

result (Tropp & Bianchi, 2006). For minorities, mentioning group membership does not break any taboos, but it can be interpreted positively or negatively depending on who does it and how it occurs. In particular, if it leads them to anticipate prejudice, it undermines trust and acceptance (Tropp, Stout, Boatswain, Wright, & Pettigrew, 2006). Exposure to prejudice understandably makes people feel anxious and hostile (Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey, 1999; Dion & Earn, 1975; Tropp, 2003). Each group's expectations about the other's prejudice depend on the salience of group membership and whether one will be viewed as typical (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005b).

In any case, contact is a more dramatic issue in interracial prejudice than in sexism or ageism because people are more segregated by race than by gender or age. We turn to the distinctive features of these categories in the next sections.

Table 12.5 Effects of intergroup contact by target groups

Outgroup type	Correlation between contact and prejudice
Sexual orientation	-.27
Physical disability	-.24
Race, ethnicity	-.21
Mental disability	-.21
Mental illness	-.18
Elderly	-.18

Note: Higher absolute values indicate greater reduction of prejudice; contact with homosexuals greatly reduces anti-gay prejudice, whereas contact with the elderly reduces prejudice to a lesser degree.

Source: Adapted from Pettigrew & Tropp (2006)

GENDER PREJUDICE HAS BUILT-IN AMBIVALENCE

In contrast to racism, sexism has interested social psychologists only relatively recently (Deaux & LaFrance, 1998; J. T. Spence, Deaux, & Helmreich, 1985). These few decades of gender research reflect three particular aspects of American culture (and probably most developed cultures): gender polarization, i.e., categorical divides instead of overlapping continua; androcentrism, i.e., maleness as the neutral norm; and biological essentialism, i.e., focusing on genetic predispositions more than socialization (S. L. Bem, 1993). Although all these features also occur for race, they take a different form in gender prejudices. Notable features of gender prejudice interact with cognition, as this section moves from (a) men's and women's unique structural relationships of heterosexual interdependence and male power in society, to (b) the resulting mixed, prescriptive stereotypes and ambivalent prejudices, to (c) biological and social bases of gender prejudice.

Intimate Interdependence and Male Status

Compared to the intense segregation of interethnic contact, men and women certainly have plenty of contact, and of the most intimate kinds. As far as we know, no one proposes to overcome sexism by increased intergroup contact. Of course, only equal-status intergroup contact reduces prejudice, and the genders don't often have that. One exceptional feature of gender as an intergroup boundary is how much each ingroup needs the outgroup, more than any other societal groups. We could not very well measure this odd ingroup–outgroup relation by the classic Bogardus (1933) social distance scale, wherein allowing the group into one's country reflects superficial acceptance, and allowing members of the group into one's family by marriage reflects intimate acceptance. Certainly both men and women would endorse all levels of social interaction. Viewed this way, men and women accept each other completely. Male–female interdependence is a wonderful fact of life.

At the same time, every culture shows male status: In society at large, men dominate women, holding more positions of power in business and government and scoring higher on development indices such as education, health, and literacy (United Nations Entity, 2012). Even in the United States, women still earn far less than comparable men (82%) (United States Department of Labor, 2012), and in dual-career couples, women work a double shift – regular hours at work and longer hours at home than men do (Business and Professional Women's Foundation, 2005; Crosby, 1991; F. M. Deutsch, 1999). Female-headed households (even without children) are more likely to be in poverty than comparable male households. Women are injured and killed by men far more often than vice versa. Female fetuses are more often aborted, and female infants are more often killed at birth. For social cognition, what is remarkable is the combination of intimacy and unequal status that creates the cognitive background for gender prejudice.

Expectations for male status but heterosexual intimacy particularly clash when the typical hierarchy reverses, as when women take leadership roles in traditionally male domains. Female leaders provide a case study of gender-role tension, expressed both cognitively and affectively. Perceived incongruity between the roles expected of leaders and women suggests that (a) women will have more challenges to become leaders, being viewed more negatively as potential leaders, and (b) when they are leaders, the same leaderlike behavior will be evaluated more negatively in a woman compared to a man (Eagly & Karau, 2002).

A remarkable series of meta-analyses supports this **role congruity theory**. Leadership is traditionally a male domain (Koenig, Eagly, Mitchell, & Ristikari, 2011; see Table 12.6), and gender roles are certainly expressed in behavior (Eagly & Carli, 2007). Regarding the emergence of leaders, men more often do lead initially leaderless groups in the laboratory and in the field (Eagly & Karau, 1991), especially in tasks that do not require complex social interaction. However, women more often emerge as social leaders, consistent with gender roles. When women do lead organizations, they do not differ from men on task versus interpersonal orientations, contrary to stereotypes. But they do lead in a more democratic

and participatory, less autocratic or directive style than men (Eagly & Johnson, 1990). Moreover, they are equally as effective as men, though less so in masculine roles and in male-dominated settings (Eagly, Karau, & Makhijani, 1995). Consistent with the effectiveness data, women are evaluated negatively when they lead in a stereotypically masculine style (especially directive or autocratic) or in a male-dominated role, and particularly from male evaluators (Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, 1992). Despite these barriers, women are nearly as motivated to manage as men are (Eagly, Karau, Miner, & Johnson, 1994). In one study, both implicit and explicit gender beliefs (associating men with high authority and women with low authority), respectively, correlated with implicit and explicit prejudice against female authority (Rudman & Kilianski, 2000). Thus people's expectations about gender reflect in part the statistical averages (more men in charge), but the expectations do not take account of variability around those means, nor do they acknowledge the nuances of leadership styles and the interplay of gender, behavior, and negative evaluations of role-incongruent behavior.

The incongruity between expectations about gender and job roles doubtless occurs beyond leadership. Women and men are differentially distributed into homemaker and employee roles, which guides gender stereotypes (Eagly & Steffen, 1984), maintaining both intimate interdependence and male status. Within employment, stereotypes of occupations fit two dimensions of gender and prestige (Glick, Wilk, & Perreault, 1995), and these images reflect the actual sex-segregation of employment (Cejka & Eagly, 1999). Women in nontraditional jobs probably face similar prejudice to that facing women leaders: difficulty entering the jobs and difficulty receiving fair evaluations. As a whole, this work engages cognitive factors, such as role expectations, stereotypes, and incongruity, with effects on attitudes (evaluations) but also on more complex affective responses.

Table 12.6 Masculinity of leader stereotypes, from meta-analyses of three paradigms

Paradigm	Database	Result
<i>Think manager–think male paradigm</i> , compares gender & leader stereotypes (Schein, 1973)	40 studies, 51 effects	Leader-women similarity = .25 Leader-men similarity = .62
<i>Agency–communion paradigm</i> , compares stereotypes of leaders' agency & communion (Powell & Butterfield, 1979)	22 studies, 47 effects	Agency > communion
<i>Masculinity–femininity paradigm</i> , stereotypes of leader-related occupations (Shinar, 1975)	7 studies, 101 effects	Greater masculinity

Source: Koenig, Eagly, Mitchell, & Ristikari (2011)

Emotionally Mixed, Prescriptive Stereotypes and Ambivalent Prejudices

The backlash directed at men and women who do not conform to gender stereotypes suggests that people take their gender prejudices personally; these beliefs and emotions hit home. When women self-promote, for example, they may gain attributed competence, but they lose attributed social attractiveness (and hireability), an apparent backlash (Rudman, 1998). When either men or women succeed in gender-atypical ways, their competitors sabotage them (Rudman & Fairchild, 2004). Such processes maintain cultural stereotypes as well as personal values.

Consequently, women must temper their “masculine” (**agentic**) side with “feminine” (**communal**) warmth (Rudman & Glick, 1999, 2001); Ann Hopkins learned this the hard way in a high-powered accounting firm, and social cognitive psychology – categorization and stereotyping – explained why in her Supreme Court case (S. T. Fiske, Bersoff, Borgida, Deaux, & Heilman, 1991). Prescriptions for female communality arguably reinforce the status quo (Jackman, 1994; Ridgeway, 2001). Emphasis on feminine warmth results from men depending on women for sexual relations and domestic duties, which require a loving and morally pure partner (Glick & Fiske, 2001). Stereotypes describe the typical woman as sentimental, superstitious, and emotional; the warmth aspect fits the **prescriptive** ideal whereas the sentimental aspect is merely a **descriptive stereotype** (Ruble & Ruble, 1982). Female stereotypic traits carry less economic value but form an important piece of the intimate interdependence. Female gender-deviants risk their heterosexual interdependence, according to these lines of research. Women perhaps rightly believe that behaving in too masculine a manner would forfeit heterosexual romance (Rudman & Heppen, 2003).

Conversely, stereotypically male traits carry more economic value (agency, competence) and reinforce male status because women traditionally depend on men for economic security and social prestige. Across cultures, the typical man is stereotyped as adventurous, independent, strong, and active; this descriptive stereotype also fits the prescriptive ideal (Ruble & Ruble, 1982). Prescriptive stereotypes reinforce heterosexual interdependence along with male societal dominance (Rudman & Glick, 2008).

Intimate interdependence and male status together create **ambivalent sexism** that incorporates hostility toward women who violate gender prescriptions and benevolence toward women who uphold them (Glick & Fiske, 2001; Chapter 11). One metaphor is the cultural carrot of benevolent sexism (BS) and the cultural stick of hostile sexism (HS). BS prescribes cherished but paternalistic stereotypes for women in traditional gender roles, liked but disrespected, whereas HS targets women who take nontraditional roles, respected but disliked. In line with these analyses of ambivalent sexism, more men than women on average do endorse hostile sexism in 19 countries (Glick et al., 2000). Men also on average endorse benevolent sexism more, although the gap is smaller, and in a few of the most sexist countries, women endorse it more. (In the worst settings, the benevolent sexism pedestal looks good, even if confining.)

All these patterns fit the idea that men have more to gain than women do from enforcing proscriptions against nontraditional roles for women (hostile sexism) because it helps to maintain their traditionally more powerful role. Conversely, women have less to lose from endorsing prescriptions for traditional roles (benevolent sexism) than they do from endorsing hostile sexism. BS has some advantages (e.g., chivalry), and women do not always view it as sexism (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005; Kilianski & Rudman, 1998), but it does undermine their performance (Dardenne, Dumont, & Bollier, 2007). Hostile and benevolent sexism are correlated, but they have distinct meanings. BS predicts positive (likable, moral) stereotypes of traditional women, and HS predicts negative (cold, untrustworthy) stereotypes of nontraditional women, reflecting the fundamental ambivalence.

As a cognitive belief system, ambivalent sexism has consequences. Women as well as men endorse both forms of sexism to some extent, and national averages predict UN indices of gender inequality across nations. Prejudices about men also predict gender inequality across nations (Glick et al., 2004), probably because they stereotype men as less pleasant but more powerful than women; in effect, men are stereotypically designed for dominance. For both male and female targets, gender prejudice is not a simple form of antipathy but fundamentally an ambivalent, mixed set of emotions.

Gender prejudice has interpersonal consequences beyond its link to gender inequality on a national scale (wages, education, health). For example, gender prejudice creates everyday hassles. In a diary study, college women reported one or two weekly sexist incidents (defined as stereotyping, prejudice, degrading comments, sexual objectification), and these incidents undermined their psychological well-being (Swim, Hyers, Cohen, & Ferguson, 2001). Although women mostly do not respond directly, they stew about it in private (Swim & Hyers, 1999); this preoccupation could stress physical as well as mental health.

Biological and Social Bases of Gender Prejudice

Besides social structural perceptions of heterosexual interdependence and male status, with the resulting ambivalent prejudices, both biological-evolutionary and cultural explanations have been offered for the interplay of gender beliefs and feelings. In particular, sex differences in behavior and in mate preferences have attracted social-cognitive theories about why they occur and how they translate into stereotypes and prejudices. Here are some of the commonsense but provocative facts backed up by meta-analysis of sex differences: Girls show more effort at self-control (inhibition and perceptual sensitivity), whereas boys are more active and intense (Else-Quest, Hyde, Goldsmith, & Van Hulle, 2006). Men are more physically aggressive than women, who are more socially aggressive (Eagly & Steffen, 1986). Men are more heroically helpful than women, who are more helpful in long-term, caring ways (Eagly & Crowley, 1986). As noted earlier, men are more likely to emerge as leaders in task-oriented groups, whereas women are more likely to emerge as social leaders

(Eagly & Karau, 1991). Women more often seek older mates with higher status and good earning capacity; men more often want younger mates who are physically attractive but also good housekeepers and cooks (Buss, 1989). Researchers, like other people, are fond of contrasting the sexes (Eagly & Wood, 1991).

Some favor explaining such gender differences in evolutionary terms. In particular, derivations from the **parental investment models** argue that women have always had to invest more in reproduction because of pregnancy and nursing, whereas men's required biological investment is minimal (Trivers, 1985). From this, the argument runs, men are promiscuous, and women are choosy. Men seek fertile mates to maximize their reproductive capacity, and women seek mates with resources to ensure their reproductive success (Buss & Schmitt, 1993). Women do indeed weigh social class and ambition higher than do men, who weigh attractiveness higher than do women (Feingold, 1992). The evolutionary explanations are appealing in their simplicity and apparent reliance on biology, though testing them is complicated (Buss & Kenrick, 1998). Also, unlike race, one can easily argue for the ancestral conditions that would have made automatically perceiving gender to be adaptive (Cosmides et al., 2003).

Other researchers favor explaining the same differences in sociocultural terms. **Social role theory** also addresses gender differences in social behavior. It starts with the division of labor between men and women, which guides both gender-role expectations and sex-typed skills and beliefs, which together guide sex differences in behavior (Eagly & Wood, 1999). Cross-cultural variation in mate preferences, for example, correlates with cultural variations in social structure: namely, gender inequality. A **biosocial approach** acknowledges biological differences in average size and parental investment, as well as nearly universal but culturally moderated divisions of labor. The contrast with more evolutionary theories is that the biosocial approach argues for social forces as explaining most of the variance. This approach also highlights the enormous joint contributions that men and women make to child rearing and earning (W. Wood & Eagly, 2002).

The most comprehensive account of cognitions and prejudices about gender will require integrative approaches that combine biological and social realities. In the end, the gender similarities are greater than the differences, and most differences are small (Hyde, 2005). For example, regarding mate preference, across 37 cultures everyone first specifies kindness, intelligence, and social skills in a prospective mate (Buss, 1989). Both biological and cultural factors matter to gender differences in behavior, and both underlie gender stereotyping and prejudice.

AGE PREJUDICE AWAITS ALL OF US

This section examines prejudice against older adults. (Age prejudice includes biases against children too, but scant research has addressed this topic.) Although a host of negative adjectives stereotype older adults (Kite & Johnson, 1988), age stigma is mixed