Evaluation Biases Regarding Gender Norm Violators

Nicholas Paron

University of Michigan - Dearborn

Primary Advisor: Robert Hymes, Ph.D.

Secondary Advisor: Eric Fuller, Ph.D.

Approved August 16, 2017

Abstract

People who fail to conform to gender norms are often the subject of prejudice and ostracism. It was hypothesized that resume applicants who violated gender norms in multiple categories (facial appearance and communication style) would be perceived as less competent and likable than those who conform to norms in one or both of those categories. One hundred fifty-six ($N = 156$) introductory psychology students from the University of Michigan – Dearborn were given resumes and asked to rate the competency and likability of the job applicants. The resumes differed on their listed sex (*Male* or *Female*), profile picture (*Masculinized* or *Feminized*), and communication style (*Agentic* or *Communal*). A three-way ANOVA was used to analyze the results, which failed to support the hypothesized negative reaction to gender norm violators. The three-way interaction between sex, profile picture, and communication style was not significant for ratings of competency ($p = .81$) nor for likability ($p = .99$). A significant two-way interaction between profile picture and communication style for ratings of competency was found ($p = .05$). *Masculinized communal* resumes were rated as significantly more competent than *feminized communal* resumes ($p = .045$), and *feminized agentic* resumes were marginally significantly more competent than *feminized communal* resumes ($p = .10$). This could suggest that androgynous individuals are perceived as more competent than gender norm conforming individuals. Future research should explore reactions to different indicators of gender norm conformity.

Evaluation Biases Regarding Gender Norm Violators

Social norms are perceived rules that govern which attitudes and behaviors are considered acceptable for individuals of a particular group (Chekroun, 2008). They affect many aspects of people's lives, from minor issues like what clothes are deemed appropriate for a given individual and occasion, to more serious issues like who deserves to be ostracized . People look to groups they identify with called reference groups to decide which norms to follow at any given time (Tankard & Paluck, 2016). What is considered normal and acceptable for one group may not necessarily be okay in another group, so people use reference groups to determine how to act.

Norms related to gender can be especially strong. From the marketing of baby clothes and children's toys, to the target demographics of products like makeup and tool sets, there are clear distinctions between what is expected of a man versus of a woman in US society. When these norms are broken, the reaction can be extreme. From an early age, gender nonconforming individuals face prejudice and discrimination (Chekroun, 2008; Conry-Murray, Kim, & Turiel, 2015; Toomey, Card, & Casper, 2014). Even infants are subject to this. Ben-Zeev and Dennehy (2014) found that participants were more willing to risk the lives of male infants wearing pink clothing than male infants wearing blue. Although infants have no control over their adherence to gender norms, their gender atypical clothing was enough for participants to ascribe less value to their lives, at least in the context of the experiment. This is despite the fact that strict adherence to gender stereotypes can be a bad thing. For example, extreme adherence to masculine gender norms has been linked to a higher risk of suicide (Granato, Smith, & Selwyn, 2015). Therefore, following those norms less strictly and even breaking them sometimes would be the beneficial option. What drives the harsh reaction to those who break social norms?

People are driven to understand what is "normal" because they want to feel like they are a part of their community and because they want to avoid social rejection themselves (Tankard & Paluck, 2016). An individual's perception of a norm guides their behavior (Tankard & Paluck, 2016) and leads them to punish others who do not seem to adhere to it (Prentice & Carranza, 2002). Prescriptive stereotypes, the social guidelines for how group members should behave, are a major component of social norms for gender (Prentice & Carranza, 2002). For example, the traditional gender role prescribed for a father in US society is to be the breadwinner, while mothers are traditionally the caregivers. When these roles are reversed, (i.e., when mothers serve as breadwinners and fathers as caregivers) both parents are evaluated more negatively (Brescoll & Uhlmann, 2005).

Role congruity theory explains that human beings tend to think more positively about individuals whose traits match their group's social role (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Impressions of an individual's traits arise from stereotypes about their sex, ethnicity, etc., and those whose perceived traits conflict with the expectations of their social role are viewed more negatively. For example, female leaders are the subject of more criticism than male ones because leadership roles are traditionally masculine (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Women are stereotypically submissive, but leaders are expected to take charge and be dominant. The mismatch between the stereotypical expectations of a woman versus of a leader creates an inconsistency that can make people uncomfortable. In addition, they may be seen as possessing deficits in traditional female areas like nurturing skills when they succeed in male roles (Tyler & McCullough, 2009).

Another possible explanation for why those who break gender norms could be viewed more negatively is the Black Sheep effect (Marques, & Yzerbyt, 1988). This effect describes that people will evaluate in-group members more harshly for engaging in deviant behavior, in part

because their actions reflect poorly on the group as a whole. Normally individuals favor other members of their group over outsiders, but the reverse is true when a fellow group member's behavior is considered unacceptable (Chekroun, 2008). Men with traditional views on gender may perceive a man acting "girly" as reflecting poorly on the male sex. Although they may generally hold more positive opinions of men over women, men that conform to traditional masculinity norms may particularly dislike effeminate men for deviating from what they view as acceptable behavior.

Prior research into social norms has used resume evaluations as a way to measure participant attitudes and behaviors (Burns, Christiansen, Morris, Periard, & Coaster, 2014; Juodvalkis, Grefe, Hogue, Svyantek, & DeLamarter, 2003; Tyler & McCullough, 2009) Resumes may not be the most accurate representations of individuals, but employers nonetheless use them to appraise the applicant's suitability for a job. Personality traits of the applicant are inferred from cues in their resume, and this can influence the decision to hire them or not (Burns et al., 2014). When these cues suggest traits that go against the prescriptive stereotypes for that individual, the evaluations they receive are more negative (Tyler & McCullough, 2009). For example, male applicants who use more feminine communication styles and women who use more masculine styles are both less liked than applicants who project a stereotypically sex-consistent image of themselves (Juodvalkis et al., 2003). Men are stereotypically associated with agentic qualities like self-reliance and ambition, while women are stereotypically associated with communal qualities like helpfulness and "concerned with the welfare of others" (Deaux & Kite, 1993). This means that women whose communication styles express agency and men whose communication styles express communion are perceived as going against the norms for their gender.

An individual's appearance is another way to gauge adherence to social norms. There are prescribed ways that members of any group should look, and violating these prescriptions can have consequences. For example, having tattoos or piercings is unacceptable for many professions and can prevent an individual with either of them from being hired. The norm-violating appearance was chosen by the individual in that example, but it can also be out of their control as well.

The gender stereotypicality of a face affects how positively or negatively it is perceived (Sutherland, Young, Mootz, & Oldmeadow, 2015). Generally, masculine male faces and feminine female faces are rated more positively because they are consistent with their stereotypes. Simply seeing that an individual looks feminine or masculine is enough for their peers to make all kinds of judgments about them. Banchefsky, Westfall, Park, and Judd (2016) found that participants were less likely to believe that women with feminine appearances were actually scientists, a stereotypically masculine profession. Putting aside their actual gender, it was easier to believe that someone with a masculine appearance would work in a traditionally masculine profession. This becomes a significant issue if employers unconsciously believe that job applicants with more masculine faces are better suited for masculine jobs and vice versa, because people have very little control over their facial features. An individual's facial features that defy gender norms may be judged even more harshly when that person breaks other norms as well.

Faces are processed in a social way. Traits about the person whom the face belongs to, like their race, affects to what degree the face is processed in a "typical" way (Michel, Rossion, Han, Chung, & Caldara, 2006). Whether the traits are inferred from appearance (e.g., "this face *looks* like someone of a different race from myself") or social context (e.g., "this person is poor"),

they help determine how typically a particular face is processed (Shriver, Young, Hugenberg, Bernstein, Lanter, 2008). Fincher and Tetlock (2016) found this effect for faces paired with social norm violations. On a succession of perceptual tasks, participants processed faces associated with positive or neutral behaviors (e.g., this person donated to charity) in a typical fashion while they processed faces associated with negative behaviors (e.g., this person stole) atypically. In a follow up study, Fincher and Tetlock (2016) manipulated faces to either be processed more typically by blurring them or more atypically by inverting them. They paired these faces with criminal behaviors, and asked participants to assign how severe a punishment was appropriate for the one who committed the crime. Participants assigned more severe punishments to faces that they processed atypically than those that they processed typically, even when the crime and face were identical, aside from the blurring or inverting.

Fincher and Tetlock (2016) argued that individuals who violate norms threaten the social order, so this mechanism of facial perception facilitates keeping them in line. Knowledge of a person's norm violations causes their face to be processed more atypically, and this make them appear more deserving of punishment. This should apply to faces with gender atypical features. Actually seeing feminine male and masculine female faces would then produce more negative reactions to them than would simply hearing about them. Any gender norm violation by itself could produce negative reactions, but seeing the norm violator's face facilities an even more extreme reaction through the mechanism Fincher and Tetlock discussed.

It should come as no surprise to most that career paths are very gendered. Men are still more likely to go into STEM fields and physical labor jobs, while women tend to be educators, clerical workers, or work in health fields (Lawson, Crouter, & McHale, 2015). This could be due to a variety of factors like job availability or gender differences in interests. One other possible

reason is that working in field that is stereotyped as being better suited for the opposite sex can make it more difficult to maintain one's gender identity (McDonald, 2013). Male nurses, for example, often feel forced to present a hyper masculine identity to offset the fact that nursing is a traditionally feminine occupation. When given a choice of two similar occupations to pursue, one feminine and one masculine, it may be safer for an individual to select the one that fits their gender norms. Unlike a male nurse, a male doctor would not have to worry about people questioning his masculinity.

The prevalence of men dominating some occupations while women dominate other ones also occurs because employers are more willing to hire individuals whose gender matches the stereotypical gender role of the job (Glick, Zion, & Nelson, 1988). Construction jobs primarily involve intense manual labor, so men are stereotyped as being more fit for those jobs than women who are stereotyped as physically weak. Teaching jobs, especially in primary school, require individuals who are nurturing and work well with children, so women are stereotyped as being better suited than men to be teachers. Actual, inherent sex differences in general intelligence (Colom, Juan-Espinosa, Abad, & Garcia, 2000) and ability are negligible, but these stereotypes nonetheless affect which gender is favored for which jobs. It is not yet clear whether the gender congruence of an individual factors into this effect. Are men uniformly stereotyped as being better equipped than women to handle "masculine" jobs, or does it depend on the individual male's level of masculinity?

The research referenced above suggests that individuals who conform to gender norms in terms of their personality traits (Tyler & McCullough, 2009) and facial features (Sutherland et al., 2015) are treated more favorably. Prior research examined adherence to gender norms in these areas, but few studies have incorporated both personality and facial features simultaneously.

Rather than look only at the effects of following or breaking one category of gender norms, it is worth examining the effects of multiple categories when they come together. Real world evaluations of individuals are not based solely on one attribute. Including manipulations of multiple attributes that suggest gender norm violation or adherence may then lead to more ecologically valid findings.

This study aims to investigate how gender norms affect how likable and competent people are perceived to be. Participants evaluated the likability and competency of male and female applicants from resumes manipulated to either conform to or violate gender norms for appearance and communication style. The study used a 2 (listed resume sex: *Male* or *Female*) x 2 (resume profile picture: *Masculinized* or *Feminized*) x 2(resume communication style: *Agentic* or *Communal*) between-subjects design. An interaction between listed sex, profile picture, and communication style is expected, such that resumes whose profile picture and communication style both violate gender norms for their listed sex (i.e. *Male Feminized Communal* and *Female Masculinized Agentic*) should produce far more negative ratings of likability and competency than the other resumes that conform to one or more gender norms. Also, resumes that violate some gender norms but not others (ex. *Male Masculinized Communal*) are expected to produce slightly more negative ratings of likability and competency compared to resumes that completely conform to gender norms (ex. *Male Masculinized Agentic*).

Method

Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted to investigate what sort of materials and measures would be able to successfully show gender norm violations. Four similar resumes were created for this pilot, and all depicted a male applicant applying for a pharmacist position. The study was a 2 (profile picture: masculine or feminine) x 2 (interests: masculine or feminine) between-groups design. The masculine and feminine pictures were taken from a previous study (Rennels, Bronstad, & Langlois, 2008) that used facial morphing software to create masculinized and feminized male faces. Each resume listed either three masculine (woodcarving, metalworking, and fishing) or feminine (yoga, scrapbooking, baking) interests that had been associated with masculinity or femininity in an earlier convenience survey. The study was conducted online with Google Forms using a convenience sample of 40 participants. Participants were asked to judge the trustworthiness, competency, ambition, and hireability of the applicant in the resume they received. They also completed a brief Big Five personality measure (Gosling, Rentfrow, & Swann, 2003) and completed manipulation checks.

Manipulation checks showed that the masculine and feminine interests were perceived as intended. However, including hobbies like "woodworking" that had little to do with the job being applied for was seen as unrealistic. For this reason, the interests manipulation was replaced by manipulating the communication style to be agentic or communal. Conveying an agentic or communal communication style in a resume is more believable and normal than including hobbies. In addition, agentic styles and communal styles are still associated with masculinity and femininity, respectively.

Manipulation checks also showed that the profile pictures used from the Rennels et al. (2008) study were not perceived as intended. Both the masculine and feminine picture were seen

as androgynous with little difference between the two. For this reason, new masculinized and feminized profile pictures were created for the present study.

No significant effects were found for any of the four dependent measures. Competency ratings came closest to demonstrating mean differences (see Table 1), so competency was the only trait evaluation from the pilot chosen to be used in the full study. Ratings of likability were not included in the pilot but were added to the full study based on similar existing research that found effects using likability measures (Jackson, 1983).

Full Study

Participants

A total of 156 undergraduate students were recruited from the University of Michigan-Dearborn SONA research pool for this study. Only the data from the 142 participants who passed all manipulation checks were analyzed. Sixty-nine participants were female (48.6%) and 73 were male (51.4%). Tem participants identified as Hispanic (7.0%), 61 as White (43.0%), 12 as Black (8.5%), 36 as Middle Eastern (25.4%), three as East Asian (2.1%), 10 as Indian (7.0%), nine as other (6.3%), and one preferred not to respond (0.7%). Ten participants identified that they were working full time (7.0%), 72 were working part time (50.7%), 58 were unemployed (40.8%), one was retired (0.7%), and one preferred not to respond (0.7%).

Materials

Resumes. Each participant received three resumes, one with a profile picture and two without. The resume with the profile picture is the only one of interest; the other two only were intended to make participants believe the purpose of the study was to investigate the effect of

profile pictures. The distractor resumes had completely different content from the resumes of interest, and all participants received the same two distractor resumes. Participants were randomly assigned to one of the eight possible experimental conditions according to a 2 (listed sex: *Male* or *Female*) x 2 (profile picture: *Masculinized* or *Feminized*) x 2 (communication style: *Agentic* or *Communal*) design. An example of these critical resumes can be found in Appendix A.

For *male* resumes, the job applicant's name was "Shane Kowalski" while it was "Shannon Kowalski" for *female* resumes. Job applicants portrayed in the resumes were intended to be viewed as heterosexual. Thus, the resumes listed a spouse with an opposite-gendered name. For the communication style variable, the personal skills and descriptions of work history in the resumes were manipulated to be either *communal* or *agentic*. The *communal* condition includes skills like "sympathetic to the needs of others", whereas the *agentic* conditions include ones such as "decisive and independent".

The facial morphing software FantaMorph 5 (Abrosoft, 2016) was used to create the *masculinized* and *feminized* profile pictures. First, one male and one female composite face were created by morphing together 15 randomly selected male and female faces from a database of neutral faces using FantaMorph 5. The Nottingham scans from The Psychological Image Collection at Stirling (PICS) was the database used, and it is composed of 50 male and 50 female black-and-white photos of different people making neutral expressions (pics.stir.ac.uk). In addition to the two averaged faces, five of the most feminine and most masculine faces in the database were morphed to create one very feminine face and one very masculine face. The averaged male and female faces were then mixed with the feminine and masculine faces to create four new faces: a *masculinized* male, a *feminized* male, a *masculinized* female, and a *feminized*

female. These four faces are the only ones that actually appear in the study, and they can be seen below in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Profile pictures used in the resumes of interest. From left to right: *Feminized Female*, *Feminized Male, Masculinized Female, Masculinized Male*. Created using FantaMorph 5 (Abrosoft, 2016) software on images from The PICS database (pics.stir.ac.uk).

Manipulation checks and competency scale. Two questionnaires were given for each resume. These can be found in their entirety in Appendix B. The first questionnaire contained several questions like "What sex was the applicant?" that served as manipulation checks to ensure participants were paying attention. It also contained a 4-item Likert-type scale that was created for this study and intended to measure competency. It was composed of the following statements that participants responded to on a scale of 1 "Very Strongly Disagree" to 7 "Very Strongly Agree": "This person would be an efficient worker", "This person would be a successful employee", "This person is dependable", and "This person possesses the skills necessary for the job".

Reysen Likability Scale. The second questionnaire participants completed was the Reysen Likability Scale (Reysen, 2005), which measures how likable they found that applicant to be. This 11-item Likert-type scale is composed of statements like "this person is similar to me" and

"I would ask this person for advice" that participants respond to on a scale of 1 "Very Strongly Disagree" to 7 "Very Strongly Agree".

Procedure

Upon arriving at the study location, participants were told that the study is examining how the presence of profile pictures in resumes affects perceptions of job applicants. This was done to mask the true purpose of the study, to investigate whether or not gender norm violators are evaluated differently than those who conform. Participants were asked to complete a standard departmental consent form if they wished to participate and were given a copy of the form for their records. After obtaining their consent, participants completed a demographics questionnaire.

Participants then received one manipulated resume and two distractor resumes. After reading through each resume, participants were given two questionnaires and asked to judge the likability and competency of each applicant. These competency and likability ratings of the applicant were the dependent variables of interest. Participants completed these two questionnaires a total of three times, once after they viewed each of the three resumes. After they finished evaluating the third resume, participants were debriefed and thanked for their time.

Results

Manipulation Checks

Of the 156 total participants, 154 correctly identified the job the resume applicant was pursuing (98.7%). One hundred fifty three participants (98.1%) correctly identified the listed sex of the resume applicant. These data suggest that participants were paying attention to the details of the resume. The applicants described in the resumes were intended to be perceived as

heterosexual and 144 (92.3%) participants identified them as such. Participants who failed one or more of these manipulation checks were excluded from analysis, leaving a total of 142 participants that passed all checks[1]. All 142 of these participants completed all of the competency items, but four did not complete some or all of the likability items. For this reason, only 138 participants' data were analyzed for the likability scale, while 142 participants' data were analyzed for the competency scale.

Trait Evaluations

Both the competency scale ($\alpha = .79$) and the Reysen Likability scale ($\alpha = .87$) demonstrated adequate reliability. The potential competency scores ranged from 4 to 28, with higher scores indicating higher ratings of competency. Actual competency ratings ranged from 9 to 28 *(M = 21.07, SD = 3.92)*. The potential likability scores ranged from 11 to 77, with higher scores indicating higher ratings of likability. Actual likability ratings ranged from 27 to 74 (*M =* 50.07, *SD* = 8.94). The distribution of actual competency and likability scores were skewed in the positive direction compared to their potential scores. This suggests that participants tended to rate applicants as being above average in terms of competency and likability.

A 2 (resume sex) x 2 (profile picture) x 2 (resume communication style) between-subjects ANOVA was conducted on participants' ratings of competency. Descriptive statistics for these data can be found in Table 2. The hypothesized three-way interaction was not supported $F(1, 134) = 0.06$, $p = .81$. There were no significant main effects for resume sex, profile picture, or communication style (All *p*'s > .05). This suggests that resume sex, profile picture, and communication style did not significantly influence ratings of competency on their own. There were no significant two-way interactions between resume sex and communication style, $F(1,$

---

[1] Including participants who failed manipulation checks did not significantly affect the results.

134) < 0.01, *p* = .95, or between resume sex and profile picture *F*(1, 134) = 0.36, *p* = .55. There

was a significant two-way interaction between communication style and profile picture, *F*(1,

134) = 3.90, *p* = .05. An LSD post hoc test revealed that competency ratings for *masculinized*

communal resumes (*M* = 21.91, *SD* = 3.99) were significantly higher than ratings for *feminized*

communal resumes (*M* = 20.05, *SD* = 3.92) (*p* = .045). It also revealed that competency ratings

for *feminized agentic* resumes (*M* = 21.59, *SD* = 4.09) were marginally significantly higher than

for *feminized communal* resumes (*M* = 20.05, *SD* = 3.92) (*p* = .10). These are the reverse of the

predicted effect that more gender norm violating resumes would be rated as less competent.

There were no statistically significant differences between the other groups.

A 2 x 2 x 2 ANOVA was conducted on participants' ratings of likability. Four

participants did not complete some or all of the likability questions, so only the data from the

remaining 138 participants was analyzed. Descriptive statistics for these data can be found in

Table 3. The hypothesized three-way interaction was not supported, *F*(1, 130) < 0.01, *p* = .99.

There were no significant two-way interactions between resume sex and communication style,

F(1, 130) = 0.03, *p* = .86, between resume sex and profile picture *F*(1, 130) = 0.60, *p* = .81, or

between communication style and profile picture *F*(1, 130) = 2.17, *p* = .14. A significant main

effect for resume sex was found, *F*(1, 130) = 5.49, *p* = 0.02. This is because *female* resumes (*M* =

51.83, *SD* = 8.82) were rated as being more likable than *male* resumes (*M* = 48.49, *SD* = 8.81). A

significant main effect was also found for resume communication style, *F*(1, 130) = 18.18, *p*

< .001. This is because *communal* resumes (*M* = 52.99, *SD* = 9.34) were rated as more likable

than *agentic* resumes (*M* = 46.97, *SD* = 7.39). There was no significant main effect for profile

picture (*p* > .05).

Discussion

Prior research into gender nonconformity (Brescoll & Uhlmann, 2005; Eagly & Karau, 2002) has suggested that gender nonconforming individuals are evaluated more negatively than their peers. It was hypothesized that the most gender nonconforming resumes (*Female Agentic Masculinized* and *Male Communal Feminized*) would be rated as the least likable and competent out of any condition. These two conditions violated gender norms for appearance and communication style, so participants were expected to perceive and evaluate them very negatively. Resumes that conformed to some gender norms and violated others (ex. *Female Agentic Feminized*) were also expected to be evaluated more negatively than the resumes that fit traditional norms for communication style and appearance, although not as intensely as the completely gender norm violating resumes. These expectations were not supported.

There appeared to be a small interaction between communication style and profile picture's effects on competency. More specifically, *masculinized communal* resumes were rated as more competent than *feminized communal* resumes. Although it was only approaching significance, *feminized agentic* resumes were also rated as more competent than *feminized communal* resumes. These run contrary to the expectation that more gender norm violating resumes would be viewed as less competent, as femininity tends to be associated with communal traits and masculinity with agentic traits. Perhaps participants viewed the masculinized communal and feminized agentic resumes as possessing the positive traits stereotypically associated with both men and women, while they viewed the feminine communal resumes as possessing both the positive (friendly, good communicator) and negative traits (absent-minded, poor leaders) associated with women.

While this interaction does not support the predictions made, there is research precedent for androgynous people being seen more positively. A study by Piché and Plante (1991) found that teachers had more favorable impressions of their androgynous male students than they did of their masculine male students. Arkkelin and O'Connor (1992) tasked participants with evaluating how desirable different personality profiles would be for a variety of occupations. Across all occupations, the researchers found that androgynous personality profiles were rated as being more fit for the jobs than masculine or feminine profiles. Some research also supports the notion that androgynous people self-report being more skillful and socially competent than sex-typed people do (Cambell, Steffen, & Langmeyer, 1981). This lines up with the present study's finding that androgynous combinations of communication style and profile picture (*masculinized communal* and *feminized agentic*) were rated as more competent than sex-typed combinations (*masculinized agentic* and *feminized communal*). Although the hypothesized three-way interaction was not supported, it is possible that individuals whose appearance and communication style violate gender norms are actually more liked than those whose conform.

Female resumes were rated as more likable than *male* resumes. This makes sense, as women are perceived to be more approachable and less aggressive than men (Deaux & Kite, 1993). Communal resumes were more likable than agentic ones. This supports prior research findings that likability is more influenced by communal traits than agentic traits (Leaper, 1987; Wojciszke, Abele, & Baryla, 2009). Communal traits suggest putting the needs of others first, while agentic traits are more concerned with self-advancement. Participants may have liked communal applicants more because those applicants appeared be more likely to help them than agentic applicants, who seemed more likely to help themselves. These effects were not part of the hypothesis though, and limited conclusions can be drawn from them.

Although the hypothesis was not supported, that does not mean gender nonconforming individuals are not looked down upon. Research has found that they face bullying in adolescence (Conry-Murray et al., 2015; Toomey, et al., 2014), prejudice in the workplace (Banchefsky et al., 2016; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Glick et al., 1988), and can face discrimination elsewhere in their lives. The manipulations used in the present study may have been insufficient to convince participants that the resume applicants conformed to or violated gender norms. No data were collected on whether each resumes' communication style was perceived as intended. It is possible that the difference between the *agentic* and *communal* manipulations was too subtle for participants to pick up on. It also possible that they were sufficient, but the effects were too small to become apparent without a larger sample size.

Resumes may not be the best indicator of gender norm conformity, as they offer a limited glimpse into a person's personality. People do tend to infer personality traits from resumes (Burns et al., 2014), but perhaps the resumes created for this study did a poor job of depicting masculinity or femininity. The *masculinized* and *feminized* profile pictures may not have been perceived as intended. The manipulated facial features done may not have been enough to give the impression of a particularly masculine or feminine face. Aside from a small convenience survey, there was little evidence that participants would perceive the *masculinized* faces as particularly masculine or the *feminized* faces as particularly feminine.

Participants were deceived into believing that the purpose of the study was to investigate the effect of profile pictures in resumes. Some participants may have evaluated the resumes based on what they thought the expected results of the study were. The deception about the true purpose was intended to avoid such demand characteristics, but the given purpose could have

still biased the results. Perhaps some participants believed that the resumes with profile pictures were expected to be rated more positively and made their evaluations accordingly.

Some of the atypical details in the resumes may have prevented the hypothesized effects from being found. The manipulated resumes included not only a profile picture, but also marital status and listed the name of the applicant's spouse. All three of these are unusual to include in a resume, and they may have confused participants. For some participants, inclusion of such unnecessary details may have caused them to give lower competency and likability evaluations than they would have otherwise.

A future study would need to first pilot a variety of different pictures to see which ones participants view as most gender-stereotypical. Follow up studies into gender conformity may benefit from using interviews with confederates instead of resumes. Facial appearance and communication style would still be able to be manipulated, and it would likely feel more natural to participants than to evaluate resumes with atypical details like profile pictures. Manipulating other traits that signal gender norm conformity or violation may also be prudent. In the present study, little support was found for sex, communication style, and facial appearance interacting to influence evaluations of competence and likability. Instead of facial appearance, the appearance of one's clothing may interact with sex and communication style to produce more obvious effects. A future study could also use scenarios that depict characters whose behavior violates gender norms, like a man being emotionally expressive and crying, to investigate whether gender norm violators are perceived more negatively. Regardless of the method used, more research into gender norm conformity is warranted.

References

Abrosoft (2016). FantaMorph 5 [Computer software]. Retrieved from

http://www.fantamorph.com/index.html

Arkkelin, D., & O'Connor, R. (1992). The 'good' professional: Effects of trait-profile gender type,

androgyny, and likableness on impressions of incumbents of sex-typed occupations. *Sex

Roles*, *27*(9-10), 517-532. doi:10.1007/BF00290007

Banchefsky, S., Westfall, J., Park, B., & Judd, C. M. (2016). But you don't look like a scientist!:

Women scientists with feminine appearance are deemed less likely to be scientists. *Sex

Roles,* doi:10.1007/s11199-016-0586-1

Ben-Zeev, A., & Dennehy, T. C. (2014). When boys wear pink: A gendered color cue violation

evokes risk taking. *Psychology Of Men & Masculinity*, *15*(4), 486-489.

doi:10.1037/a0034683

Brescoll, V. L., & Uhlmann, E. L. (2005). Attitudes toward traditional and nontraditional

parents. *Psychology Of Women Quarterly*,*29*(4), 436-445. doi:10.1111/j.1471-

6402.2005.00244.x

Burns, G. N., Christiansen, N. D., Morris, M. B., Periard, D. A., & Coaster, J. A. (2014). Effects

of applicant personality on resume evaluations. *Journal Of Business And

Psychology*, *29*(4), 573-591. doi:10.1007/s10869-014-9349-6

Campbell, M., Steffen, J. J., & Langmeyer, D. (1981). Psychological androgyny and social

competence. *Psychological Reports*, *48*(2), 611-614. doi:10.2466/pr0.1981.48.2.611

Chekroun, P. (2008). Social control behavior: The effects of social situations and personal

implication on informal social sanctions. *Social And Personality Psychology

Compass*, *2*(6), 2141-2158. doi:10.1111/j.1751-9004.2008.00141.x

Colom, R., Juan-Espinosa, M., Abad, F., & García, L. F. (2000). Negligible sex differences in
    general intelligence. *Intelligence*, *28*(1), 57-68. doi:10.1016/S0160-2896(99)00035-5

Conry-Murray, C., Kim, J. M., & Turiel, E. (2015). Judgments of gender norm violations in
    children from the United States and Korea. *Cognitive Development*, *35*, 122-136.
    doi:10.1016/j.cogdev.2015.04.002

Deaux, K. & Kite, M. E. (1993). Gender stereotypes. In F. Denmark & M. Paludi
    (Eds.), *Handbook on the psychology of women* (pp. 107-139). Greenwood Press.

Diekman, A. B., & Goodfriend, W. (2006). Rolling with the changes: A role congruity
    perspective on gender norms. *Psychology Of Women Quarterly*, *30*(4), 369-383.
    doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2006.00312.x

Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female
    leaders. *Psychological Review*, *109*(3), 573-598. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.109.3.573

Fincher, K. M., & Tetlock, P. E. (2016). Perceptual dehumanization of faces is activated by norm
    violations and facilitates norm enforcement. *Journal Of Experimental Psychology:
    General*, *145*(2), 131-146. doi:10.1037/xge0000132

Glick, P., Zion, C., & Nelson, C. (1988). What mediates sex discrimination in hiring
    decisions?. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, *55*(2), 178-186.
    doi:10.1037/0022-3514.55.2.178

Gosling, S. D., Rentfrow, P. J., & Swann, W. B., Jr. (2003). A Very Brief Measure of the Big
    Five Personality Domains. *Journal of Research in Personality, 37*, 504-528.

Granato, S. L., Smith, P. N., & Selwyn, C. N. (2015). Acquired capability and masculine gender
    norm adherence: Potential pathways to higher rates of male suicide. *Psychology Of Men
    & Masculinity*, *16*(3), 246-253. doi:10.1037/a0038181

Hoyt, C. L., & Burnette, J. L. (2013). Gender bias in leader evaluations: Merging implicit

theories and role congruity perspectives. *Personality And Social Psychology*

Bulletin, *39*(10), 1306-1319. doi:10.1177/0146167213493643

Jackson, L. A. (1983). The perception of androgyny and physical attractiveness: Two is better

than one. *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin*, *9*(3), 405-413.

doi:10.1177/0146167283093011

Juodvalkis, J. L., Grefe, B. A., Hogue, M., Svyantek, D. J., & DeLamarter, W. (2003). The

effects of job stereotype, applicant gender, and communication style on ratings in

screening interviews. *The International Journal Of Organizational Analysis, 11*(1), 67-84.

doi:10.1108/eb028963

Lawson, K. M., Crouter, A. C., & McHale, S. M. (2015). Links between family gender

socialization experiences in childhood and gendered occupational attainment in young

adulthood. *Journal Of Vocational Behavior*, *90*26-35. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2015.07.003

Leaper, C. (1987). Agency, communion, and gender as predictors of communication style and

being liked in adult male-female dyads. *Sex Roles*, *16*(3-4), 137-149.

doi:10.1007/BF00289645

Marques, J. M., & Yzerbyt, V. Y. (1988). The Black Sheep effect: Judgmental extremity toward

in-group members in inter- and intra-group situations. *European Journal of Social*

Psychology, 18, 287–292.

McDonald, J. (2013). Conforming to and resisting dominant gender norms: How male and

female nursing students do and undo gender. *Gender, Work And Organization*, *20*(5),

561-579. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0432.2012.00604.x

Michel, C., Rossion, B., Han, J., Chung, C., & Caldara, R. (2006). Holistic Processing Is Finely

    Tuned for Faces of One's Own Race. *Psychological Science*, *17*(7), 608-615.

    doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01752.x

Piché, C., & Plante, C. (1991). Perceived masculinity, femininity and androgyny among primary

    school boys: Relationships with the adaptation level of these students and the attitudes of

    the teachers towards them. *European Journal Of Psychology Of Education*, *6*(4), 423-435.

    doi:10.1007/BF03172775

Prentice, D. A., & Carranza, E. (2002). What women should be, shouldn't be, are allowed to be,

    and don't have to be: The contents of prescriptive gender stereotypes. *Psychology Of

    Women Quarterly*, *26*(4), 269-281. doi:10.1111/1471-6402.t01-1-00066

Rennels, J. L., Bronstad, P. M., & Langlois, J. H. (2008). Are attractive men's faces masculine or

    feminine? The importance of type of facial stimuli. *Journal Of Experimental Psychology:

    Human Perception And Performance*, *34*(4), 884-893. doi:10.1037/0096-1523.34.4.884

Reysen, S. (2005). Construction of a new scale: The Reysen Likability Scale. *Social Behavior

    and Personality, 33*(2), 201-208.

Shriver, E. R., Young, S. G., Hugenberg, K., Bernstein, M. J., & Lanter, J. R. (2008). Class, race,

    and the face: Social context modulates the cross-race effect in face

    recognition. *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin*, *34*(2), 260-274.

    doi:10.1177/0146167207310455

Sutherland, C. M., Young, A. W., Mootz, C. A., & Oldmeadow, J. A. (2015). Face gender and

    stereotypicality influence facial trait evaluation: Counter-stereotypical female faces are

    negatively evaluated. *British Journal Of Psychology*, *106*(2), 186-208.

    doi:10.1111/bjop.12085

Tankard, M. E., & Paluck, E. L. (2016). Norm perception as a vehicle for social change. *Social Issues And Policy Review*, *10*(1), 181-211. doi:10.1111/sipr.12022

Toomey, R. B., Card, N. A., & Casper, D. M. (2014). Peers' perceptions of gender nonconformity: Associations with overt and relational peer victimization and aggression in early adolescence. *The Journal Of Early Adolescence, 34*(4), 463-485. doi:10.1177/0272431613495446

Tyler, J. M., & McCullough, J. D. (2009). Violating prescriptive stereotypes on job resumes: A self-presentational perspective. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *23*(2), 272-287. doi:10.1177/0893318909341412

Wojciszke, B., Abele, A. E., & Baryla, W. (2009). Two dimensions of interpersonal attitudes: Liking depends on communion, respect depends on agency. *European Journal Of Social Psychology*, *39*(6), 973-990. doi:10.1002/ejsp.595

Table 1

Pilot Study Means and Standard Deviations of Dependent Measures as a Function of Resume Profile Picture and Interests

Dependent Variable	Resume Profile Picture	Resume Interests	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Trustworthiness	Masculine	Masculine	10	4.70	.949
		Feminine	10	4.80	.919
		Total	20	4.75	.910
	Feminine	Masculine	10	5.00	1.054
		Feminine	10	5.20	.632
		Total	20	5.10	.852
	Total	Masculine	20	4.85	.988
		Feminine	20	5.00	.795
		Total	40	4.93	.888
Competency	Masculine	Masculine	10	4.90	1.101
		Feminine	10	5.10	1.370
		Total	20	5.00	1.214
	Feminine	Masculine	10	5.10	.994
		Feminine	10	5.40	1.265
		Total	20	5.25	1.118
	Total	Masculine	20	5.00	1.026
		Feminine	20	5.25	1.293
		Total	40	5.13	1.159
Ambition	Masculine	Masculine	10	4.70	.823
		Feminine	10	4.30	1.337
		Total	20	4.50	1.100
	Feminine	Masculine	10	4.40	1.075
		Feminine	10	4.80	1.476
		Total	20	4.60	1.273
	Total	Masculine	20	4.55	.945
		Feminine	20	4.55	1.395
		Total	40	4.55	1.176
Hireability	Masculine	Masculine	10	4.70	.949
		Feminine	10	4.70	1.567
		Total	20	4.70	1.261
	Feminine	Masculine	10	5.00	1.247
		Feminine	10	5.50	.707
		Total	20	5.25	1.020
	Total	Masculine	20	4.85	1.089
		Feminine	20	5.10	1.252
		Total	40	4.98	1.165

Note. Potential scores for each dependent measure ranged from 1 to 7.

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations on the Measure of Competence Ratings as a Function of Resume Applicant Sex, Communication Style, and Profile Picture

Sex of Applicant	Communication Style	Profile Picture	n	M	SD
Female	*Agentic*	*Feminized*	18	21.50	4.18
		Masculinized	17	20.18	4.19
		Total	35	20.86	4.17
	Communal	*Feminized*	18	19.83	4.38
		Masculinized	16	21.44	4.70
		Total	34	20.59	4.54
	Total	*Feminized*	36	20.67	4.30
		Masculinized	33	20.79	4.42
		Total	69	20.72	4.33
Male	*Agentic*	*Feminized*	16	21.69	4.13
		Masculinized	19	21.47	2.89
		Total	35	21.57	3.46
	Communal	*Feminized*	20	20.25	3.57
		Masculinized	18	22.33	3.31
		Total	38	21.24	3.56
	Total	*Feminized*	36	20.89	3.84
		Masculinized	37	21.89	3.09
		Total	73	21.40	3.49
Total	*Agentic*	*Feminized*	34	21.59	4.09
		Masculinized	36	20.86	3.57
		Total	70	21.21	3.82
	Communal	*Feminized*	38	20.05	3.92
		Masculinized	34	21.91	3.99
		Total	72	20.93	4.04
	Total	*Feminized*	72	20.78	4.05
		Masculinized	70	21.37	3.79
		Total	142	21.07	3.92

Note. Potential Competence scores ranged from 4 to 28

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations on the Measure of Likability Ratings as a Function of Resume Applicant Sex, Communication Style, and Profile Picture

Sex of Applicant	Communication Style	Profile Picture	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Female	*Agentic*	*Feminized*	17	50.06	8.44
		Masculinized	15	47.77	4.65
		Total	32	48.93	6.93
	Communal	*Feminized*	18	53.78	8.90
		Masculinized	15	55.67	10.66
		Total	33	54.64	9.63
	Total	*Feminized*	35	51.97	8.76
		Masculinized	30	51.67	9.05
		Total	65	51.83	8.82
Male	*Agentic*	*Feminized*	16	46.06	8.98
		Masculinized	19	44.42	6.00
		Total	35	45.17	7.43
	Communal	*Feminized*	20	50.35	9.13
		Masculinized	18	52.89	8.83
		Total	38	51.55	8.96
	Total	*Feminized*	36	48.44	9.19
		Masculinized	37	48.54	8.55
		Total	73	48.49	8.81
Total	*Agentic*	*Feminized*	33	48.12	8.81
		Masculinized	34	45.85	5.59
		Total	67	46.97	7.39
	Communal	*Feminized*	38	51.97	9.07
		Masculinized	33	54.15	9.65
		Total	71	52.99	9.34
	Total	*Feminized*	71	50.18	9.09
		Masculinized	67	49.94	8.85
		Total	138	50.07	8.94

Note. Potential Likability scores ranged from 11 to 77

Appendix A: *Female Agentic Masculinized* Resume

Code ID: _____

Shannon Kowalski

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Sex: Female
Date of Birth: March 1st, 1994
Marital Status: Married
Spouse's Name: Jack Kowalski

CAREER OBJECTIVE

Recent college graduate seeking a real estate agent position with a reputable real estate agency.

WORK HISTORY

WALMART – Boston, MA   October 2014 – Present
Staff Member
- Took initiative to find extra tasks when scheduled duties were completed
- Seized opportunities to upsell extra food to customers
- Processed payments and kept daily cash reports

MCDONALD'S – Springfield, MA   June 2012 – September 2014
Cashier
- Loaded and unloaded heavy shipments
- Maintained a well-stocked inventory
- Organized products and merchandise throughout the store

EDUCATION

Bachelor of Business Administration in Real Estate   May 2016
Bentley College, Waltham, MA

PERSONAL SKILLS

- Work well under pressure
- Decisive and independent
- Ambitious and hardworking

Appendix B: Questionnaires

Code ID: _____

Instructions: Read through each question and circle the letter of the correct answer.

1) _____ **What job was the applicant applying for?**
   a. Postal Worker
   b. Real Estate Agent
   c. Administrative Assistant
   d. Bank Teller

2) _____ **What sex was the applicant?**
   a. Male
   b. Female

3) _____ **What sexuality was the applicant?**
   a. Heterosexual
   b. Homosexual
   c. Other

Part II

Instructions: Circle how strongly you agree with each statement below.

1) This person would be an efficient worker.

   Very Strongly   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Very Strongly
     Disagree   Neutral   Agree

2) This person would be a successful employee.

   Very Strongly   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Very Strongly
     Disagree   Neutral   Agree

3) This person is dependable.

    Very Strongly   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Very Strongly
      Disagree   Neutral   Agree

4) This person possesses the skills necessary for the job.

    Very Strongly   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Very Strongly
      Disagree   Neutral   Agree

Instructions: Circle how strongly you agree with each statement.

1) This person is friendly.

    Very Strongly   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Very Strongly
      Disagree   Neutral   Agree

2) This person is likable.

    Very Strongly   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Very Strongly
      Disagree   Neutral   Agree

3) This person is warm.

    Very Strongly   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Very Strongly
      Disagree   Neutral   Agree

4) This person is approachable.

    Very Strongly   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Very Strongly
      Disagree   Neutral   Agree

5) I would ask this person for advice.

    Very Strongly   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Very Strongly
      Disagree   Neutral   Agree

6) I would like this person as a coworker.

    Very Strongly   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Very Strongly
      Disagree   Neutral   Agree

7) I would like this person as a roommate.

    Very Strongly   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Very Strongly
      Disagree   Neutral   Agree

8) I would like to be friends with this person.

    Very Strongly   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Very Strongly
      Disagree   Neutral   Agree

9) This person is physically attractive.

    Very Strongly   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Very Strongly
      Disagree   Neutral   Agree

10) This person is similar to me.

    Very Strongly   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Very Strongly
      Disagree   Neutral   Agree

11) This person is knowledgeable.

    Very Strongly   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Very Strongly
      Disagree   Neutral   Agree