with effective leadership, producing the mistaken impression that women are not capable of holding top management roles (Welbourne, 2005). These prejudices can have a significant negative impact on female leaders in the workplace, restricting their ability to ascend to top leadership positions.

The research method

In the prior literature, the researchers created a comprehensive framework for measuring distinct aspects of agency and communality in order to examine modern gender stereotypes and their impact on characterizations of others and self in this study. They used the multidimensional framework to see if men and women have different gender norms, if men and women have different self-characterizations, and if men and women's self-characterizations vary from their gendered group portrayals. They compared the results obtained using the standard unidimensional framework for measuring agency and communality with those obtained using the newly developed multidimensional framework in each case.

They tested two independent variables: the gender of the rater (male or female) and the target group (men in general, women in general, or self). Male and female raters were given the target group manipulation at random. To answer the individual study questions, they used subsets of this overarching approach.

Six hundred and twenty-nine individuals were recruited online for this study via Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk), giving a more representative group of the US population than student samples. Although MTurk samples are slightly more diverse and dependable than other types of internet samples used in psychology research, they are still convenience samples rather than truly representative samples based on demographic data. The ages of those in their sample ranged from 19 to 83, with a median age of 34.5 years.

Furthermore, education levels ranged from those who had not entered college (17%), those who had some college education (33%), those who had graduated from college (37%), to those who had graduate degrees (13%). 77.6% said they were White, 8.4% said they were Asian, 7.0 percent said they were African American, 4.8 percent said they were Hispanic, and 2.2 percent said they were other. The survey link was only viewable to residents of the United States who had a past MTurk acceptance rate of better than 95%, indicating that their previous work had been dealt with appropriately. In addition, they asked individuals to identify whether or not they finished out the form honestly. One individual stated that he had not completed the poll honestly, and hence was not included in the analysis.

On an attribute inventory representing several dimensions of agency and communality, the participants were asked to rank men in general, women in general, or themselves. The traits were given to participants in a randomized order, based on the survey instrument they employed. Ratings were given on a seven-point scale, with responses ranging from one ("not at all") to seven ("very").

Scale development was done in four steps using an inductive method. In the first phase, they identified a collection of 74 features, which included adjectives, traits, and descriptors, and were reflective of how agency and communality have been assessed by researchers over the years. The characteristics were chosen based on previous gender stereotype research. They were chosen to reflect a wide range of agentic and communal characteristics with the least degree of redundancy possible. Three judges divided the descriptive features into groups based on their theoretical similarity in the second phase.

They had a different set of three impartial assessors arrange the retained qualities into the labeled categories in the third step. Finally, they employed confirmatory factor analysis approaches to sharpen their categories in a fourth phase.

The statistical methods

Table 1 shows the dimension scales, scale items, and reliability information. It includes the Cronbach alphas and corrected-item-scale correlations, as well as the qualities that make up each of the scales. Descriptive statistics and interrelations of agentic and communal dimension scales are included in the Table 2.

Results are displayed for a 2 (rater gender: male, female) × 2 (target group: men in general, women in general) × 4 (agency dimension: instrumental competence, leadership competence, assertiveness,

freedom) ANOVA and a 2 (rater gender: male, female) × 2 (target group: men in general, women in general) × 3 (communality dimension: concern for others, sociability, emotional sensitivity) ANOVA.

While Table 3 shows the findings of the mixed model ANOVA, Table 4 shows the results of the LSD comparisons. Male raters evaluated women in general as lower in overall agency than men in general, according to LSD comparisons of overall agency ratings.

LSD comparisons of overall agency ratings in Table 4 revealed that male raters rated women as having a lower overall agency rating than men. They also stated that female raters assessed both women and men as equally agentic in general. LSD comparisons of the individual agency scales revealed that this conclusion was consistent across the board for the majority of the agency dimensions. With the exception of the component of instrumental skill, on the agency dimensions, male raters ranked women lower than men in general (such as in leadership competence, assertiveness, and independence). In contrast to male raters' ratings, female raters assessed women in general no differently than males in terms of leadership competency and independence, which is consistent with the overall agency outcome. Female raters, in contrast to the results of the overall agency ratings, distinguished between women and men in assertiveness evaluations. That is, female raters, like male raters, judged women as being less forceful in general than males. The results for the agency dimensions are shown in Figure 1.

The obtained result

In the prior study conducted in the United States, 628 male and female raters rated men, women, and themselves on scales representing multiple dimensions of agency and communality, the two defining features of gender stereotypes: assertiveness, freedom, improvisatory competence, management competence, and concern for others, social connection, and emotionality. The data demonstrated that communality preconceptions exist and are equally prevalent among male and female raters, despite the fact that agency characterizations are far more complicated. Male raters described women as being less agentic than men. Female raters, on the other hand, made a distinction between agency aspects, identifying women as less assertive than men but equally capable leaders. Both men and women raters gave instrumental competence a high rating.

With certain counterexamples, self-characterizations reflected gender stereotypes, with female raters judging themselves as less agentic than masculine raters and male raters evaluating themselves as less communal than feminine raters. Women tended to portray themselves in stereotyped ways as less aggressive and capable in leadership, according to studies of self-ratings and gender assessments in general. Men, on the other hand, described themselves as less stereotypical and more communal. Total, their findings show that focusing on specific aspects of agency and communality rather than overall agency and communality may yield more insight into stereotype content.

Many disparities in communication patterns between men and women have been discovered through academic research. Overall, women are supposed to utilize communication to strengthen social bonds and relationships, whereas men are expected to use language to assert social dominance (Leaper, 1991; Mulac, Bradac, & Gibbons, 2001). Women, on average, use more emotive, cautious, and courteous language than men, especially in conflict circumstances (Basow & Rubenfield, 2003). Men, on the other

hand, are thought to be more prone than women to provide answers to difficulties in order to avoid potentially unneeded discussions about interpersonal issues (Baslow & Rubenfield, 2003).

Women, according to other academic study, use less strong speech: they tend to swear less, speak more gently, and employ more tag questions and intensifiers (Lakoff, 1975). Women also interrupt less than men, which experts believe is due to their perceived lesser status in comparison to men (Thorne & Henley, 1975). It's possible that this is related to societal standards that enforce the gender status hierarchy. Pearson (1985) discovered that women's statements are frequently weakened. One explanation for this could be their insecurity in what they're saying and their anxiety of being incorrect, both of which can lead to their perceived inferior status in the workplace to male bosses.

In general, research has found that women are more sociable and emotional in their contacts with others, whereas males are more independent and unemotional or attached in dialogues (Eagly, 1987). Women, according to theorists, are at a disadvantage when engaging with others because they speak more cautiously than males, who are known to speak more assertively, giving the appearance that men are more confident and adept as leaders (Lakoff, 1975). Many of the gender variations in communication styles discussed make women appear inferior to males, implying that they should be treated as second-class citizens. This has ramifications for gender inequalities in leadership styles, as women are still considered as second-class citizens in this domain, making them appear unsuited for a leadership or managerial position.

Many research that look at the interaction of gender and influence methods have come up with conflicting results. While the great deal of research on gender and influence tactics has found that males and females use different influence tactics (White, 1988; Carli, 1999; Lamude, 1993), numerous different research has found that these differences are due to differences in situational circumstances rather than gender (White, 1988; DuBrin, 1991; Carothers & Allen, 1999). Male managers utilize personal appeal, consultation, assertiveness, and inspiring appeal more than female managers, according to a meta-analysis of research on the interaction of influence strategies and gender.

Females used counseling, inspiring appeal, and ingratiation more with other female employees, whereas males utilized exchange methods more with male employees, according to the study (Carli, 1999; Carothers & Allen, 1999; Dubrin, 1991; Lamude, 1993; White, 1998). This means that female managers are more likely to readily form and maintain tight ties with other female employees due to their similar communication styles, but men managers are less likely to do so due to their opposing communication styles.

These qualitative disparities in men's and women's normative roles have an impact on their leadership conduct and outcomes (Eagly, 1987). This status difference between men and women can be evident in an individual's cultural gender and is a visible status marker, influencing others' views, observations, and judgments of an individual's, particularly females', organizational and leadership ability (Eagly, 1987). Because these high positions are congruent with their cultural gender, men are assigned higher status and privilege and are more likely to be in leadership roles, resulting in distinct results for men and women. Women, on the other hand, have less privileges in society because of their inferior standing, particularly in the workplace. Because of the notion that leadership is male-dominated, this prevents women from reaching leadership positions.

Significance

According to Leslie et al. (2015), the findings of the prior study raise a number of questions that should be investigated further in the future. Not only would it be beneficial to look into the competence component of agency in greater depth, clarifying what it entails and what it does not, but it would also be beneficial to consider another aspect of competence that has recently been identified as strongly male gender-typed intellectual brilliance. Exploring the implications of women's seemingly contradictory views of themselves in terms of agency on their attitudes and conduct in other sectors might also be beneficial. Furthermore, it would be beneficial to identify whether the greater communality men attribute to themselves than to other men reflects true beliefs or is purely self-enhancing, as well as whether this has ramifications for men's attitudes about traditionally feminine roles and positions.

Finally, it is critical that future research demonstrates the value of discriminating between the characteristics of agency and communality that they have defined, for both self and other characterizations. While an overall agency and overall communality measure would likely suffice for some research issues, finer distinctions will undoubtedly be advantageous in other cases. Different characteristics of gender stereotypes may, for example, be more strongly related with selection decisions, performance evaluations, or reward distributions.

Other researchers have begun to show the benefit of addressing different aspects of agency when evaluating gender disparities in leader ratings, albeit with a less diverse set of variables that simply includes self-reliance and dominance (Schaumberg and Flynn, 2017). It is also probable that distinct self stereotype characteristics are more closely linked to career goals and choices, as well as support for gender-related organizational regulations. Demonstrating that different levels of agency and communality predict diverse outcomes would contribute to their multidimensional framework's credibility. Such discoveries could provide valuable information on leverage areas for intervention to alleviate the harmful impacts of gender stereotyping and the bias they foster, in addition to expanding their understanding.

Conclusion

At a young age, we acquire and internalize socially established gender norms. By the age of four, children have a firm awareness of their gender's proper characteristics and attempt to conform to these roles (Eddleston, Veiga, & Powell, 2003). These preconceptions are aided by one's immediate environment: one's family, friends, school, and the media are all compelling elements in persuading individuals to adhere to their stereotype, forcing them to seek for consistency between their biological sex and what is expected of them (Eddleston, Veiga, & Powell, 2003). These stereotypes of roles that an individual is exposed to during their childhood and adolescent years are perpetuated throughout their lives through socialization (Welbourne, 2005). They have the power to impact an adult's actions and qualities, including interpersonal and leadership styles (Eagly, 1987). These traditional gender roles serve as workplace rules since they unconsciously dictate how a person should communicate and act based on their gender.

Leadership style disparities have emerged between male and female leaders as a result of psychological variances in communication styles and influence strategies between men and women. These

discrepancies frequently result in gender stereotypes that represent women's leadership qualities and abilities in a negative way, making it difficult for women to succeed in management roles. Companies must proactively engage in activities that support the promotion of female leaders in order to remove gender stereotypes and bias. If organizations are able to eliminate the barricades negatively affecting female leaders from accomplishment, there will not only be a rise of woman leaders in supervisors positions in the place of work, but organizations will also see introduced perks that come along with the various leadership styles and abilities that ladies bring to the table. Organizations that do not promote and cultivate an accepting climate in which female leaders can thrive are not only discriminating against female leaders, but they are also missing out on the distinctive leadership style contribution of women.

References

- Baslow, S. A., & Rubenfeld, K. (2003). "Troubles talk": Effects of gender and gender typing.
- Carli, L. L. (1999). Gender, interpersonal power, and social influence. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55, 81–99.
- Carothers, B. J., & Allen, J. B. (1999). Relationships of employment status, gender role, insult, and gender with use of influence tactics. *Sex Roles*, 41, 375–387.
- DuBrin, A. J. (1991). Sex and gender differences in tactics of influence. *Psychological Reports*, 68, 635–646
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eddleston, K., Veiga, J.F. and Powell, G. (2006). "Expanding the Traditional View of Managerial Career Satisfiers: Beyond Sex Differences," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(2), 437-44
- Gray, J. (1992). *Men are from Mars, Women are from Venus: a Practical Guide for Improving Communication and Getting What You Want in a Relationship*. HarperCollins, New York.
- Hentschel, T., Heilman, M. E., & Peus, C. V. (2019). The Multiple Dimensions of Gender Stereotypes: A Current Look at Men's and Women's Characterizations of Others and Themselves. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 10(11). Doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00011.
- Lakoff, R. T. (1975). *Language and womans place*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Lamude, K. G. (1993). Supervisors' upward influence tactics in same-sex and cross-sex dyads. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 77, 1067– 1070.
- Leeper, C. (1991). Influence and involvement in children's discourse: Age, gender, and partner effects. *Child Development*, 62, 797-811.
- Leslie, S. J., Cimpian, A., Meyer, M., and Freeland, E. (2015). Expectations of brilliance underlie gender distributions across academic disciplines. *Science* 347, 262–265. Doi: 10.1126/science.1261375
- Maltz, D. N., & Borker, R. (1982). A cultural approach to male-female miscommunication. In J. J. Gumpertz (Ed.), *Language and social identity*. Cambridge; Cambridge University Press.
- Mason, E. S. (1994). Gender differences in job satisfaction. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 135, 143-151.
- Merchant, K. (2012). *How Men And Women Differ: Gender Differences in Communication Styles, Influence Tactics, and Leadership Styles*. CMC Senior Theses Paper, 513.
http://scholarship.claremont.edu/cmc_theses/513
- Mulac, A., Bradac, J. J., & Gibbons, P. (2001). Empirical support for the gender-as culture hypothesis: An intercultural analysis of male/female language differences. *Human Communication Research*, 27, 121-152.
- Pearson, J. C. (1985). *Gender and communication*. Dubuque, A: William C. Brown.

Schaumberg, R. L., and Flynn, F. (2017). Self-reliance: a gender perspective on its relationship to communality and leadership evaluations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(5), 1859–1881.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2015.0018>

Schneider, D., (2005). *The Psychology of Stereotyping*, New York: Guilford Press.

Tannen, D. (1990). *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation*. Ballantine Books, New York.

Thorne, B, & Henley, N. (1975). Difference and dominance: An overview of language, gender, and society. In B. Thorne & N. Henley (Eds.), *Language and sex: Difference and dominance*, Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers, 5-42.

Welbourne, T. (2005). Women "Take Care," Men "Take Charge:" Stereotyping of U.S. Business Leaders Exposed, *Catalyst*, 7, 10, 22.

White, J. W. (1988). Influence tactics as a function of gender, insult, and goal. *Sex Roles*, 18, 433–448.

Wood, J. T (1996). *Gendered lives: Communication, gender and culture* (2nd ed). Belmont, CA;Wadsworth.