AFFECT CONTROL THEORY AND GENDERED OCCUPATIONS

by

Leanne Barry

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
The University of North Carolina at Charlotte
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts in
Sociology

Charlotte

2018

Approved by:

_____
Dr. Lisa Slattery Walker

_____
Dr. Murray Webster

_____
Dr. Sarah Pollock

ABSTRACT

LEANNE BARRY. Affect Control Theory and Gendered Occupations.
(Under the direction of DR. LISA SLATTERY WALKER)

Gender is widely considered to be a major contributing factor in workplace inequality. This is largely due to the gendering of occupations by labelling certain jobs as more appropriate for one gender than the other. In this paper, I examine gendered occupations and how they are perceived through two studies. The first study uses occupations from an existing Affect Control Theory dictionary to obtain information about which jobs are considered gendered. The second study uses these gendered occupations to measure how perceptions of individuals differ when they are in occupations that are expected or unexpected for their gender. The findings of this study may have implications for the study of gendered occupations as well as the examination of hiring practices and discrimination.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

Gender is widely considered to be a major contributing factor in workplace inequality (Williams 2013). This is largely due to the gendering of occupations by labelling certain jobs as more appropriate for one gender than the other, the most noticeable of which is inequality of pay for positions that are dominated by men or women (Alksnis, Desmarais, and Curtis 2008). This project aims to examine gendered occupations through mathematical sociological theory, and in particular to measure how people perceive individuals whose jobs are not viewed as appropriate for their gender. While biological sex and gender are separate constructs with different meanings, this paper will focus on gender as an outward portrayal due to the social context of work and work-related interactions with other people. Additionally, the spectrum of gender will be simplified to men and women in order to group occupations into categories that would be understandable to most people.

GENDER AND WORK

Societal expectations for behavior based on one's gender are referred to as gender norms. Since gender norms are commonly used to frame social interactions, these expectations are present in most aspects of daily life, particularly in organizational settings (Ridgeway 2009). These norms dictate implicit and explicit expectations for how people present themselves and behave in social situations, including the expression of gender and how people behave in the workplace. There are several ways in which occupations may be considered gendered; when they are specifically defined or conceptualized in gendered ways, when the majority of positions are held by people of

one gender, or when they are ideologically described in ways that are based on norms of hegemonic masculinity and femininity (Britton 2000).

For example, increasingly woman-dominated occupations tend to experience devaluation in both status and pay due to the norm of femininity being less valued in society than masculinity (Busch 2017). Since this process is based on meanings and characteristics of the occupation, gendering of an occupation can also take place independently from the proportion of workers that are of that gender (Irvine and Vermilya 2010). This gendering of occupations then has consequences for people of both genders in the workplace. For example, the phenomenon of the glass ceiling describes how women in professions dominated by men are often prevented from obtaining higher positions in the workplace, while the glass escalator phenomenon states that men in professions dominated by women often receive unfair advantages such as faster promotions and higher pay (Williams 2013).

POLICING GENDER

Since gender is an outward expression, one's gender identity and expression may not always align with the expectations of others based on their perceptions of that individual; that is, how one does gender may not always align with gender norms (West and Zimmerman 1987). When individuals break gender norms, others often police them by reacting in ways meant to punish norm-breaking and encourage the individuals to conform to expectations (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005). This practice is so common that it is often regarded as one of the main ways in which adolescent males learn the norms of hegemonic masculinity (Pascoe 2005). Policing takes many forms, from avoidance or subtle comments to direct confrontation. The form which policing takes

depends largely on situational context – who is breaking the norm, what norm is being broken, and who is observing or reacting to the offense. In the case of gender, the norm of hegemonic masculinity dictates that men should aim to be as masculine as possible, and men who break this norm are often policed harshly through name calling and other means (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005; Pascoe 2005).

It has also been observed that men participating in feminine activities are often judged, and thus likely policed, more harshly than women participating in masculine activities (Kane 2006). Kane's study primarily refers to parents' perceptions of their children's behavior, but the base elements of gender roles and policing extend throughout one's lifespan, so it is possible that these same mentalities extend to adulthood and the workplace as well. Men in feminine occupations and women in masculine occupations often have to develop different coping strategies to deal with the conflict between their jobs and gender identities, as well as how others react to this kind of norm-breaking (Irvine and Vermilya 2010). Gender policing in the workplace is also related to harassment behaviors based on gender and sexual orientation (Konik and Cortina 2008). This means that there may be increased incidences of harassment behaviors or discrimination in occupations where gender is particularly salient.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Affect Control Theory (ACT) provides a mathematical representation of how people perceive and respond to social situations, and the application of this theory can help predict how people will behave in specific situations. A social situation is modeled by this theory as a directed social behavior, wherein an actor deliberately performs a specific behavior toward another person, who is labeled the object. The mathematical representation is based on ratings of three dimensions, with a scale of -4 to 4 on each dimension. These dimensions are evaluation, which measures how good or bad the subject is; potency, which measures strength or weakness; and activity, which ranges from passive to active. A list of labels used in ACT and the mean ratings on each dimension for each item is collectively known within the theory as a dictionary (Smith-Lovin 1987a).

When the reality of a situation does not match one's internalized expectations, deflection occurs, causing the evaluation, potency, and activity ratings of the in-context item to differ from the overall ratings, usually in a negative direction (Robinson and Smith-Lovin 2006). Since deflection refers to any difference between expected and observed ratings, this definition can also be extended to situations where the mean evaluation, potency, and activity ratings for a label collected from a sample differ from the ratings found in an existing dictionary.

ACT ratings are particularly useful in the study of gender because the numerical ratings on each dimension are very different for gender labels. For example, the dictionary in the program *Interact* lists ratings for *male* as 1.85, 2.12. 1.38, which

indicates that people generally perceive men as moderately good, strong, and active. The dictionary entry for *female* is 0.75, -0.65, 0.18, which indicates that people generally perceive women as only slightly good, specifically weak, and hardly active (Francis and Heise 2006).

The ratings for some occupations reflect these gendered ratings, as well. *Interact* defines *nurse* as 1.65, 0.93, 0.34, indicating that nurses are generally perceived as moderately good, somewhat strong, and slightly active (Francis and Heise 2006). Nursing also tends to be labelled as a feminine occupation, which makes sense from this theoretical perspective, since the ratings between *nurse* and *female* are similar. This means that the modified label *female nurse* may yield ratings similar to those for just *nurse*, resulting in a low level of deflection. In contrast, the label *male nurse* may be rated very differently and result in a high level of deflection. As previously mentioned, people who break gender norms are typically reacted to in a negative way, just as deflection typically creates a negative effect on evaluation, potency, and activity ratings. By using ACT to measure the deflection that occurs when a subject's occupation is not typical for their gender, this study should provide a representation of the processes that go into the policing of gender norms in the workplace.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The goal of this study will be to use ACT to examine how people perceive individuals whose chosen occupations do not conform to societal gender norms. Since policing is a reaction to the breaking of gender norms, and ACT states that deflection occurs when situational expectations are not met, I predict that there will be deflection when the gender of the individual does not match the stereotypical gender of a given occupation.

Prior research has found that men engaging in feminine activities are often more harshly policed than women engaging in masculine activities (Kane 2006; Pascoe 2005). Because of this, I expect that the deflection for men in typically-feminine occupations will be greater than that for women in typically-masculine occupations.

This research could have practical applications in lines of work that are considered gendered occupations. If individuals are perceived differently at work based on gender, then customers, coworkers, and supervisors may treat them differently due to these perceptions. This may indicate that these individuals have needs that are not being met by workplace regulations and human resource standards, which could have consequences for the individual such as harassment and discrimination, as well for the organization in terms of hiring practices and turnover rates. This research may also contribute to the existing literature on gendered occupations and perceived status differences within the workplace by highlighting the differing perceptions between gendered occupations.

STUDY 1

METHODS

The first step in this study was gathering ratings for gender modifiers and occupations from an existing ACT dictionary. The dictionary used in this study comes from the *Interact* program, which includes data from 12 separate ACT studies (Francis and Heise 2006).

Item Selection

Interact has labels sorted into categories; for this study, only the *lay* and *work* categories are used. This ensured that all items were relevant to a work setting and that participants would be familiar enough with each label to rate it accurately. It has also been noted that there are gendered differences in ratings of certain types of items, such as those related to religion (Smith-Lovin 1987b). Therefore, eliminating categories with a high probability of personal bias should give more accurate ratings. Pulling all job titles and occupations from the lay and work categories and adding the label *unemployed person* yielded a list of 94 items.

The list of labels was then narrowed down in several phases. First, occupations for which gender was inherent or directly implied in the job title were removed in favor of gender-neutral titles. For example, *waiter* and *waitress* were removed, but *server* was kept on the list. Next, similar or repetitive items were removed from the list, such as removing *aide* in favor of *assistant*. Finally, in order to maintain a representative sample of occupations, the remaining items were sorted into eight categories based on the positive or negative values of ratings in each dimension. Categories with a small number

of items retained all entries; the largest category (+++) still contained too many items, so the least generalizable items were removed to reduce the risk of confusing participants. The final list of occupations contained 30 items, which can be found in Table 1.

Table 1. *Items for Study 1 and Corresponding Ratings from* Interact

Occupation	Evaluation	Potency	Activity
Army officer	0.72	1.87	1.41
Athlete	1.57	1.66	2.04
Coach	1.82	1.93	1.19
Computer expert	1.36	1.05	-0.13
Critic	-0.38	0.64	1.58
Detective	0.91	1.61	-0.30
Doctor	1.90	0.69	0.05
Entrepreneur	1.18	1.88	1.68
Executioner	-2.03	1.86	-0.73
FBI agent	1.51	2.38	0.51
Flight attendant	0.92	-0.93	0.57
Graduate student	1.40	0.94	0.26
Intern	1.31	-0.82	0.56
Judge	0.67	1.60	-0.31
Lawyer	0.52	1.06	0.80
Librarian	1.07	-0.70	-1.79
Manager	0.98	1.57	1.34
Nurse	1.65	0.93	0.34
Police officer	-0.30	0.95	0.62
Politician	-0.90	1.85	1.80
Professor	1.61	1.58	0.35
Prostitute	-1.86	-2.02	0.70
Receptionist	1.00	0.37	0.16
Salesclerk	0.73	-0.07	0.97
Schoolteacher	1.63	1.25	0.61
Scientist	1.32	1.46	-0.56
Server	1.40	0.33	1.33
Temporary worker	0.37	-0.83	0.10
Unemployed person	-1.57	-2.50	-1.60
University student	1.01	0.34	0.94

Survey

The survey for Study 1 was hosted on the online Qualtrics platform. Participants rated each occupation on a semantic differential scale from *Masculine* to *Feminine* and responded on a 9-point bipolar Likert scale, with the above labels at the extremes (see Figure 1). A convenience sample of participants were recruited through distribution of the online survey link via social media, and includes undergraduate students, graduate students, and working adults. The only restriction for recruitment was that participants must be at least 18 years of age. The consent form and directions for this survey can be found in the Appendix.

Sample

In total, 34 people responded to the survey. Of these, 4 people failed to complete the whole survey, so these responses were deleted. The remaining 30 participants consisted of 7 men and 23 women.

ANALYSIS

Since Study 1 serves mainly to compile the list of items to be used in Study 2, the primary analysis is the calculation of simple means. Since the survey was on a 9-point scale, the default values of 1 through 9 were recoded to -4 through 4 to better match standard ACT scales. In this recode, -4 indicated that the occupation was completely masculine, and 4 indicated that the occupation was completely feminine; a rating of 0 was centered on the scale and represented a truly gender-neutral occupation. Table 2 shows the overall mean gender ratings for each occupation label, as well as the mean ratings by participant gender and all standard deviations.

Table 2. *Means and Standard Deviations by Respondent Gender for Study 1*

	Total		Men		Women	
Variable	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Army Officer	-1.80	1.40	-2.57	1.27	-1.57	1.38
Athlete	-0.80	1.21	-1.00	1.15	-0.74	1.25
Coach	-1.14	1.13	-1.43	1.13	-1.05	1.13
Computer Expert	-1.47	1.28	-2.43	0.98	-1.17	1.23
Critic	-0.47	1.17	-0.86	1.07	-0.35	1.19
Detective	-0.70	1.06	-1.57	1.40	-0.43	0.79
Doctor	-0.27	0.91	-0.71	1.25	-0.13	0.76
Entrepreneur	-0.73	1.17	-1.14	1.35	-0.61	1.12
Executioner	-2.76	1.38	-3.33	0.82	-2.61	1.47
FBI Agent	-1.00	1.17	-1.43	1.27	-0.87	1.14
Flight Attendant	1.67	1.30	2.00	2.00	1.57	1.04
Graduate Student	0.67	1.32	0.14	1.86	0.83	1.11
Intern	0.10	0.88	-0.43	1.51	0.26	0.54
Judge	-0.43	0.90	-0.86	1.07	-0.30	0.82
Lawyer	-0.47	0.97	-0.71	1.60	-0.39	0.72
Librarian	1.73	1.23	2.43	1.13	1.52	1.20
Manager	0.00	0.95	-0.43	1.51	0.13	0.69
Nurse	1.57	1.01	2.14	0.38	1.39	1.08
Police Officer	-1.10	1.11	-1.57	0.79	-0.95	1.17
Politician	-1.03	1.03	-1.43	0.98	-0.91	1.04
Professor	0.10	0.92	-0.57	0.79	0.30	0.88
Prostitute	2.50	1.14	3.14	0.69	2.30	1.18
Receptionist	2.23	1.10	2.71	0.49	2.09	1.20
Salesclerk	0.57	1.25	0.14	1.21	0.70	1.26
Schoolteacher	1.69	1.11	2.14	1.07	1.55	1.10
Scientist	-0.60	0.77	-0.86	0.69	-0.52	0.79
Server	0.57	1.04	1.00	1.41	0.43	0.90
Temporary Worker	-0.31	1.23	-0.50	1.97	-0.26	1.01
Unemployed	-0.77	1.30	-1.14	1.57	-0.65	1.23
University Student	0.37	0.72	0.43	0.98	0.35	0.65

Note. N=30. -4.00 = entirely masculine, 4.00 = entirely feminine

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Since there was little difference in ratings based on respondent gender, I used the overall means to determine the list of items for Study 2. I first took the most similarly-

rated items from each end of the scale (masculine and feminine) to compile a balanced list of 16 gendered occupations.

It is interesting to note that jobs generally associated with power or authority tended to be rated as masculine, while jobs in the service industry tended to be rated as feminine. This aligns with the norms of hegemonic masculinity and femininity, wherein men are expected to be aggressive and dominant while women are expected to be passive and nurturing. Computer Expert, Doctor, and Scientist all received masculine ratings, which may be reflective of the underrepresentation of women in STEM fields. Unemployment was rated as more masculine, which seems to contradict the stereotype of women being more dependent and more likely to focus on the home than a career. This, however, may be due to the perception of women being absent from the workplace to focus on parenting, while unemployment generally implies being in the workforce but not currently employed. These observations may provide a basis for follow-up studies that look more closely at how gendered occupations align with or differ from gender norms, and whether these patterns are different within STEM fields.

STUDY 2

METHODS

Survey. The 16 items from Study 1 were combined with gender modifiers to create four groups of equal size: men in masculine jobs, men in feminine jobs, women in masculine jobs, and women in feminine jobs. Modifiers were randomly assigned to each occupation to create an equal number of men and women in each type of occupation.

I then built another survey in Qualtrics with semantic differential scales measuring perceived evaluation, potency, and activity for each modified occupation. The rating scales in ACT typically range from -4 to 4 with 0 being neutral; thus, this study used a 9-point bipolar Likert type scale to capture that range. Each label to be rated appeared on its own page of the survey with an evaluation scale labeled *Bad* to *Good,* a potency scale labeled *Weak* to *Strong*, and an activity scale labeled *Passive* to *Active*. The scales for 4 randomly selected labels were reversed (e.g. labeled *Good* to *Bad* rather than *Bad* to *Good*) to serve as an attention check and prevent response sets. Table 3 lists the full set of items as they appeared in the survey, as well as whether each survey item falls into the expected (gender-matched) or unexpected (gender-mismatched) category.

Table 3. *Survey Items for Study 2*

Page	Gender	Occupation	Category
1	Male	Army Officer	Expected
*2	Female	Computer Expert	Unexpected
3	Female	Coach	Unexpected
*4	Female	Politician	Unexpected
5	Female	FBI Agent	Unexpected
6	Male	Athlete	Expected
7	Female	Nurse	Expected

Table 3 Cont. *Survey Items for Study 2*

8	Female	Schoolteacher	Expected
*9	Male	Police Officer	Expected
10	Male	Unemployed	Expected
11	Male	Librarian	Unexpected
12	Male	Receptionist	Unexpected
*13	Male	Salesclerk	Unexpected
14	Female	Server	Expected
15	Female	Graduate Student	Expected
16	Male	Flight Attendant	Unexpected

Note. * indicates reverse-coded items.

Sample

Participants for Study 2 were recruited through Amazon's Mechanical Turk platform. The Mechanical Turk task was listed as "Assessing Occupations" and rewarded participants with one dollar upon submission of a randomly-generated completion code, which they only received when they completed the survey. The final analytical sample contained responses from 353 individuals. Of these, 186 identified as men, 165 identified as women, and 2 identified as other or preferred not to answer. Participants ranged from 19 to 71 years old, with a mean age of 35.32 (*S.D.* 10.77). A power analysis based on deflection for all three dimensions of ACT predicted a minimum required sample size of 338 individuals. Since the sample collected consisted of 353 people, the results should be generalizable.

ANALYSES

Calculating Deflection

The first step in calculating deflection is to calculate the mean participant ratings for each occupation. These ratings can be found in Table 4. The deflection for each item

is equal to the sum of squared differences between the participants' mean ratings and the dictionary values for each scale. Thus, the formula to calculate the deflection for an actor is:

$$D(A) = (Ae^i - Ae)^2 + (Ap^i - Ap)^2 + (Aa^i - Aa)^2$$

where *A* represents the actor label; *e*, *p*, and *a* represent the evaluation, potency, and activity ratings, respectively; and *i* represents the observed value as opposed to the existing dictionary entry (Nelson 2006). Table 5 shows the observed deflection, as calculated with mean survey responses as the observed ratings in comparison to the dictionary ratings for each occupation.

Table 4. Observed Item Ratings for Study 2

	Evaluation		Potency		Activity	
Label	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Female Coach	2.33	1.51	2.59	1.41	2.95	1.25
Female Computer Expert	2.11	1.96	1.23	2.09	1.13	2.22
Female FBI Agent	2.30	1.75	2.73	1.58	2.82	1.44
Female Graduate Student	2.44	1.53	1.73	1.65	2.05	1.64
Female Nurse	3.01	1.27	2.32	1.51	2.75	1.37
Female Politician	0.89	2.23	1.33	2.06	1.43	2.08
Female Schoolteacher	2.80	1.38	1.69	1.75	2.06	1.77
Female Server	2.00	1.59	1.59	1.64	2.24	1.66
Male Army Officer	1.91	1.79	2.89	1.30	3.00	1.17
Male Athlete	2.09	1.62	3.19	1.25	3.32	1.10
Male Flight Attendant	1.81	1.75	1.13	1.94	1.58	2.07
Male Librarian	2.08	1.56	0.66	1.92	0.57	2.22
Male Police Officer	1.13	2.42	1.99	2.26	2.03	2.11
Male Receptionist	1.66	1.83	0.50	1.97	0.62	2.16
Male Salesclerk	1.02	1.93	0.45	1.83	0.89	2.09
Male Unemployed	0.02	1.87	-0.05	1.92	-0.60	2.13

Table 5. *Observed Deflection Based on Study 2 Responses*

Gender and Occupation	Deflection
Female Coach	9.62
Female Computer Expert	15.31
Female FBI Agent	13.70
Female Graduate Student	12.65
Female Nurse	15.35
Female Politician	17.10
Female Schoolteacher	11.75
Female Server	10.74
Male Army Officer	11.27
Male Athlete	9.66
Male Flight Attendant	17.15
Male Librarian	19.47
Male Police Officer	20.50
Male Receptionist	12.53
Male Salesclerk	11.79
Male Unemployed	21.16

Hypothesis Testing

Since the modified occupations can be categorized by both gender and expectation, the list can be split into four equal groups of expected men, expected women, unexpected men, and unexpected women. The first step in preparing the data for testing was to calculate average deflection for each group for each respondent. I then created a meta data set composed of dummy variables for the four groups and average group deflections for each respondent as observations. Before testing my hypotheses, I ran an ANOVA to test for differences between these four groups.

My first hypothesis is that there will be greater deflection when the gender of the individual and occupation do not match. This was be tested with a one-tailed t-test between the expected group of men in masculine occupations and women with feminine occupations, and the unexpected group of men in feminine occupations and women in

masculine occupations. I then followed up with one-tailed t-tests between the expected and unexpected groups within each gender.

My second hypothesis is that men in feminine jobs will have higher levels of deflection than women in masculine jobs. This was also be tested via a one-tailed t-test, between men and women within the unexpected category.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As presented in Table 6, the ANOVA resulted in an F-statistic of 7.06 ($p < .01$). This indicates that there is at least one significant difference between the four groups. Follow-up two-tailed t-tests between groups showed that 4 of the 6 possible combinations yielded significant results; these differences were between expected men and expected women ($p < .01$), expected men and unexpected women ($p < .05$), expected women and unexpected men ($p < .01$), and between expected women and unexpected women ($p < .05$).

Table 6. *ANOVA between All Categories*

Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
m_expected	353	5523.397	15.64702	89.03868
f_expected	353	4456.394	12.62435	61.01065
m_unexpected	353	5377.457	15.23359	157.3445
f_unexpected	353	4919.436	13.93608	66.60988

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	1980.96	3	660.32	7.06	0.0001	2.6112
Within Groups	131649.30	1408	93.50			
Total	133630.30	1411				

An initial t-test between the expected and unexpected groups, ignoring gender, yielded no statistically significant results. However, when gender is accounted for, the results are quite different; unexpected occupations had higher deflection than expected ones for women ($p < .05$), while the difference between expected and unexpected occupations was not significant for men. These results can be seen in Table 7.

Table 7. *T-Tests between Unexpected and Expected Categories*

	Men		Women	
	Expected	Unexpected	Expected	Unexpected
Mean	15.6470	15.2336	12.6243	13.9361
Variance	89.0387	157.3445	61.0107	66.6099
Observations	353	353	353	353
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0		0	
df	654		703	
t Stat	0.4949		-2.1816	
P(T<=t) one-tail	0.3104		0.0147	
t Critical one-tail	1.6472		1.6470	
P(T<=t) two-tail	0.6209		0.02947	
t Critical two-tail	1.9636		1.9633	

Overall, this provides partial support for my first hypothesis. It seems likely that gender bias is present here, as women appear to be more affected by occupational expectations than men. This finding may be related to the glass escalator phenomenon, in which men are more likely to receive promotions and other benefits in occupations that are typically dominated by women (Williams 2013).

Table 8 presents the one-tailed t-test between unexpected men and women. This test yielded a result that was not significant. This does not support my second hypothesis, that men in feminine occupations would have higher deflection than women in masculine occupations. This seems to imply that when it comes to policing gender nonconformity,

the gender of the transgressor is not as important as addressing the behavior itself; men and women who break gender norms of occupation are not perceived any differently from each other.

Table 8. *T-Test between Unexpected Categories*

	Men	Women
Mean	15.2336	13.9361
Variance	157.3445	66.6099
Observations	353	353
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
df	605	
t Stat	1.6290	
P(T<=t) one-tail	0.0519	
t Critical one-tail	1.6474	
P(T<=t) two-tail	0.1038	
t Critical two-tail	1.9639	

CONCLUSION

LIMITATIONS

The first main limitation to this study is my sample selection. The convenience sample for the first study is more likely to contain individuals with similar viewpoints, meaning that the ratings of how gendered each occupation is may be skewed. Additionally, using two separate samples may allow for discrepancy between groups in the responses, as the more randomized sample for Study 2 may not see the occupations the same way as the respondents in Study 1. To account for this, participants in both studies were directed to go with their first reaction and be honest with their answers, which should allow for the ratings to reflect how the occupations are typically seen as opposed to how each respondent would like them to be. Additionally, a larger sample for Study 2 would have allowed for more advanced analysis such as linear regression, rather than ANOVA and t-tests.

Additionally, while measures of deflection represent differing perceptions of individuals in gendered occupations, they do not capture the experiences of those individuals or how they are actually treated in social interactions. This issue could be addressed in future research by implementing qualitative or mixed methods such as interviews with individuals employed in gendered occupations.

IMPLICATIONS

This project may have practical applications by identifying and measuring the severity of a problem faced by workers in gendered occupations, which may relate to hiring practices and discrimination. Further studies could extend from this by examining

what this issue looks like for individuals on a day-to-day basis, identifying needs of people in gendered occupations that are not being met, and implementing solutions to these issues.

On a theoretical level, this project provides a three-dimensional mathematical model of people's perceptions of gendered occupations and the people who work in them. This serves as a starting point for future research on what leads individuals to pursue gendered occupations, such as how strongly the glass escalator motivates men to participate in jobs dominated by women or whether the glass ceiling deters women from entering jobs dominated by men. It would also be interesting to study whether patterns of status differences exist between gendered occupations; since occupations with lower prestige such as receptionist and server tend to be perceived as feminine. It is possible that this is a reflection of the devaluing of jobs dominated by women, but could also reflect the preferences of working mothers for jobs with more flexible scheduling [cite].

In addition, a similar study to this one could gather more information about the respondents in order to examine how the gender or sexual orientation of the respondent may affect their interpretation of a gendered occupation or worker. For example, people who break gender norms in expressing their gender identities or sexual orientations may be less likely to police others, and thus perceive gender norm breakers more positively since they identify more closely with them.

Future research could also measure how gendered specific fields are, such as the range of occupations in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM). In my first study, *computer expert*, *doctor*, and scientist were all rated as masculine occupations, with *computer expert* receiving one of the most extreme ratings. This shows

that occupations dealing with science and technology are still widely considered masculine. Studies have found differences between subsets of STEM fields, wherein women tend to lean more toward health and biological sciences as math and technology tend to remain dominated by men [cite]. It would be interesting to study whether gender norms are changing to reflect these trends.

REFERENCES

Acker, Joan. 1990. "Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations." Gender & Society 4(2):139-158.

Alksnis, Christine, Serge Desmarais, and James Curtis. 2008. "Workforce Segregation and the Gender Wage Gap: Is 'Women's' Work Valued as Highly as 'Men's'?" *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 38(6):1416-1441.

Britton, Dana M. 2000. "The Epistemology of the Gendered Organization." *Gender & Society* 14(3):418-434.

Busch, Felix. 2017. "Occupational Devaluation Due to Feminization? Causal Mechanics, Effect Heterogeneity, and Evidence from the United States, 1960 to 2010." *Social Forces* 1-25.

Connell, R. W. and James W. Messerschmidt. 2005. "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept." *Gender & Society* 19(6):829-859.

Francis, Clare and David R. Heise. 2006. "Mean Affective Ratings of 1,500 Concepts by Indiana University Undergraduates in 2002-3 [Computer file]." Distributed at Affect Control Theory Website, Program Interact <http://www.indiana.edu/~socpsy/ACT/interact/JavaInteract.html>.

Kane, Emily W. 2006. "'No Way My Boys Are Going to Be Like That!' Parents' Responses to Children's Gender Nonconformity." *Gender and Society* 20(2):149-176.

Konik, Julie and Lilia M. Cortina. 2008. "Policing Gender at Work: Intersections of Harassment Based on Sex and Sexuality." *Social Justice Research* 21:313-337.

Irvine, Leslie and Jenny R. Vermilya. 2010. “Gender Work in a Feminized Profession.” *Gender & Society* 24(1):56-82.

Nelson, Steven M. 2006. “Redefining a Bizarre Situation: Relative Concept Stability in Affect Control Theory.” *Social Psychology Quarterly* 69(3):215-234.

Pascoe, C. J. 2005. “‘Dude, You’Re a Fag’: Adolescent Masculinity and the Fag Discourse.” *Sexualities* 8(3):329-346.

Smith-Lovin, L. 1987a. “Impressions from Events.” *Journal of Mathematical Sociology,* 13(1-2):35-70.

Smith-Lovin, L. 1987b. “The Affective Control of Events within Settings.” *Journal of Mathematical Sociology,* 13(1-2):71-101.

Ridgeway, Cecilia L. 2009. “Framed Before We Know It : How Gender Shapes Social Relations.” *Gender & Society* 23(2):145-160.

Robinson, Dawn T. and Lynn Smith-Lovin. 2006. “Affect Control Theory.” Pp. 137-1 64 in *Contemporary Social Psychological Theory*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

West, Candace and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. “Doing Gender.” *Gender and Society* 1(2):125-151.

Williams, Christine L. 2013. “The Glass Escalator Revisited: Gender Inequality in Neoliberal Times.” *Gender and Society* 27:609-629.

APPENDIX A: STUDY 1 MATERIALS

SURVEY CONSENT FORM

Assessing Occupations

Welcome to our survey on Rating Occupations. Before taking part in this study, please read the consent form below and click on the "Agree" button at the bottom of the page if you understand the statements and freely consent to participate in the study.

Consent Form

The purpose of this research is to examine how people rate certain occupations and job titles. Participation in the study takes 5-10 minutes and is strictly confidential. Participants answer a series of questions online in one session. Anyone over the age of 18 is eligible to participate.

We hope to have approximately 50 people complete the online survey. There are no foreseeable risks, costs, or benefits for participating in the study. You are a volunteer. The decision to participate in this study is completely up to you. If you decide to be in the study, you may stop at any time. You will not be treated any differently if you decide not to participate in the study or if you stop once you have started.

As a participant, the information you share with us will be recorded, but your confidentiality will be protected. No one other than the researchers will know what you as an individual have said. Your confidentiality will be maintained in all written and published data resulting from the study. If you have further questions or concerns about your rights as a participant in this study, contact the Compliance Office at (704) 687-1871. If you have questions concerning the study, contact the principal investigator, Leanne Barry, at lbarry4@uncc.edu.

This form was approved for use on 6/15/2017 for a period of one (1) year.

By choosing to continue with this online survey, you are consenting to the project and confirming that you meet the criteria for participation.

You may print a copy of this form. If you are 18 years of age or older, understand the statements above, and freely consent to participate in the study, click on the "Agree" button to begin the survey.

SURVEY DIRECTIONS

For the following questions, you will be presented with occupations and job titles. Please rate each on the corresponding scale. A rating at either extreme end of the scale indicates that the occupation would be entirely that way, while a rating in the center of the scale would indicate that the occupation is neither one way nor the other. For example, a mark

at the far left would indicate that the occupation is entirely masculine, a mark at the far right would indicate that it is entirely feminine, and a mark in the center would indicate that the occupation is neutral. If you are unsure what an occupation is or how to rate it, go with your first reaction.

APPENDIX B: STUDY 2 MATERIALS

SURVEY CONSENT FORM

Assessing Occupations 2

Welcome to our survey on Rating Occupations. Before taking part in this study, please read the consent form below and click on the "Agree" button at the bottom of the page if you understand the statements and freely consent to participate in the study.

Consent Form
The purpose of this research is to examine how people rate certain occupations and job titles. Participation in the study takes approximately 5 minutes and all responses are strictly confidential. Participants will answer a series of questions online in one session. Anyone over the age of 18 is eligible to participate.

We hope to have approximately 350 people complete the online survey. There are no foreseeable risks or costs for participating in the study. Participants will be rewarded with $1.00 paid through Amazon's Mechanical Turk service.

You are a volunteer. The decision to participate in this study is completely up to you. If you decide to be in the study, you may stop at any time. You will not be treated any differently if you decide not to participate in the study or if you stop once you have started.

As a participant, the information you share with us will be recorded, but your confidentiality will be protected. No one other than the researchers will know what you as an individual have said. Your confidentiality will be maintained in all written and published data resulting from the study. If you have further questions or concerns about your rights as a participant in this study, contact the Compliance Office at (704) 687-1871. If you have questions concerning the study, contact the principal investigator, Leanne Barry, at lbarry4@uncc.edu.

This form was approved for use on 11/20/2017 for a period of one (1) year.

By choosing to continue with this online survey, you are consenting to the project and confirming that you meet the criteria for participation.

You may print a copy of this form. If you are 18 years of age or older, understand the statements above, and freely consent to participate in the study, click on the "Agree" button to begin the survey.

SURVEY ITEMS

(1) Directions: In this survey, you will be presented with situations. Please rate each label on all three of the corresponding scales. A rating at either extreme end of the scale indicates that the person would be entirely that way, while a rating at the center of the scale would indicate that the person is neither one way nor the other. For example, a rating at the far left of the first scale would indicate that the person is entirely bad, a rating at the far right would indicate that the person is entirely good, and a rating at the center would indicate the person is neutral – neither good nor bad. If you are unsure of how to rate something, go with your first impression.

(2) Male Army Officer
Bad _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Good
Weak _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Strong
Passive_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Active

(3) Female Computer Expert
Bad _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Good
Weak _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Strong
Passive_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Active

(4) Female Coach
Bad _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Good
Weak _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Strong
Passive_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Active

(5) Female Politician
Bad _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Good
Weak _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Strong
Passive_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Active

(6) Female FBI Agent
Bad _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Good
Weak _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Strong
Passive_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Active

(7) Male Athlete
Bad _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Good
Weak _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Strong
Passive_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Active

(8) Female Nurse
Bad _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Good
Weak _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Strong
Passive_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Active

(9) Female Schoolteacher
Bad _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Good
Weak _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Strong
Passive_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Active

(10) Male Police Officer
Bad _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Good
Weak _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Strong
Passive_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Active

(11) Male Unemployed Person
Bad _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Good
Weak _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Strong
Passive_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Active

(12) Male Librarian
Bad _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Good
Weak _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Strong
Passive_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Active

(13) Male Receptionist
Bad _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Good
Weak _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Strong
Passive_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Active

(14) Male Salesclerk
Bad _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Good
Weak _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Strong
Passive_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Active

(15) Female Server
Bad _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Good
Weak _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Strong
Passive_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Active

(16) Female Graduate Student
Bad _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Good
Weak _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Strong
Passive_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Active

(17) Male Flight Attendant
Bad _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Good
Weak _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Strong
Passive_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Active