DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 173 549 CE 019 863

AUTHOR O'Leary, Virginia E.
TITLE Barriers to Professional Advancement among Female Managers.
PUB DATE Aug 78
NOTE 38p.; Paper presented at the International Congress of Applied Psychology (9th, Munich, Germany, August, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Employer Attitudes; Employment Opportunities; *Employment Problems; Employment Qualifications; *Females; *Managerial Occupations; Self Esteem; *Sex Discrimination; *Sex Stereotypes; *Social Attitudes; Social Influences; Working Women

ABSTRACT

It appears that there is nothing inherently associated with femaleness which should preclude the ascendence of women into management positions. However, barriers do exist and they stem from such factors as societal sex-role stereotypes, attitudes toward women in management, attitudes toward female competence, and the prevalence of the male managerial model. These factors are external to the woman herself but may create barriers to her job-related aspirations. Internal factors which may serve to inhibit the expression of upwardly mobile occupational aspirations include low self-esteem and fear of failure, as well as the perceived consequences of occupational advancement and the incentive value associated with such expectations. Increasing employment opportunities for women represent a small first step toward equalizing the distribution of men and women in the labor force. However, it appears that a concerted effort to modify existing societal attitudes, to provide environmental support for dealing with the real pressures arising from role conflicts, and to redefine the exclusively male managerial model will be required to diminish the impact of the pervasive stereotypes which seem to be remarkably effective in keeping women out of managerial positions. (BM)

Barriers to Professional Advancement Among Female Managers[1]

Virginia E. O'Leary
Oakland University

In recent years, the need for placing women in higher occupational levels of business and industry has been recognized and the legal consequences of precluding such advancement strengthened. However, despite evidence that the business community, prodded by Affirmative Action and other legislation, appears more willing than ever before to accept women into managerial ranks, women today account for less than two percent of the managerial personnel in the United States. While evidence for discriminatory hiring and promotional practices does exist, it has become increasingly clear that qualified women are themselves unwilling to pursue management positions. As former Assistant Secretary of Education so aptly observed, "If job discrimination should end tomorrow, there wouldn't be very much change in the number of women in positions of authority" (Buzenberg, 1975).

Even among those women employed in professional and technical jobs the majority occupy positions considered "female sex-role appropriate." For example, 97% of all registered nurses, 92% of all dieticians, 85% of all elementary school teachers and 70% of all health technicians are

[1]Paper presented at the Ninth International Congress of Applied Psychology, Munich, Germany, August, 1978.

women. In contrast, 2% of the engineers, 5% of the attorneys and 9% of the physicians in the U. S. are women (U. S. Department of Commerce, 1973).

It is generally agreed, that for a woman to succeed in the competitive economic marketplace she must possess characteristics which have been regarded (stereotypically) as male sex-role appropriate. Clearly, there is a reluctance on the part of many women to pursue occupations which require the expression of traits traditionally ascribed to men. Apparently, this reluctance extends even to the acquisition of the educational training which would qualify them for such occupations (Horner, 1972; Horner & Walsh, 1974).

One of the critical problems confronting business and industry as they attempt to comply with current legislative efforts to equalize the distribution of men and women in the occupational hierarchy, centers around the question of how to motivate the woman worker to aspire to ascendency into positions of status and responsibility. The current paper reviews the literature on women in management with regard to those psychological factors which may interact to bar women from entering management.

Some of these factors, such as societal sex-role stereotopes, attitudes toward women in management, attitudes toward female competence, and the prevalence of the "male managerial" model are external to the woman herself but may create barriers to her job-related aspirations. Internal factors which may serve to inhibit the expression of upwardly mobile occupational aspirations include low self esteem and fear of failure as well as the perceived consequences of occupational advancement and the incentive value associated with such expectations. These last two variables, expected consequences and their incentive values are regarded by Atkinson and Feather (1966) as crucial determinants of the nature and

degree of achievement-related behaviors. If the anticipated consequences of a particular behavioral response (i.e., promotion) have negative valences such responses may be inhibited.

Attitudes Toward Women in Management

The majority of the literature relevant to the question of societal attitudes toward women in management has focused upon the attitudes of male managers. To the extent that promotional decisions on women are made by men in positions of authority one obvious barrier to successful occupational advancement for women lies in the attitudes of their promoters. A classic study of male attitudes toward women executives was conducted by the Harvard Business Review (Bowman, Wortney, & Gruper, 1965). Male executives rated their attitudes toward female executives in the mildly favorable to the mildly unfavorable range. While the males sampled felt that women in management had no appreciable negative effects on efficiency and production, one third of those sampled felt that females in managerial positions had a "bad" effect on employee morale. Fifty-one percent of the male respondants felt that women were temperamentally unfit for management. Eighty-one percent believed that men would feel uncomfortable working for a woman and 73% indicated that they themselves would feel uncomfortable if they were to work for a woman.

Schein (1973) asked male management personnel working in insurance companies to describe either women, men, or successful middle level managers. She found a high degree of correspondance between the male and successful middle manager profiles; women were described quite differently. Apparently those attributes commonly attributed to women (e.g., dependence, passivity, and emotionality) were viewed as antithetical to the requisite characteristics for successful managers.

These findings reflect the norm in American culture that women should not have authority over men of equivalent age and social class. Other prevalent male attitudes which may be anticipated to adversely effect hiring and promotional decisions on women include: (1) women are given preferential treatment and premature advancement due to the influence of "pressure groups," (2) the employment of women jeopardizes the institution of the family, (3) the presence of women in the job setting makes social interactions difficult, (4) women are less able to cope with crises than men, and (5) women require inordinate amounts of sick leave--due to menstruation and pregnancy (Dipboye, 1975; Loring & Wells, 1972; Lynch, 1973; Minahan, 1975; Rogalin & Pell, 1975; Williams, 1977).

Research by Bass, Krussell, and Alexander (1971) looking at how male managers perceive women and their relationship to work revealed several factors that influenced their ability to accept women on an equal basis with men in the work situation. Although the male managers sampled did not perceive of women as less capable than men, they did indicate concern about the norms defining the interaction between men and women in job settings. It was the managers' belief that both men and women prefer male supervisors. Further, they perceived of the woman worker as less dependable than her male counterpart. The reasons given for this negative perception were related to the "biological" and personal characteristics of women. Classification of the data in terms of the managers' actual experience with women workers indicated that men who did not work with women had more positive regard for women workers than men who did. The least favorable attitudes toward working women were expressed by male managers who supervised women in subordinate positions. Bass, et al. (1971) suggest that as long as men judge women from positions of superiority,

women may continue to be viewed in an unfavorable light. Empirical attempts to change negative attitudes toward outgouups based on the intergroup contact hypothesis indicate that equality of status is an important determinant of prejudice reduction (Allport, 1958; Cook, 1969).

It has been widely assumed that the existence of negative attitudes toward women in managerial positions based on the prevalence of a stereotypic conception of appropriate feminine behavior accounts for both access and treatment discrimination against women in organizational settings (Levitan, Quinn, & Staines, 1971). Indeed, it has been demonstrated repeatedly that women are perceived as less desirable job applicants than comparably qualified men (Cohen & Bunker, 1975; Fidell, 1970; Haefner, 1977; Shaw, 1972; Wiback, Dipboye, & Fromkin, 1975). Further, once they are hired their salaries are lower (Levitan, et al., 1971; Bayer & Astin, 1975; Treiman & Terrell, 1975) and they are promoted less rapidly (Day & Stogdill, 1972; Rosen & Jerdee, 1974a).

There has been little systematic research into the nature of the qualifications expected of female applicants for managerial positions. One study by Cecil, Paul, and Olins (1973) attempted to identify the qualities perceived to be important for male and female applicants for a "white collar" job. Graduate and undergraduate students enrolled in management classes were asked to rate the importance of each of fifty variables to an interviewer considering the job application of either Mary Thomas or Joe Stephens. The results indicated that subjects' perceptions of the importance of standard variables frequently used in selection varied as a function of the sex of the applicant. Personality-appearance and skills-education were perceived to be more important in evaluating the female applicant, while motivation-ability and interpersonal relations were weighed

more heavily in evaluating the male. Apparently, the female applicant was more likely to be perceived as a typical clerical employee, in contrast to the male "administrative manager."

It thus appears that women are generally regarded as lacking the necessary characteristics to assume management roles. Further, the performance of women who do attain such positions is evaluated differently from that of comparable males.

Rosen and Jerdee (1973) examined the way sex-role stereotypes--perceptions and expectations of what is appropriate behavior for males and females--influences evaluations of male and female supervisory behavior. Undergraduate students and bank supervisors were asked to read one of six versions of a supervisory problem (with either a male or a female supervisor and with eight male, female, or mixed subordinates) and to evaluate the effectiveness of four supervisory styles. The results indicated that the evaluations of the efficacy of certain supervisory styles was subject to the influence of sex of supervisor and subordinate.

A reward style was rated as more effective for male supervisors, while a friendly-dependent style was rated as more effective for supervisors of either sex when used with subordinates of the opposite sex. On the other hand, evaluations of threat and helping styles did not differ for male and female supervisors. It should be noted that the similarity of ratings made by subjects of both sexes provides evidence that men and women share common perceptions concerning sex-role appropriate behavior for individuals in supervisory positions.

Although the results of a recent survey-experiment have been interpreted to suggest personnel decisions of male managers reflect societally endorsed sex-role stereotypes (Rosen & Jerdee, 1975a) favoring male employees,

Terborg and Ilgem (1975) have questioned the validity of post hoc explanations based on stereotypic inferences. In the Rosen and Jerdee study no measure of stereotypes was actually taken. When Terborg and Ilgen (1975) obtained a measure of male subjects' Attitudes Toward Women as Managers (Peters, Terborg, & Taynor, 1974) prior to their participation in an In-Basket simulation they found that the stereotype measure was related to decision-making behavior only in situations where little information about a woman applicant was provided (at the time of hiring). When data regarding her performance were presented the effects of negative stereotyping diminished. Similarly, Rosen and Jerdee (1974b) and Murphy (1977) found that the effect of stereotypes on decision-making decreased when regulatory policies were made explicit. In the absence of information a woman applicant may be easily classified in accordance with prevailing norms dictating sex role appropriate behaviors. When her job related qualifications are detailed explicitly for the purposes of hiring or promotion decisions it may not be as easy to overlook her abilities. However, in Murphy's (1977) study selection of the female employee for job rewards or opportunities never exceeded that of the male. Irrespective of whether the decision-maker was a student or executive, "James" was much more likely than "Jane" to receive (1) a high starting salary, (2) a high second-year salary increment, (3) assignment to challenging work, (4) the opportunity for further training, and (5) selection for promotion. The most striking discrepancy was obtained in the promotion selection. Under unambiguous conditions the male was selected for promotion in 20 of 44 cases, the female in three of 52. When conditions were highly ambiguous the female was never selected, while the male was promoted in 11 of 22 cases. Further, the only female promotional selections were made by female subjects.

According to Katz (1973) women's attitudes toward successful women are more favorable than those of men toward successful women. However, while men report punitive and unaccepting attitudes toward successful women, these attitudes are subject to change as a function of the context within which the success is achieved. If female success is depicted as occurring in an environment in which female participation is as frequent as male participation, males tend to react favorably to this success; when success is associated with "deviant" female stereotypic sex role inappropriate behavior, males react punitively. The success of the woman is not so much the issue as is the deviant nature of her actions. These findings suggest, that the attitudes of male managers toward women in management may be influenced by the actual number of women having attained high level positions within a particular organization.

It has been suggested that the attitudes of women managers themselves toward women in management are unfavorable. In a national sample of working women Staines, Travis, and Jayaratre (1973) found evidence for a "queen bee syndrome." That is, women who had achieved high status positions tended to view other women as competitors and evaluated them negatively. However, Terborg, Peters, Ilgen, and Smith (1974) found that women employees with high levels of education held more favorable attitudes toward women as managers than either women with less education or men. Assuming that educational level is positively related to position within the organization these results contradict those of Staines and his colleagues, as do those of Bowman and her colleagues (1965) who found that a higher proportion of female than male executives rated their attitudes toward women executives as strongly favorable.

Although only five percent of the managers included in Rosen and Jerdee's (1974c) survey of Harvard Business Review subscribers were women

they were no less likely to discriminate against women employees than their male peers in cases involving the selection of a purchasing manager, nominating an employee to attend a training conference, giving advice to a philandering junior executive, and resolving conflict over work related social obligations. Apparently, male and female executives share common perceptions and expectations concerning the behavior of men and women in organizational settings. The pervasiveness of such expectations may reflect the tendency of those in managerial positions to adhere to a fundamentally "male" managerial model.

The Male Managerial Model

American society values success and the model upon which the definition of "success" is based is essentially a male sex role appropriate one. For example, it is the male, not the female sex role stereotype which coincides with the managerial model. McGregor (1967) writes, "The model of the successful manager in our culture is a masculine one. The good manager is aggressive, competitive, firm and just. He is not feminine, he is not soft and yielding or dependent or intuitive in the womanly sense. The very expression of emotion is widely viewed as a feminine weakness that would interfere with effective business processes" [p. 23]. In describing the managerial model, Loring and Wells (1972) observe that "men are supposed to be tough, concerned for the dollar, practical and objective enough to face the facts and act accordingly. Even if someone gets hurt in the process, a man is supposed to be strong enough to do what has to be done. Such strength, toughness, and total responsibility, even occasional, necessary violence are attributed to men as 'natural'...He is expected to repress those aspects of himself which are associated with the feminine in our culture" [p. 92].

Women do not fit into the "executive mold." Bowman (1964) quotes one junior executive, "I would like to recommend people for promotion on merit alone, but I am justifiably afraid that my own judgment will be called into question if I recommend anyone who deviates too markedly from the kind of person I see getting ahead in my company" [p. 189]. Women, evidently "deviate too markedly," as Bowman's research reveals that factors of race, sex, and national origin appear to be more important deterents to promotion than the candidate's dishonest, self-seeking, or authoritarian tendencies.

Schein (1975) found that women in middle management were as likely as their male counterparts to view "masculine" characteristics as the requisite characteristics for a managerial position such that to think "manager" was to think "male." These findings suggest that to "think like a man" may be vital for a woman if she is to be accepted and successful in predominately male organizations. In an interview study, Schein (1973) found that successful women executives admitted to identifying with the "male model" during their early managerial careers.

One explanation for the wide-spread acceptance of the validity of the male managerial model lies in the prevalence of myths regarding the nature of women's job commitment and their competence.

Myths Regarding Competence and Commitment

Persistent myths concerning the sincerity of the commitment on the part of the female worker continue to influence promoters' perceptions of her and to have a detrimental effect on her chances for advancement. Crowley, Levitan and Quinn (1973) found no support for the notion that women work only for "pin money." Full 40% of their female sample were economically independent. One third of the female sample were the sole

wage earners in their households. Yet the myth p
continue to be regarded as better candidates for
economic need.

Also unfounded was the belief that women are
socio-emotional aspects of their jobs. Like the
regard the concern and competence of their superv
to the job than the opportunity to make friends.
expresses the fear that women supervisors would a
to supersede objective judgment.

Crowley and her colleagues found no factual
valent assumptions regarding the motivations and
workers. Such notions include (1) women would nc
reasons did not force them into the labor market,
than men with an intellectually undemanding job,
cerned than men that their work be self actualizi
less concerned with "getting ahead." Empirical
these myths.

These findings lend support to the contentic
motivations of workers of each sex are more simil
types would lead us to believe. Yet women worker
by myths and half-myths which to the extent they
involved in making promotional decisions may adve
tunities for advancement.

The available literature clearly indicates t
to perform less well than men on a variety of act
example, Feldman-Summers and Kiesler (1974) were
occupation in which females were expected to outp

the presumably female appropriate occupational fields of nursing and elementary school teaching, Sedgwick (reported by Feldman-Summers & Kiesler, 1974) found that subjects of both sexes expected males to be more competent and successful than females.

Moreover, when male and female subjects are asked to evaluate the same performance attributed to either a man or a woman, they tend to agree that the man's performance is superior. For example, the female college students who were asked by Goldberg (1968) to rate professional articles on the basis of value, persuasiveness, writing style, profundity, and competence gave higher ratings to identical papers when they were led to believe that the author was male. Bem and Bem (1970) replicated these findings with male college students. Similar results have been obtained in studies requiring both women and men to evaluate the artistic merit of paintings (Pheterson, Kiesler, & Goldberg, 1971) and the qualifications of student applicants for a study-abroad program (Deaux & Taynor, 1973).

Several attempts have been made to specify the conditions under which a woman's achievement may be regarded as more (or equally) meritorious than that of a man. Taynor and Deaux (1973) found that a woman's behavior in a civic emergency (armed robbery) was rated as more deserving of a reward than that of a man when her behavior was portrayed as somewhat out of role (she remained cool headed) and her actions were praised by experts (the police). Similarly, Pheterson, et al. (1971) found that a woman's artistic achievement was evaluated as favorably as that of a man only when it had been judged superior by experts. Apparently, for a woman's competence to be recognized, her accomplishment must be portrayed as exceptional and its worth must be acknowledged by an authoritative source.

Even when a woman's achievement is acknowledged, her success is generally attributed not to her ability but to luck or effort. Deaux and Emswiller (1974) asked male and female college students to evaluate the performance of a fellow student (either male or female) on a task characterized as either masculine or feminine. When the task was presented as one at which males excel, both male and female raters attributed a good performance by a man to his skill. The same level of performance by a female was attributed to her luck. Similarly, Feldman-Summers and Kiesler (1974) found that college students attributed the success of a male physician to his ability and that of a female physician to her great motivation. They interpret these findings to suggest that women (who are number two) must try harder.

Feather (1969, 1975) has demonstrated that regardless of original expectations for success, women rely more often on variable attributions (i.e., luck and effort) than males following both success and failure. In a recent review of women's expectations of and causal attributions for performance Frieze (1975) concludes that women generally attribute failure to lack of ability and success to effort. In contrast, men credit their success to their high ability and blame someone or something else if they fail (Deaux, 1976; Mednick & Weissman, 1975).

The findings cited above may be regarded as evidence for the existence of a societal bias against the recognition of female competence. This bias may stem from the belief that females are not endowed with the masculine attributes which make success more likely.

Indeed, a recent study by Spence and Helmreich (1972) lends support to such an interpretation. Male and female students were shown one of four videotaped versions of a female stimulus person being interviewed.

The stimulus person portrayed either a competent or incompetent individual who was either feminine or masculine in her interests. The attributes of competency and masculinity of interests combined in such a way to make the masculine-competent female more rather than less attractive, regardless of sex of rater or their expressed attitudes toward women. Apparently, if a female stimulus is portrayed as possessing highly-valued male attributes (competence) and correspondingly appropriate masculine interests, subjects of both sexes are willing to acknowledge their shared preference for individuals possessing those societal traits valued most highly. The difficulty may lie in convincing men and women that such valued traits are not by definition possessed exclusively by men. While the prevalence of the myth that women are less competent than men may be rendered ineffective in laboratory situations, the prevalence of such attitudes in the general society may continue to interfere with the ability to accurately predict and assess female's job performance.

It seems reasonable to expect that sex differences in the perceived cause of success, when it is acknowledged, will produce different ractions to it. Most organizational rewards are designed to recognize personal accomplishments. Thus, to be judged as deserving of a reward it is necessary to be perceived as having played an instrumental role in the (successful) outcome. Heilman and Guzzo (1978, in press) asked men and women MBA students to make recommendations regarding the appropriateness of various personnel actions taken on successful male and female employees. Four different causes for the hypothetical employee's success were described (ability, effort, task difficulty, and luck). The types of causal explanations frequently used to account for women's success, luck and task difficulty, which are both external and unstable (Farris & Deaux, 1977) were

found to detrimentally effect the degree to which organizational rewards were viewed as appropriate, and if they were, to detrimentally affect the scope and magnitude of reward deemed preferable. When the causal basis of men's and women's behavior was thought to be the same, they were rewarded identically. Unfortunately, the tie between success and maleness is so strong (Feldman-Summers & Kiesler, 1974) that males are expected to be more successful than females regardless of the sex-role appropriateness of the occupational context in which the success occurs (Toughey, 1974a, b). As a result, a woman's success may always be viewed as unexpected and due to different factors than the (anticipated) success of a man.

In a recent study Hagen and Kahn (1975) found that males liked competent women only when they were not required to interact with them. When men were required to work with a woman (either cooperatively or competitively) they preferred incompetent female coworkers over competent ones. Further, both males and females were more likely to exclude a competent woman from their group than a competent man and to include an incompetent woman than an incompetent man. The authors conclude that while competent women may be afforded the status comensurate with their ability (competent women were rated high in leadership ability) they will not be liked and may be excluded from the work group.

Insofar as promoters perceive the characteristics of women workers as discrepant from the predominately "masculine" criteria inherent in the male managerial model to which they adhere it is reasonable to anticipate that such attitudes may constitute barriers to higher occupational attainment for women. Further, if as the Hagen and Kahn results suggest men's self esteem is threatened by the demonstration of female competence even if a woman does possess the requisite "masculine" attributes for success she may not be hired or promoted.

Thus far, the discussion has focused on empirical findings directly relevant to expressed attitudes toward women in management. Such attitudes reflect societally held sex role stereotypes.

Societal Sex Role Stereotypes

Society assigns particular characteristics to males and females for the purpose of enhancing performance in traditional sex roles. The stereotypic images of the achieving male and nurturant female become a powerful force in the socialization of children as they grow into adulthood. Norms governing the approved "masculine" or "feminine" image are clearly defined and consensually endorsed (Fernberger, 1948; Lunnenborg, 1970; McKee & Sherriffs, 1959; Seward, 1946; Sherriffs & McKee, 1957; Steinman & Fox, 1966). Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson and Rosenkrantz (1972) report a high degree of agreement regarding the differing characteristics of males and females in a large sample comprised of subjects of both sexes, various ages, religious affiliations, educational levels and marital statuses.

An analysis of those characteristics most commonly ascribed to each sex reveal that attributes valued highly in men reflect a "competency" cluster including such items as objectivity, skill in business, and decision-making ability. Female-valued traits comprise a "warmth-expressiveness" cluster antithetical to the male profile. That is, the ideal female does not possess male valued traits. Similarly, McKee and Sherriffs (1957) found that components of the "masculine" image generated by their subjects included (1) rational competence and ability and (2) vigor, action and effectiveness, while the female stereotype consisted of (1) social skills and graces and (2) warmth and emotional support. Further, subjects of both

sexes agree that male-valued traits are more socially desirable than female valued traits (Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman, & Broverman, 1968).

Indeed, the ascription of greater desirability to the male has been repeatedly demonstrated. The prevalence of consensually endorsed negative valuation of female traits may result in women holding a negative opinion of their worth relative to that of men (Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz, & Vogel, 1970).

However, the question of the extent to which sex role stereotypes influence the self conceptions of men and women cannot be resolved on the basis of empirical evidence to date. While the sex difference literature does suggest a high degree of correspondence between male and female self conceptions and their concepts of ideal same and opposite sex stereotypic profiles (McKee & Sherriffs, 1959; Rosenkrantz et al., 1968, Steinman & Fox, 1966) it is difficult to assess the relationship between self concept and differentially valued sex role stereotypes. As Constantinople (1973) points out, the majority of measures used to differentiate males from females with regard to dimensions of masculinity-femininity, sex role adoption, sex role preference and sex role identity are based on the assumption that masculinity and femininity represent a single bi-polar dimension. The usual procedure for obtaining male versus female self and opposite sex-other profiles involves asking subjects to respond to trait and adjective check lists, characterizing males, females and self. While the sequence of response to these differential instructions is typically counterbalanced, the very fact that all operations are performed on the same set of scales may artifically elicit bi-polar characterizations artifactually anchored. Thus, caution must be exercised in interpreting the results of sex differences in response to both self and sex role stereotypic profiles generated in this fashion.

Further, as Pleck (1975) has recently observed sex stereotypes are typically defined in terms of the traits that most differentiate the sexes rather than those that most characterize each sex. The fact that the mean ratings for males and females on almost all traits that do differentiate are on the same side of the midpoint is often overlooked (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974). Thus, the male and female stereotype both included masculine and feminine traits.

The traditional view of sex role stereotypes assumed that sex represented a dichotomous construct anchored by masculinity at one extreme and femininity at the other. More recent formulations view masculinity and femininity as orthogonal dimensions which may vary independent of one another (Bem, 1974; Spence, et al., 1974). However, despite the recognition among social scientists that sex roles may be defined androgynously, the impact of this recognition on the public's expectations governing sex role appropriate behavior has yet to be evaluated.

Evidence to date suggests women share men's bias against the recognition of competence in women, generate the same sex role stereotypic profiles as their male counterparts, and endorse the ascription of more positively valued traits to men. The extent to which this agreement reflects the consensual endorsement of "socially desirable" responses is difficult to determine. A number of recent studies suggest that the extent of perceived dissimilarity between the sexes is much greater than the actual differences between them as reflected in their self or typical same-sex versus ideal stereotypic ratings (Fay, 1975; Steinmann & Fox, 1974; Unger & Siiter, 1974). Although women perceive themselves as having achieved a balance between self achieving and family orientation (self ratings) and indicate that they

are pretty much what they want to be (ideal ratings), they do not believe that men approve of their self achieving orientation (women's perception of men's ideal woman) (Steinmann & Fox, 1974). Interestingly, the ratings of men's ideal woman and women's own ideal correspond closely. Whether or not their perceptions are accurate, women's beliefs concerning what men want them to be may be reasonably anticipated to inhibit those behaviors they deem stereotypically counternormative. Consistent with the evidence indicating a readiness on the part of women to subscribe to stereotypic sex role definitions are data suggesting that women characterize themselves less positively than men.

In a recent review of the literature on sex differences in self concept Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) conclude that women and men do not differ significantly on generalized measures of self esteem. However, women do express lower expectancies for success than do males (Crandall, 1969; Feather, 1969; Frieze, Fisher, McHugh, & Valle, 1975; McMahan, 1972b; Montanelli & Hill, 1969) even when their task performance is objectively superior (Vaughter, Gubernick, Matassian, & Haslett, 1974). Further, college women are less likely than men to accept personal responsibility for their performance outcomes, attributing both success and failure to external factors such as luck or task difficulty (Frieze et al., 1975; Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974). When women are asked to characterize themselves in terms of adjectives reflecting personal vs. social self definitions, women emphasize their social attributes such as attractiveness, sympathy, cooperation, whereas men define themselves in accord with the personal attributes, ambitious, optimistic and practical (Carlson, 1965, 1971; Carlson & Levy, 1968). It thus appears that while women do not evaluate themselves more negatively than men, they do subscribe to a self definition

which reflects the societal stereotype of femininity and in a number of situations, women are less confident than men (Lenney, 1977).

Women have traditionally been reared to want to fill the role in which society castes them. They are trained to model themselves after the accepted image. According to Bardwick (1971) the origins of ego style in the female lie in an empathetic, intuitive, person-oriented style of perception and in the central role that the motive to affiliate plays in the development of self esteem among women (Douvan & Adelson, 1966; Hoffman, 1972). For women affiliation is seen as achievement and an affirmation of the self. The subjective quality of feminine ego functions is praised and valued in the warm mother-child and husband-wife relation which have traditionally characterized the feminine role. However, these very traits may be viewed as incompatible with the requisite characteristics to ensure success in the competitive economic marketplace.

According to Korman (1970) one of the most important factors determining task performance of a given individual is socially influenced self esteem. To the extent that woman's self definition incorporates traditionally feminine stereotypic notions it is plausible to anticipate that she may be hesitant to display behaviors inconsistent with that stereotype.

Hollander (1972) found a negative relationship between the demonstration of academic achievement and social self-esteem scores for females, but not for males. Females with A averages in high school had significantly lower self-esteem scores than females with C averages, the reverse was true for males. Hollander's interpretation of these findings suggests the existence of a positive relationship between self esteem and exhibition of sex role appropriate behavior.

Results reported by Gordon and Hall (1974) indicate that the best predictor of a woman's happiness and satisfaction is her self image.

Interestingly, the more potent, supportive and unemotional a woman feels (predominately "masculine" characteristics), the more satisfied and happy she reports herself to be. The inconsistency evidenced in these findings suggest that the incorporation of "masculine" traits into women's self descriptions may differentially effect their overall estimation of self worth. Those characteristics more closely tied to sex role inappropriate behavior may depress positive self evaluations. Further research on the relative impact of counter-stereotypic self-definitions along these dimensions is necessary to clarify the relationship between the ascription of more valued "masculine" characteristics and women's self concepts.

Campbell's (1971) work with the Strong Vocational Interest Blank reveals that women working in such traditionally "masculine" fields as mathematics and chemistry fail to select the more "flamboyant" items (e.g., "be a professional dancer," "thrilling and dangerous activities," etc.) endorsed by women in occupational roles (e.g., airline stewardesses, fashion models, and entertainers) which require more stereotypically feminine attributes such as poise, charm and physical beauty. One explanation for these findings lies in the notion that the adoption of male-valued traits (i.e., rational, analytic orientation) may preclude the development and/or expression of traits highly valued in the female.

The relative impact of societal sex role stereotypes on women's self conceptions is difficult to evaluate. However, if as Bardwick (1971) suggests the value one places on theself determines the level of self-esteem and the lower a person's self-esteem the greater the anxiety and the greater the tendency to assume a societally prescribed role it is plausible to suggest that women whose self esteem is low may be hesitant to engage in behaviors requiring the assumption of highly valued male sex role appropriate traits. Regardless of whether this negative conception of feminine value

is internalized in the self concept of a given woman or simply a reflection of what she considers to be the female's sex role appropriate stance as reflected by societal stereotypes it may be anticipated to effect the achievement directed behavior of that woman.

Women are caught in a double bind, unable to optimally fulfill the role requirements for the more socially desirable achieving individual and those for the ideal woman simultaneously. The woman who seeks employment in a traditionally masculine position is faced with a dilemma. Society views the ideal woman as an expressive individual lacking in the "masculine" attributes of logic and drive. If she feels that because she is not a man, she is not endowed with the competency characteristics ascribed to men, she may suffer from lack of confidence concerning her ability to do the job well. If, on the other hand, she feels that she has the potential to manifest "masculine" traits, she may feel that allowing such characteristics to surface might be detrimental to her femininity, rendering her "less of a woman."

To the extent that a woman perceived herself as possessing both the "masculine" attributes associated with probable successful competitive achievement and interests in marriage and family considered appropriately "feminine" she may experience role conflict. If the conflict between competing goals is sufficiently strong, the existence or mere anticipation of such a dilemma may result in the suppression of achievement striving.

As Schein (1972) observes, to the extent a woman's self image incorporates the "feminine" role aspects she may be less likely to acquire those job characteristics or engage in those behaviors associated with the "masculine" managerial role unless viable role models are available to her who represent the integration of "the best of both worlds." It should

be noted that the mere imitation of the male managerial style by a female cannot necessarily be expected to result in success. The absence of women as role models functioning successfully in male dominated fields may be considered a barrier to the occupational aspirations and achievement directed behavior of women in the labor force.

One first set of factors which may serve to inhibit the achievement strivings of women in organizational settings are related to women's expectations regarding the probability that achievement behavior will be positively reinforced.

Women and Achievement

Adherence to the stereotypically feminine-role definition dictates that for many young women the most important area for achievement is social skill (Stein & Bailey, 1973). Achievement striving and social activities are more closely linked for females than for males. Although this link has frequently been interpreted as evidence that female-achievement striving is motivated by the need to affiliate, it appears equally plausible that the demonstration of social skills reflects female sex-role appropriate achievement concern. For example, comparisons of achievement-motivation scores obtained under instructions stressing competency and mastery with those obtained under neutral or relaxed conditions yield sex differences. When men are exposed before the test to instructions aimed at arousing their achievement concerns, their achievement-motivation scores increase. Under relaxed conditions women's achievement-need scores are higher than men's, but they do not increase under arousal conditions (House, 1974; Veroff et al., 1953).

One plausible explanation for this result is that arousal instructions that stress intelligence and leadership ability--two characteristics

that are regarded as stereotypically masculine, are of little relevance to women, particularly those who are traditionally oriented (Field, 1953; Lesser, Krawitz, & Packard, 1963). Several successful attempts to increase the achievement-motivation scores of females using arousal instructions emphasizing social acceptance and interpersonal skills have been reported (Field, 1953; French & Lesser, 1964). However, Friedrick's (1976) recent attempt to replicate these findings utilizing (feminine) value-appropriate instructions was unsuccessful. Yet, in the same study Friedrick found evidence that expanding the method of scoring projective measures of achievement motivation to include achievement in traditionally feminine areas improved her ability to predict women's performance from their motive scores. As Veroff (1978) so aptly observes, to adequately account for the overt achievement-strivings of women (and men), the interaction between sex-role expectations for success and achievement orientation must be specified. Furthermore, there is more than one variety of achievement orientation (Helmreich & Spence, 1978; Veroff, 1977; Veroff et al., 1975). For example, the fact that women's achievement motive scores under relaxed conditions are higher than men's suggests that women are concerned with the achievement process; men with the achievement outcome or impact (Veroff, 1977).

Unlike men, women are motivated to strive for success accomplished through their own efforts without the benefit of help or the threat of surveillance (autonomous achievement motivation) (Deci, 1972; Depner, 1975; Kipnis, 1974; Veroff, 1977). This variety of achievement motivation reflects a process orientation. Women are also concerned with another process motive; responsibility achievement (i.e., "trying hard," "doing their best"). In contrast to men whose primary achievement concern centers on whether the game is won or lost, women are more concerned with how it is played (Kidd &

Woodman, 1975; Veroff, 1977; Zander, Fuller, & Armstro more interested in building competence than in having competence (competence achievement motivation) (Veroff,

The female socialization experience in Western so against the expression of impact oriented achievement denotes expressivity and interpersonal concern. Thus, that Helmreich and Spence (1978) found a small negativ tween Femininity and Competitiveness suggesting that i sensitivity is orthogonal if not negatively related to oth[redacted]. Not only do women show little interest in dem assertive competence, they may actually refuse to acce for their competitive success by attributing their per factors such as luck (Deaux & Farris, 1974; Feather, 1 1974) or ease of the task (Croke, 1973; Frieze & Barta 1972a). Consistent with women's concern regarding the of their achievement strivings when they do attribute internal cause, they are likely to use the unstable fa & Frieze, 1973; Feldman-Summers & Kiesler, 1974).

In comparison to men, who are socialized to be co women are expected to be more interpersonally (communi 1966). To the extent that women derive satisfaction f without reference to others (Depner, 1975; Kipnis, 197 Veroff et al., 1975), they may be less concerned than recognition for their accomplishments. Indeed, they m cost associated with such recognition (envy, hostility to the maintenance of interpersonal relationships they value.

Furthermore, American women have been socialized historically to assume an "Is it worth it?" attitude toward career aspirations. For example, Frank and Frank (1954) advised:

> Consider your job from every standpoint: The satisfaction it gives you and how necessary they are, the net income it contributes after you pay for all the services your job prevents you from doing for yourself, the effect it has on your stamina, your disposition, your relationship with your husband. When you become pregnant, set the time when you feel the job had best be given up. And decide, with your husband, when--and whether you think you should resume. Perhaps an honest examination of the problem will suggest other solutions: A less taxing part-time job, or a secretarial/typing service you can conduct from your home, or the development of a latent skill, such as painting tiles, or hooking rugs, which will help keep you alert without disrupting your entire home life or cutting off the extra income you are counting on. [p. 69]

Thus, women are encouraged to imagine all possible negative consequences of careerism and to weigh them against assured positive outcomes. Obviously, in order for a career to be considered justifiable, it would have to offer sufficient benefits to cancel out all possible liabilities. During the 1970's, a wider range of roles have been defined as acceptable for women, yet at the same time, because we are in the midst of social change, the ultimate consequences of any given role choice have become more difficult to predict. Although the possible benefits of careerism have increased substantially, they are not guaranteed. If the contemporary western woman weighs possible negative consequences of careerism against assured positive ones, she could still be dissuaded from deciding on a career. Probably her

own gender role identity will affect such a weighing process profoundly because it will affect the salience of certain negative and positive expectancies.

The idea that anticipated negative consequences often discourage women from aspiring to achievement goals is the basis for Horner's (1968) notion of fear of success (FOS). Fear of success is conceived as a psychological variable to achievement aroused by the expectation that success in certain contexts may result in negative consequences, including loss of femininity and social rejection. Indeed, Horner demonstrated that women who fear success perform less well than usual when competing against men. Presumably, such women anticipate social censure for out-performing men.

Viewed within the context of Atkinson's expectance value theory of achievement motivation, the fear of success construct rests on the assumption that an individual will pursue her/his achievement related tendencies unless she/he experiences competing motives (e.g., fear of failure, fear of success), which reduces the inclination to achieve.

Extending the fear of success construct to explain the failure of women to enter traditionally male-dominated occupations, Horner (1972) observed: "Most feminine women when faced with a conflict between their feminine image and expressing their competencies or developing their abilities and interests adjust their behaviors to their internalized sex-role stereotypes ...In order to feel or appear more feminine women disguise their abilities and withdraw from the mainstream of thought, nontraditional aspirations, and achievement in our society." [p. 67].

In a recent study, Anderson (1978) compared the self descriptions of college women who scored high on fear of success with those who scored low. Women exhibiting (FOS) were generally career oriented but aspired to

traditional female occupations and were less concerned with making a major contribution to their field. Women not exhibiting fear of success were more likely to choose a traditional female occupation and their mothers were more likely to be employed in a traditional field. Further, women high in FOS reported lower expression of affection, lower self-concept, higher self-criticism and higher external locus of control than women who did not fear success. Consistent with Anderson's findings, Wood (1976) failed to obtain sex differences in FOS in a sample of executives in the corporate offices of the Atlantic Richfield Company. Presumably, women who fear success are hesitant to enter male dominated fields.

Conclusion

It appears that there is nothing inherently associated with femaleness which should preclude the ascendence of women into management positions. The source of those barriers which do exist appear to stem from the willingness of both men and women to subscribe to the validity of sex role stereotypes. Recent reviews of the sex difference literature emphasize the extent of similarity between the sexes (Maccoby & Jaklin, 1974; Rosenberg & Sutton-Smith, 1973). As Hall and Hall (1975) have recently suggested, barriers to women's occupational advancement have been amply documented. The time has come to focus on the ways in which these barriers can be overcome, through both individual and organizational actions. The subtle differences between men and women appear to primarily reflect differences in expected role behaviors acquired via the socialization process. As society turns toward a reexamination of the meaning and function of sex role stereotypes, increased self awareness may reduce the effect of stereotypic barriers to women's career aspirations.

Hall (1974) has argued persuasively that equal employment opportunity plus low organizational support equals discrimination for women. To the extent that organizational support for women's success is low that very success is less likely self reinforcing. Thus merely placing women in positions of responsibility and autonomy may increase the probability that women in such positions will fail, thereby confirming their own worst expectations.

As Frieze et al. (1975) have recently suggested, the cognitions of women regarding their achievement reflect cultural reality. Until the external stereotypically based pressures blocking achievement are removed it cannot reasonably be anticipated that many women will engage in the achievement-directed behaviors necessary to the occupational ladder to success. Women need organizational support, not because they are fragile, but because in most competitive contexts their achievement related behaviors are likely to be labeled deviant.

Increasing employment opportunities for women represents a small first step toward equalizing the distribution of men and women in the labor force. However, it appears that a concerted effort to modify existing societal attitudes, to provide environmental support for dealing with the real pressures arising from role conflicts, and to redefine the exclusively male managerial model will be required to diminish the impact of the pervasive stereotypes which seem to be remarkably effective in "keeping women in their place"--out of the managerial suite.

References

Allport, G. W. The nature of prejudice. New York: Doubleday, 1958.

Anderson, R. Motive to avoid success: A profile. Sex Roles, 1978, 4(2), 239-248.

Atkinson, J. W., & Feather, N. T. A theory of achievement motivation. New York: Wiley, 1966.

Bakan, D. The duality of human existence. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.

Bardwick, J. M. The psychology of women: A study of biosocial conflict. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.

Bar-Tal, D., & Frieze, I. H. Achievement motivation and gender as determinants of attributions for success and failure. Unpublished manuscript, University of Pittsburg, 1973.

Bass, B. M., Krusell, J., & Alexander, R. H. Male manager's attitudes toward working women. American Behavioral Scientist, 1971, 15, 77-83.

Bayer, A. E., & Astin, H. S. Sex differentials in the academic reward system. Science, 1975, 188, 796-801.

Bem, S. L. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 165-172.

Bem, S. L., & Bem, D. J. Case study of a non-conscious ideology: Training the woman to know her place. In D. J. Bem, Beliefs, attitudes, and human affairs. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole, 1970, 80-99.

Bowman, G. What helps or harms promotability. Harvard Business Review, 1964, 42(1), 6-26, 184-196.

Bowman, G., Wortney, B. N., & Greyser, S. H. Are women executives people? Harvard Business Review, 1965, 43(4), 14-28, 164-178.

Broverman, I. K., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., Rosenkrantz, P., & Vogel, S. R. Sex-role stereotypes and clinical judgments of mental health. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1970, 34, 1-7.

Broverman, I. K., Vogel, S. R., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., & Rosenkrantz, P. S. Sex-role stereotypes: A current appraisal. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 59-78.

Buzenberg, E. Educating women to be executives. Paper presented at the Midwest Academy of Management Conference, April, 1975.

Campbell, D. P. The clash between beautiful women and science. In A. Theodore (Ed.), The professional woman. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman, 1971.

Carlson, R. Stability and change in the adolescent's self image. Child Psychology, 1965, 36, 659-666.

Carlson, R. Sex differences in ego functioning: Exploratory studies of agency and communion. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1971, 37, 267-277.

Carlson, R., & Levy, N. Brief method for assessing social-personal orientation. Psychological Reports, 1968, 23, 911-914.

Cecil, E. H., Paul, B. J., & Olins, R. A. Perceived importance of selected variables used to evaluate male and female job applicants. Personnel Psychology, 1973, 26, 397-404.

Cohen, S. L., & Bunker, K. A. Subtle effects of sex role stereotypes on recruiter's hiring decisions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 566-572.

Constantinople, A. Masculinity-femininity: An exception to a famous dictum. Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 80(5), 389-407.

Cook, S. W. Motives in a conceptual analysis of attitude related behavior. In W. J. Arnold & D. Levine (Eds.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation (Vol. 17). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1969.

Crandall, V. C. Sex differences in expectancy of intellectual and academic reinforcement. In C. P. Smith (Ed.), Achievement related motives in children. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969.

Croke, J. A. Sex differences in causal attributions and expectancies for success as a function of the sex-role appropriateness of the task. Unpublished manuscript, University of California at Los Angeles, 1973.

Crowley, J. E., Levitan, T. E., & Quinn, R. P. Seven deadly half truths about women. Psychology Today, 1973, 6(10), 94-96.

Day, D. R., & Stogdill, R. M. Leader behavior of male and female supervisors: A comparative study. Personnel Psychology, 1972, 25, 353-360.

Deaux, K. The behavior of women and men. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole, 1976.

Deaux, K., & Emswiller, T. Explanations of successful performance on sex-linked tasks: What's skill for the male is luck for the female. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 29, 80-85.

Deaux, K., & Farris, E. Attributing causes for one's performance: The effects of sex, norms, and outcomes. Unpublished manuscript, Purdue University, 1974.

Deaux, K., & Taynor, J. Evaluation of male and female ability: Bias works two ways. Psychological Reports, 1973, 32, 261-262.

Deci, E. C. Intrinsic motivation, extrinsic reinforcement, and inequity. Journal Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 22, 113-120.

Depner, C. E. A multidimensional investigation of sex differences in achievement motivation. Unpublished manuscript, University of Michigan, 1975.

Depner, C. E., & O'Leary, V. E. Understanding female careerism: Fear of success and new directions. Sex Roles, 1976, 2(3), 259-268.

Dipboye, R. L. Women as managers--stereotypes and realities. Survey of Business, 1975, May/June, 22-26.

Dipboye, R. L., Fromkin, H. L., & Wibach, K. Relative importance of applicant sex, attractiveness, and scholastic standing in evaluation of job applicants. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 39-45.

Douvan, E., & Adelson, J. The adolescent experience. New York: Wiley, 1966.

Farris, E., & Deaux, K. The effects of sex-linkage of task and sex of competitors on attributions of another's performance. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Psychological Association, Chicago, May, 1977.

Fay, T. L. Ideal and typical males and females: Stereotypes in three cultures. Paper presented at the 83rd Convention of the American Psychological Association, Chicago, 1975.

Feldman-Summers, S., & Kiesler, S. Those who are number two try harder: The effects of sex on attributions of causality. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 30, 846-855.

Feather, N. T. Attribution of responsibility and valence of success and failure in relation to initial confidence and task performance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 13, 129-144.

Feather, N. T. Positive and negative reactions to male and female success and failure in relation to the perceived status and sex-typed appropriateness of occupations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31(3), 536-548.

Fernberger, S. W. Persistence of stereotypes concerning sex differences. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1948, 43, 97-101.

Fidell, L. S. Empirical verification of sex discrimination in hiring practices in psychology. American Psychologist, 1970, 24, 1094-1098.

Field, W. F. The effects on thematic apperception of certain experimentally aroused needs. In D. McClelland, J. W. Atkinson, R. A. Clark, & E. L. Lowell (Eds.), The achievement motive. New York: Appleton-Century-Croft, 1953.

Frank, L. K., & Frank, M. How to be a woman. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1954.

French, E. G., & Lesser, G. S. Some characteristics of the achievement motive in women. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 68, 119-129.

Friedrich, L. K. Achievement motivation in college women revisited: Implications for women, men, and the gathering of coconuts. Sex Roles, 1976, 2(1), 47-61.

Frieze, I. H. Women's expectations for and causal attributions of success and failure. In M. T. S. Mednick, S. S. Tangri, & L. W. Hoffman (Eds.), Women and achievement. New York: Wiley, 1975, 158-171.

Frieze, I. H., & Bar-Tal, D. Achievement motivation and gender as determinants of success and failure. Unpublished manuscript, University of Pittsburgh, 1974.

Frieze, I. H., Fisher, J., McHugh, M. C., & Valle, V. A. Attributing causes of success and failure: Internal and external barriers to achievement in women. Paper presented at the Conference on New Directions for Research on Women, Madison, Wisconsin, 1975.

Goldberg, P. H. Are women prejudiced against women? Transaction, 1968, 5, 28-30.

Haefner, J. E. Race, age, sex, and competence as factors in employee selection of the disadvantaged. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1977, 62, 199-202.

Hagen, R. L., & Kahn, A. Discrimination against competent women. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 1975, 5(4), 362-376.

Hall, D. T. Equal employment opportunity + low support = discrimination. Paper presented at the Annual meetings of the Academy of Management, New Orleans, 1974.

Hall, D. T., & Hall, F. S. Research on organizational career development: Where are we, and where do we go from here? Paper presented at the Cornell Career Development Seminar, School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, 1975.

Heilman, M. E., & Grazzo, R. A. The perceived cause of work success as a mediator of sex discrimination in organizations. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, in press.

Helmreich, R. L., & Spence, J. T. The work and family orientation questionnaire: An objective instrument to assess components of achievement motivation and attitudes toward family and career. Journal Supplement Abstract Service, in press.

Hoffman, L. W. Early childhood experiences and women's achievement motives. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 129-155.

Hollander, J. Sex differences in sources of social self esteem. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1972, 38, 343-347.

Horner, M. S. Sex differences in achievement motivation and performance in competitive and noncompetitive situations. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1968.

Horner, M. S. Toward an understanding of achievement-related conflicts in women. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 157-175.

Horner, M. S., & Walsh, M. R. Causes and consequences of existing psychological barriers to self actualization. In R. B. Kundsin (Ed.), Women and success: The anatomy of achievement. New York: William Morrow & Co., Inc., 1974.

House, W. C. Actual and perceived differences in male and female expectancies and minimal goal levels as a function of competition. Journal of Personality, 1974, 42, 493-509.

Katz, M. L. Female motive to avoid success: A psychological barrier or response to deviancy? Unpublished manuscript, Princeton, NJ: ETS, 1973.

Kidd, T. R., & Woodman, W. F. Sex and orientations toward winning in sports. Research Quarterly, 1975, 46(4), 476-483.

Kipnis, D. M. Inner direction, other direction, and achievement motivation. Human Development, 1974, 17(5), 321-343.

Korman, A. K. Toward a hypothesis of work behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1970, 54, 31-41.

Lenney, E. Women's self-confidence in achievement settings. Psychological Bulletin, 1977, 84(1), 1-13.

Lesser, G. S., Krawitz, R., & Packard, R. Experimental arousal of achievement motivation in adolescent girls. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 66(1), 59-66.

Levitan, T., Quinn, R. P., & Staines, G. L. Sex discrimination against the American working woman. American Behavioral Scientist, 1971, 15, 237-254.

Loring, R., & Wells, T. Breakthrough: Women in management. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1972.

Lunnenborg, P. W. Stereotypic aspects in masculinity-femininity measurement. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 34, 113-118.

Lynch, E. M. The executive suite: Feminine style. New York: AMACOM, 1973.

Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. The psychology of sex differences. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1974.

McGregor, D. The professional manager. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

McKee, J. P., & Sherriffs, A. C. The differential evaluation of males and females. Journal of Personality, 1957, 24, 356-371.

McKee, J. P., & Sherriffs, A. C. Men's and women's beliefs, ideals, and self concepts. American Journal of Sociology, 1959, 65, 356-363.

McMahan, I. D. Sex differences in expectancies for success as a function of task. Paper presented at the Eastern Psychological Association meetings, New York, April, 1972. (a)

McMahan, I.D. Sex differences in causal attribution following success and failure. Paper presented at the Eastern Psychological Association, New York, 1972. (b)

Mednick, M. T. S., & Weissman, J. The psychology of women--Selected topics. Annual Review of Psychology, 1975, 26, 1-18.

Minahan, J. Sharon Kirkman: Mind over myth. American Way, 1975 (August), 13, 15 & 17.

Montanelli, D. S., & Hill, K. T. Children's expectations of performance as a function of two consecutive reinforcements. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 13, 115-128.

Murphy, L. K. Ambiguity, sex, cognitive complexity: Effects upon treatment of subordinate personnel. Paper presented at the annual meetings of American Psychological Association, San Francisco, August, 1977.

Peters, L. H., Terborg, J. R., & Taynor, J. Women as managers scale (WAMS): A measure of attitudes toward women in management positions. JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 1974, (Ms. No. 585).

Pheterson, G. I., Kiesler, S. B., & Goldberg, P. A. Evaluation of the performance of women as a function of their sex, achievement, and personal history. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 19, 114-118.

Pleck, J. H. Male's traditional attitudes toward women: Conceptual contexts in research. Paper presented at the Conference in New Directions for Research of Women, Madison, WI, 1975.

Rogalin, W. C., & Pell, A. R. Woman's guide to management positions. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1975.

Rosen, B., & Jerdee, T. H. The influence of sex-role stereotypes on evaluations of male and female supervisory behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 57(1), 44-48.

Rosen, B., & Jerdee, T. H. Influence of sex-role stereotypes on personnel decisions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1974, 59, 9-14. (a)

Rosen, B., & Jerdee, T. H. Effects of applicant's sex and difficulty of job on evaluations of candidates for managerial positions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1974, 59, 511-512. (b)

Rosen, B., & Jerdee, T. H. Sex stereotyping in the executive suite. Harvard Business Review, 1974, 52, 45-58. (c)

Rosenberg, B. C., Sutton-Smith, B. Family structure and sex role variations. In J. K. Cole & R. Dienstbier (Eds.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1973.

Shaw, E. A. Differential impact of negative stereotyping in employee selection. Personnel Psychology, 1972, 25, 333-338.

Schein, V. Fair employment of women through personnel research. Personnel Journal, 1972, 51, 330-335.

Schein, V. E. The relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 57, 95-100.

Sherriffs, A. C., & McKee, J. P. Qualitative aspects of beliefs about men and women. Journal of Personality, 1957, 25, 451-464.

Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. Who likes competent women: Sex-role congruence of interests, and subject's attitudes toward women as determinants of interpersonal attraction. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 1972, 2, 197-213.

Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. The personal attributes questionnaire: A measure of sex role stereotypes and masculinity-femininity. JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 1974, 4, 43.

Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. Ratings of self and peers on sex-role attributes and their relation to self esteem and conception of masculinity and femininity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 32, 29-39.

Staines, G., Travis, C., & Jayaratte, T. The queen-bee syndrome. Psychology Today, 1974, 7(8), 55-60.

Stein, A. H., & Bailey, M. M. The socialization of achievement motivation in females. Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 80, 345-366.

Steinman, H., & Fox, D. J. Male-female perceptions of the female role in the United States. Journal of Psychology, 1966, 64, 265-276.

Steinman, H., & Fox, D. J. The male dilemma. New York: Jason Aronson, 1974.

Terborg, J. R. & Ilgen, D. R. A theoretical approach to sex discrimination in traditionally masculine occupations. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1975.

Terborg, J. R., Peters, L. H., Ilgen, D. R., & Smith, F. Organizational and personal correlates of attitudes toward women as managers. Unpublished manuscript, Purdue University, 1974.

Touhey, J. C. Effects of additional women professionals on ratings of occupational prestige and desirability. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 29, 86-89. (a)

Touhey, J. C. Effects of additional men on prestige and desirability of occupations typically performed by women. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1974, 4(4), 330-335. (b)

Trieman, D. J., & Terrell, K. Sex and the process of status attainment: A comparison of working women and men. American Sociological Review, 1975, 40, 174-200.

Unger, R. K., & Siiter, R. Sex-role stereotypes: The weight of a grain of truth. Paper presented at the Eastern Psychological Association meeting, Philadelphia, April, 1974.

U. S. Department of Commerce, Council of Economic Advisors, "Where women stand in the professions," 1973.

Vaughter, R., Gubernick, D., Matassian, J., & Haslett, B. Sex differences in academic expectations and achievement. Paper presented at the 82nd Convention of the American Psychological Association, New Orleans, 1974.

Veroff, J. Social comparison and the development of achievement motivation. In C. P. Smith (Ed.), Achievement-related motives in children. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969.

Veroff, J. Process vs. impact on men's and women's achievement motivation. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1977, 1(3), 283-293.

Veroff, J. Discovering dimensions of achievement motivation by studying women's achievement strivings. Society for the Advancement of Social Psychology Newsletter, 1978, 4(4), 12.

Veroff, J. McClelland, L., & Ruhland, D. Varieties of achievement motivation. In M. T. S. Mednick, S. S. Tangri, & L. W. Hoffman (Eds.), Women and achievement. New York: Wiley, 1975.

Williams, M. C. The new executive woman. Radnor, PA: Chilton Book Co., 1977.

Wood, M. M. Women in management. How is it working out? Advanced Management Journal, 1976, 41, 22-30.

Zander, A., Fuller, R., & Armstrong, W. Attributed pride or shame in a group and self. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 23(3), 346-352.