Sex Roles, Vol. 53, Nos. 11/12, December 2005 (© 2005)
DOI: 10.1007/s11199-005-8293-3

The Gender of Status: The Laypersons' Perception of Status Groups Is Gender-Typed

Constantina Giannopoulos,[1] Michael Conway,[1,3] and Morris Mendelson[2]

Studies addressed the hypothesis that people perceive lower status individuals as more feminine- than masculine-typed, and higher status individuals as more masculine- than feminine-typed, even when the feminine and masculine descriptors are equated in terms of their potency, evaluation, or activity; the latter are underlying dimensions of meaning (Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1957), and potency and activity are linked to status. Participants were presented the minimal status instantiation of Conway, Pizzamiglio, and Mount (1996) and rated low- and high-status individuals in terms of Adjective Check List (Gough & Heilbrun, 1980) descriptors. The expected status × gender-typing interactions emerged in Study 1 for the negative low-potency indices for male and female participants, and for the positive low-potency indices for female participants alone. Similarly, the status × gender-typing interactions emerged in Study 2 for the low-potency indices, for both low and high activity. Contrary to expectation, high-potency terms were generally attributed to high-status individuals. The findings indicated that status seems to be gendered beyond the correspondence observed in prior research between status and gender for the dimensions of potency and activity.

KEY WORDS: gender; status; potency; activity; evaluation.

As has been noted by a number of theorists, a hierarchical relation between individuals is one of the basic forms of social relations (Bugental, 2000; Fiske, 1992). Similarly, Lonner (1980) identified status as an underlying dimension in social structure and in people's understanding of behavior. Given these general points, it is of considerable significance that gender is a key determinant of social status, as has long been noted (Linton, 1936). That women generally have lower status than men in Western societies (Rhoodie, 1989) is a major determinant of people's representations of gender (Deaux & LaFrance, 1998). The status difference is apparent in people's stereotypes of women and men. For example, women are perceived as more communal and less agentic than men (Conway, Pizzamiglio, & Mount, 1996). Communality refers to an emotional, interpersonal orientation, whereas agency refers to an assertive, instrumental orientation. Similarly, women relative to men may be perceived as more warm and less competent, in a manner analogous to how other lower status groups are perceived (Glick & Fiske, 1999).

Status can account for many other aspects of gender representation, as well as for many gender differences in social behavior. Some recent examples for gender representation include gender stereotypes of unmitigated (i.e., extreme) communality and unmitigated agency (Conway & Vartanian, 2000), of emotions (Conway, Di Fazio, & Mayman, 1999), and of worry (Conway, Wood, Dugas, & Pushkar, 2003). Status can account for gender differences in

[1]Concordia University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.
[2]University of New Brunswick, Saint John, New Brunswick, Canada.
[3]To whom correspondence should be addressed to Michael Conway, Department of Psychology, Concordia University, 7141 Sherbrooke St. West, Montreal, Quebec, Canada H4B 1R6; e-mail: michael.conway@concordia.ca.

aggression observed in social psychological research (Conway, Irannejad, & Giannopoulos, in press), as well as certain gender differences in leadership style (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003). Status also relates to whether people individuate female and male targets in social perception(Stewart, Vassar, Sanchez, & David, 2000), how people judge female and male targets' ability (Biernat & Kobrynowicz, 1997; Foschi, 1996), and people's perceptions of causality in cross-gender interactions (LaFrance, Brownell, & Hahn, 1997). See Conway et al. (1996) for a more exhaustive list of status-related findings in the domain of gender.

A status difference between two categories of individuals, such as women and men, refers to a "differentiation of prestige and deference" (Mayer & Buckley, 1970, p. 46; Shils, 1975). That is, some individuals are seen as more worthy and are given more respect than others. As a construct, status is best construed as unidimensional (Berger, Wagner, & Zelditch, 1985; Rosenberg & Sedlak, 1972; Tracey, 1994). Status is also inherently linked to different forms of power. At a psychological level, greater prestige and deference imply referent power, in that higher status individuals are admired and may be emulated (Raven & Kruglanski, 1970). Status leads to expert power, as higher status individuals are assumed to be more competent (Berger et al., 1985). Status allows for greater reward and punishment power, as higher status individuals' recognition is likely to be more valuable to others. These general statements regarding status hold for gender. For example, status accounts for higher respect for men than women being "an important element of contemporary sexism" (Jackson, Esses, & Burris, 2001, p. 48). In research on leadership in small groups, people behave as if men are more competent than women: people are more likely to acquiesce to men's assertive behaviors (Ridgeway & Diekema, 1992).

There is another aspect to the general construct of status, one that is apparent in society at large. Beyond psychological aspects of status, higher status is usually associated with other power bases (Lenski, 1966), due, for example, to higher status individuals' social position, control over various forms of rewards and punishments, or knowledge. It is also the case that people with greater power are often attributed greater status (Ridgeway & Balkwell, 1997): consider, for example the status of very wealthy individuals. These societal factors are highly relevant to gender: women are overrepresented in lower status caretaking positions, such as secretary or nurse. Many of the highest status social positions, such as senior executives of major companies, are nearly exclusively held by men (Jacobs, 1999; Valian, 1998).

In sum, whether related to gender or other aspects of identity, greater status means more prestige and deference. The particular forms of power linked to status may vary, depending on whether one is considering psychological aspects alone, or factors that operate in society at large, such as differential occupation of social positions. In any case, theoretical work on the nature of power suggests that a person's power, regardless of its particular type, is expressed in two ways (Dépret & Fiske, 1993; Ng, 1980; Zelditch, 1992): one is in the person who has the competence and control to pursue his or her own interests and to choose activities; the other is in the person who controls others' outcomes, which implies the ability to influence them.

Gender seems to be an important status cue. Gender is an aspect of others' identity that is likely automatically processed in social perception. Gender is a pervasive construct (Brewer & Lui, 1989), as people assign a gender identity to all others with whom they interact. Research cited above provides strong evidence that people's perceptions of women and men are shaped by status. People hold a wide range of gender-differentiated expectations regarding the social roles and occupations held by others, as well as for others' behavior in a wide range of public situations. One of the authors, for example, is often amused by mentally switching the gender of an individual behaving in a public situation, such as a coffee or pastry shop, and imagining how others would react. This exercise is instructive when a man behaves very assertively, or a woman behaves very tentatively. If the loud person were a woman, or the tentative one a man, others might react quite differently.

The impact of status on the social representation of gender can be largely understood in terms of the underlying dimensions of potency, activity, and evaluation in implicit personality theory (Ashmore, 1981; Rosenberg & Sedlak, 1972). Implicit personality theory is the layperson's representation of others' personality characteristics, and it defines the connections that people assume exist among various traits (Fiske & Taylor, 1991). Potency refers to the amount of power or force implied by or associated with a certain characteristic or construct. Activity refers to the amount of movement or change. Evaluation refers to the positive or negative quality of

a characteristic or construct. Potency, activity, and evaluation are underlying dimensions in implicit personality theory (Ashmore, 1981; Rosenberg, Nelson, & Vivekananthan, 1968; Rosenberg & Sedlak, 1972). The emergence of potency, activity, and evaluation in implicit personality theory reflects the more general phenomenon that these dimensions underlie human judgment of both social and nonsocial objects (Osgood, May, & Miron, 1975; Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1957); the term *objects* is used here in the sense of targets of people's attention (Webster, 1981).

Higher status individuals are likely to be perceived as more potent and more active, which can account for some gender stereotypes. Consider the stereotypes of men as agentic and women as communal. Agency is higher in potency and activity than communality is (Ashmore, 1981; Rosenberg et al., 1968; Williams & Best, 1990). That men are perceived as higher in extreme or unmitigated agency, and women are perceived as higher in unmitigated communality, also conforms to this pattern. As well, the fact that men are perceived as expressing more anger than women (Brody & Hall, 1993) can be understood in terms of the high potency associated with anger (Shaver, Schwartz, Kirson, & O'Connor, 1987). In turn, women are perceived as expressing more fear and sadness, which conforms to a lower potency representation of women (Conway et al., 1999; Shaver et al., 1987). In sum, a number of gender stereotypes conform to a pattern of differential portrayal of women and men in terms of the dimensions of potency and activity, which themselves are linked to status. In contrast to potency and activity, evaluation is likely not a dimension that allows one to distinguish between status groups. For example, agency and communality are not clearly distinguishable in terms of evaluation (Ashmore, 1981). People may value both the go-getting attitude of an agentic individual and the interpersonal warmth of a communal individual.

The present research concerns the association in laypeople's psychology between gender and status. We took an approach different from the research on gender stereotypes described above. The focus was on whether people generally represent status groups in gender-typed terms, even for status groups that are objectively defined independently from gender. This gender-typing would go beyond differences that may emerge as a function of the dimensions of potency and activity in implicit personality theory. Specifically, the hypothesis in the present research was that people would perceive lower status individuals more in feminine than in masculine terms, and higher status individuals more in masculine than in feminine terms, even when we controlled for the levels of potency or activity of the actual descriptive terms.

In other words, the expectation was that status is gendered in laypeople's perception. The hypothesis was addressed by presenting participants with a description of low- and high-status individuals, and then asking them to rate the target individuals on trait terms that varied in their gender-typing, but that were equated in terms of their levels of potency, activity, or evaluation. Evaluation was also taken into account to ensure as much correspondence as possible between masculine- and feminine-typed terms.

If people feminize lower status groups relative to higher status groups, there may be significant social consequences. For example, this may be problematic for men who hold lower status social positions. The expectations others hold of them as a function of their social position may clash with those implied by the culturally prescribed masculine gender role (cf., Deschamps, 1982, on the implications of membership in low-status groups; also see Pettigrew, 1964). Conversely, women in higher status social positions may suffer from the societal perception that their higher status conflicts with their feminine gender role (e.g., being interpersonally sensitive).

The Present Studies

To demonstrate that the construct of status is itself gendered in laypeople's perception, the status manipulation itself needed to be unconfounded with gender. The status manipulation also needed to be unconfounded with other characteristics that are typically gender-related, such as social roles (e.g., caretaker of children) and occupations (e.g., secretary, plumber). The description of low- and high-status individuals used in the present studies avoids these confounds. The status manipulation developed and used by Conway et al. (1996) was adopted in the present research. Participants were presented a description of a society, which included an explicit statement regarding the status difference between two subgroups. This status manipulation is said to be minimal in that the status groups are equated on gender, age, social roles,

and occupations. Furthermore, the status groups are undifferentiated in terms of interpersonal behavior. This status manipulation has been used in other studies (Conway et al., 1999; Conway et al., in press; Conway & Vartanian, 2000; Conway et al., 2003).

Two studies were conducted that addressed people's perceptions of low- and high-status individuals by asking them to rate the individuals on traits drawn from the Adjective Check List (ACL; Gough & Heilbrun, 1980). The trait terms were selected by systematically sampling terms as a function of their levels of potency, activity, or evaluation. Most important with regard to the hypothesis, terms were selected as a function of their gender stereotypicality ratings. Gender stereotypicality refers to the extent to which a trait term is construed as more characteristic either of women or men. Ratings of the 300 ACL terms on the dimensions of potency, activity, and evaluation, as well as gender typicality ratings, were obtained from Williams and Best (1990). The ACL was originally designed to allow for general personality evaluation. It has been used to draw parallels between different conceptualizations of major dimensions of personality (John, 1990). The ACL continues to be used in a wide range of research (e.g., Craig & Bivens, 2000; Williams, Satterwhite, & Saiz, 1998), including research on gender stereotypes (e.g., Williams & Best, 1990).

Because of the sometimes high positive correlations between potency, activity, and evaluation ratings for ACL trait terms in Williams and Best (1990; for similar findings, see Rosenberg et al., 1968), the scales for Studies 1 and 2 were based on different combinations of dimensions.

STUDY 1

For Study 1, trait terms were selected in terms of potency and evaluation. A sample of trait terms was drawn from each of the following quadrants: low-potent/negative, low-potent/positive, high-potent/negative, and high-potent/positive. Within each quadrant, masculine-typed terms were selected to define a masculine scale; similarly, feminine-typed terms were selected to define a feminine scale. The exception to this general scheme is noted below. The hypothesis was that people perceive lower status individuals more in feminine than in masculine terms, and higher status individuals more in masculine than in feminine terms.

Method

Participants

Participants were students at Concordia University who were recruited from a booth on campus. A sign indicated *Psychology Project* and *Volunteers Needed*. Students were encouraged to complete a packet of questionnaires at the booth with the possibility of winning lottery prizes (the questionnaires were unrelated to the present research); those who were interested in participating in future research specified their names and telephone numbers. There were 40 male and 39 female participants. Mean age was 23.01 years ($SD = 5.73$); range was 18–44. Although ethnicity and language information was not collected from participants, the booth recruitment procedure has recently been shown to result in the following sample profile. When asked "What cultural group, if any, do you identify most with?", participants' responses could be grouped into the following principal categories: Canadian (24%), Middle Eastern and South Asian (14%), Chinese (10%), European (10%), French Canadian (6%), White (5%), Latin American (30%), and Black (2%); 23% left the item blank. When asked "What languages do you speak most often at home?", the majority of the responses were as follows: 51% indicated English alone, 18% indicated French alone, 7% indicated English or French and some third language, and 19% indicated a language other than English or French.

Materials

The ACL trait terms were selected in terms of their potency and evaluation. A sample of trait terms was drawn from each of the following quadrants: low-potent/negative, low-potent/positive, high-potent/negative, and high-potent/positive. Cutoffs were selected to identify 16–20 trait terms in one contiguous area of each quadrant. The six trait terms in each quadrant that were most masculine-typed were selected to define a masculine scale; similarly, the six trait terms that were most feminine-typed were selected to define a feminine scale. The trait terms that defined each index are listed in Table I. There is an exception to this general scheme. The derivation of a high-potency/negative feminine-typed scale was not possible, due to insufficient feminine-typed terms in the ACL. Only two terms, *bossy* and *complicated*, were related

Table I. Masculine- and Feminine-Typed Trait Terms Used in Study 1

	Low potent		High potent	
Valence	Masculine	Feminine	Masculine	Feminine
Negative	Apathetic	Complaining	Argumentative	—
	Dull	Fault-finding	Autocratic	
	Lazy	Foolish	Demanding	
	Selfish	Infantile	Forceful	
	Thankless	Self-pitying	Headstrong	
	Unfriendly	Whiny	Severe	
Positive	Calm	Cautious	Active	Alert
	Cool	Changeable	Adventurous	Efficient
	Easy-going	Discrete	Energetic	Enthusiastic
	Informal	Quiet	Independent	Intelligent
	Leisurely	Sentimental	Industrious	Optimistic
	Relaxed	Softhearted	Wise	Versatile

Note. A mean index was calculated for each set of trait terms. There were no high-potent feminine-typed negative terms used because of a paucity of such terms in the Adjective Check List. For the low-potent positive feminine-typed terms, the index used in the analyses consisted only of the term *sentimental*.

to women in those 16–20 terms initially selected from the ACL for that quadrant. Apart from this exception, analyses were conducted to verify that the masculine- and feminine-typed indices were equated on potency and valence within quadrant. These analyses were conducted for the low-potent/negative indices and the high-potent/positive indices. In each case, masculine- and feminine-typed terms did not significantly differ in terms of potency and valence within each quadrant. Note that this analysis was not conducted for the low-potent/positive indices, as the feminine-typed index consisted of only one item (i.e., *sentimental*; see below) of the six listed in Table I.

In sum, seven scales were derived for Study 1. The trait terms listed in Table I were presented in a random order to each participant. The set of trait terms was presented twice, once for participants to rate low-status individuals and once for them to rate high-status individuals. Each trait term was followed by a 7-point scale with endpoints labeled *never or almost never true* (1) and *always or almost always true* (7).

Procedure

Participants who, at the recruitment booth, indicated interest in participating in future paid research were contacted by telephone. There were 3–4 participants at each experimental session. At the outset, participants were informed that the study concerned their initial impressions of other people. They were presented a description of a society that consisted of a low-status group and a high-status group. The description is the one developed and used by Conway et al. (1996; see their Appendix B for a full description). Most of the presented information concerned the society as a whole. It was stated that the society consisted of a high- and a low-status group. The status difference was explicitly acknowledged but presented incidentally. Status was ascribed, not achieved. Status groups were distinguished by plausible markers (e.g., personal ornamentation, location and characteristics of housing, and preferential access to certain resources such as food). There was no indication of intergroup conflict. No information was provided regarding (a) personality characteristics, (b) style of social behavior, (c) goods for which access served as grounds for power, (d) exchange of goods between groups (Zelditch, 1992), or (e) status-related use of force, manipulation, or influence. By these deliberate omissions, status was unconfounded with other factors. In the description, the status groups were matched on all but some objective status markers, such as personal ornamentation and preferential access to certain resources.

After presentation of the description, participants reported their perceptions of low- and high-status individuals in terms of each of the trait terms selected from the ACL. Assessment of participants' perceptions of low- and high-status individuals was counterbalanced. Participants then completed a manipulation check in which they reported their perceptions of low- and high-status individuals' power

to influence others and power to control their own outcomes (cf. Conway et al., 1996). Responses were on 7-point scales with endpoints labeled *none at all* (1) and *a great deal* (7). Participants then made a forced choice in regard to which group held higher status. Finally, participants were informed of the purpose of the study and paid $8.

Results

Manipulation Check

Analyses of the manipulation check items confirmed that high-status ($M = 5.27$) relative to low-status ($M = 2.85$) individuals were perceived as more able to influence others, $t(78) = 11.48, p < .001$. Similarly, high-status ($M = 5.04$) relative to low-status ($M = 3.16$) individuals were perceived as more able to control their own outcomes, $t(78) = 8.60$, $p < .001$. All except one participant correctly identified which of the two groups held higher status.

Perceptions

For each participant, a mean score was calculated for each index by averaging across the six trait terms. Means are reported in Table II, as are reliability coefficients for each index. The low-potent positive feminine-typed index consisted only of the term *sentimental*, as there was no reliability (i.e., α was too low) for an index based on the six terms of that quadrant. This term was selected because it was the only item that was significantly correlated with other items in participants' ratings of both low- and high-status individuals (although not with the same other items in each case). For the seven indices, preliminary analyses that included participant gender as an additional factor revealed some significant effects involving both gender of participants and status of targets. These are reported below. Otherwise, results are reported collapsed across participant gender.

An ANOVA (analysis of variance) was conducted on participants' ratings of low- and high-status individuals in terms of the masculine- and feminine-typed indices in each of the following potency and valence quadrants: low-potent/negative, low-potent/positive, and high-potent/positive. For the ANOVAs, status (high or low) and gender-typing (masculine or feminine) were within-participant factors. Such an ANOVA was not conducted for the high-potent/negative quadrant as only a masculine-typed index was derived in that case.

The ANOVA for the low-potent/negative ratings revealed a status main effect, $F(1, 78) = 14.50$, $p < .001$, that was qualified by the expected status $\times$ gender-typing interaction, $F(1, 78) = 4.11$, $p < .05$. Low-status individuals were rated lower than high-status individuals on the low-potent/negative indices, both masculine- (e.g., apathetic) and feminine-typed (e.g., complaining). Comparisons across masculine- and feminine-typed indices revealed the expected pattern. Participants tended to rate low-status individuals higher on the feminine- than on the masculine-typed index, and tended to rate high-status individuals higher on the masculine- than on the feminine-typed index. The gender-typing differences were not significant, however.

The ANOVA for the low-potent/positive ratings revealed a main effect for status, $F(1, 78) = 8.53$, $p = .005$. Low-status individuals were rated higher than high-status individuals on the low-potent/positive indices, both masculine- (e.g., calm) and feminine-typed (e.g., cautious). Contrary to expectation the status $\times$ gender-typing interac-

Table II. Participants' Perceptions of Low- and High-Status Individuals in Study 1

	Low-status individuals			High-Status individuals		
Scale	*M*	*SD*	α	*M*	*SD*	α
Low Potency/Negative/Masculine	2.57	.83	.76	3.05	.99	.82
Low Potency/Negative/Feminine	2.66	.92	.80	2.96	1.04	.84
Low Potency/Positive/Masculine	4.31	.73	.50	4.13	.74	.58
Low Potency/Positive/Feminine	4.47	1.38	—	4.14	1.44	—
High Potency/Negative/Masculine	3.05	.83	.70	4.52	1.00	.80
High Potency/Positive/Masculine	4.81	.77	.53	4.97	.83	.69
High Potency/Positive/Feminine	4.93	.77	.68	5.05	.71	.76

Note. Range for each item is 1–7. The alpha coefficient for the Low Potency/Positive/Feminine index is not reported as it consisted of only one item. Note that there was no High Potency/Negative/Feminine index. $n = 79$.

tion was not significant, $F < 1$. However, the status × gender-typing × participant gender interaction was significant, $F(1, 77) = 5.51$, $p < .03$. This three-way interaction was because female, but not male, participants exhibited the expected status × gender-typing interaction, $F(1, 38) = 5.18$, $p < .03$. Consistent with expectations, female participants tended to rate high-status individuals higher on the masculine- ($M = 4.24$) than on the feminine-typed ($M = 3.87$) index, and they tended to rate low-status individuals higher on the feminine-typed ($M = 4.44$) than on the masculine-typed ($M = 4.29$) index, but the gender-typing differences were not significant.

There was one high-potent/negative index, which is masculine-typed. High-status individuals were rated higher than low-status individuals on this high-potent/negative index, $t(78) = 9.09$, $p < .001$. Finally, the ANOVA for high-potent/positive ratings did not reveal any significant effects. In particular, the expected status × gender-typing interaction was not significant, $F < 1$.

Discussion

Findings show partial support for the hypothesis that lower status individuals are perceived more in feminine than in masculine terms and that higher status individuals are portrayed more in masculine than in feminine terms. The key tests of the hypothesis are the results on the status × gender-typing interactions for each quadrant. In Study 1, for design reasons, the expected interaction could be assessed in only three of four cases. Results indicate that, of these three, the interaction was significant for both male and female participants in one case and only for female participants in another.

Other findings were also consistent with expectations, although the absence of feminine-typed terms limited the comparisons that could be made. There was only a masculine-typed index for high potency and negative valence (because there are few such ACL terms that are feminine-typed). High-status individuals were rated higher than low-status individuals on this masculine-typed index. One should also note that a number of indices failed to reveal the expected results. This was the case for the feminine and masculine high-potency/positive indices, for which no significant effects emerged.

STUDY 2

Study 2 was conducted to address the same hypothesis as Study 1, but with ACL trait terms selected according to the dimensions of potency and activity. Following the same approach as in Study 1, a sample of trait terms was drawn from each of the following quadrants: low-potent/low-active, low-potent/high-active, high-potent/low-active, and high-potent/high-active. In each quadrant, masculine- and feminine-typed terms were selected to define the masculine and feminine scales, respectively. The exception to this general scheme is noted below.

Method

Participants

Participants were recruited as in Study 1. There were 29 male and 29 female participants. Mean age was 25.42 years ($SD = 8.20$); range was 18–58.

Materials

The indices in Study 2 were derived in a manner that generally paralleled that of Study 1. The terms are presented in Table III. A sample of 16–20 trait terms was drawn from each of the following quadrants of the ACL trait term pool: low-potent/low-active, low-potent/high-active, high-potent/low-active, and high-potent/high-active. Masculine and feminine scales were defined for each quadrant, as in Study 1. The exception to this was for the high-potent high-active quadrant. No feminine scale could be derived for this quadrant, as only two terms, *enthusiastic* and *spunky*, were feminine-typed in those identified in the initial selection of 16–20 ACL items. Given this situation, positive and negative masculine-typed indices were derived for the high-potent high-active quadrant. The rationale for deriving these two high-potency high-activity indices was to facilitate a general understanding of the results obtained for all the indices: all of the other indices were generally internally coherent in terms of evaluation. As well, because of the limited number of items, the negative masculine-typed index in this quadrant consisted of four instead of six terms: aggressive, argumentative, dominant, and forceful. In sum, eight scales were derived for

Table III. Masculine- and Feminine-Typed Trait Terms Used in Study 2

	Low potent		High potent	
Activity	Masculine	Feminine	Masculine	Feminine
Low active	Apathetic	Meek	Honest	Attractive
	Dull	Mild	Natural	Forgiving
	Gloomy	Submissive	Reasonable	Patient
	Lazy	Sulky	Serious	Pleasant
	Slow	Unambitious	Stable	Poised
	Spineless	Weak	Steady	Sympathetic
High active	Disorderly	Flirtatious	*Positive*	—
	Greedy	Frivolous	Active	
	Impatient	Fussy	Assertive	
	Intolerant	Nagging	Courageous	
	Prejudicial	Nervous	Daring	
	Show-off	Temperamental	Enterprising	
			Sharp-witted	
			Negative	—
			Aggressive	
			Argumentative	
			Dominant	
			Forceful	

Note. A mean index was calculated for each set of trait terms. There were no high-potent, high-active feminine-typed terms used due to a paucity of such terms in the Adjective Check List. There were four, not six, terms in the high-potent, high-active, negative masculine-typed category.

Study 2. As can be expected, because potency is a dimension we considered in both studies, there is some overlap in the scale contents for Study 2 and Study 1. Preliminary analyses demonstrated that the masculine- and feminine-typed items were equivalent in potency and activity within each of the low-potent/low-active, low-potent/high-active, and high-potent/low-active quadrants.

Procedure

The procedure in Study 2 was identical to that of Study 1, with the exception of the differences in the questionnaire used to assess participants' perceptions of low- and high-status individuals.

Results

Manipulation Check

As in Study 1, high-status relative to low-status individuals were perceived as having greater influence ($M = 5.71$, $M = 2.76$, respectively), $t(57) = 12.34$, $p < .001$. High-status relative to low-status individuals were also perceived as having more control over their own out ($M = 5.28$, $M = 3.24$, respectively), $t(57) = 9.14$, $p < .001$. All except two participants correctly identified which of the two groups held higher status.

Perceptions

For each participant, a mean score was calculated for each index. Means and reliability coefficients are reported in Table IV. Preliminary analyses including participant gender as an additional factor revealed some significant effects for both status and participant gender. These are reported below. Otherwise, results are reported collapsed across participant gender.

An ANOVA was conducted on participants' ratings of low- and high-status individuals in terms of the masculine- and feminine-typed indices in each of the following potency and activity quadrants: low-potent/low-active, low-potent/high-active, and high-potent/low-active. For these analyses, status (high or low) and gender-typing (masculine or feminine) were within-participant factors. An ANOVA with gender-typing as a factor was not conducted for the high-potent/high-active quadrant as only masculine-negative and masculine-positive indices were derived for that quadrant. The ANOVA for

Table IV. Participants' Perceptions of Low- and High-Status Individuals in Study 2

Scale	Low-status individuals			High-Status individuals		
	M	*SD*	α	*M*	*SD*	α
Low Potency/Low Activity/Masculine	2.89	.86	.68	2.79	1.00	.81
Low Potency/Low Activity/Feminine	3.75	.88	.62	2.80	.90	.73
Low Potency/High Activity/Masculine	2.53	.87	.68	3.69	.95	.71
Low Potency/High Activity/Feminine	2.88	.86	.72	3.42	.95	.71
High Potency/Low Activity/Masculine	5.19	.73	.59	5.00	.75	.67
High Potency/Low Activity/Feminine	4.76	.78	.74	4.41	.75	.61
High Potency/High Activity/Negative	2.64	.89	.70	4.56	1.00	.70
High Potency/High Activity/Positive	4.29	.92	.69	4.81	.76	.57

Note. Range for each item is 1–7. Note that the High Positive/High Activity indices, both positive and negative, are masculine-typed. $n = 58$.

the high-potent/high-active indices was conducted with status (high or low) and valence (negative or positive) as within-participant factors.

The ANOVA for low-potent/low-active ratings revealed significant main effects for status, $F(1, 57) = 21.58$, $p < .001$, and gender-typing, $F(1, 57) = 32.11$, $p < .001$, that were qualified by the expected status × gender-typing interaction, $F(1, 57) = 26.09$, $p < .001$. The status main effect was due to low-status individuals being rated higher than high-status individuals on the low-potent/low-active indices, both masculine- (e.g., gloomy) and feminine-typed (e.g., submissive). Partially consistent with expectations, the interaction was due to low-status individuals being rated higher on the feminine- than the masculine-typed index, $t(57) = 7.44$, $p < .001$; high-status individuals were rated at a similar level on the masculine- and feminine-typed indices, $t < 1$.

The ANOVA for low-potent/high-active ratings revealed a main effect for status, $F(1, 57) = 52.20$, $p < .001$, that was qualified by the expected status × gender-typing interaction, $F(1, 57) = 27.57$, $p < .001$. The status main effect was due to high-status individuals being rated higher than low-status individuals on the low-potent/high-active indices, both masculine- (e.g., intolerant) and feminine-typed (e.g., nagging). As expected, the interaction was due to low-status individuals being rated higher on the feminine- than the masculine-typed index, $t(57) = 4.16$, $p < .001$; high-status individuals were rated higher on the masculine- than the feminine-typed index, $t(57) = 2.93$, $p < .01$. In addition, the status × gender-typing × participant gender interaction was significant, $F(1, 56) = 5.91$, $p < .02$. This three-way interaction was because both female and male participants exhibited the expected status × gender-typing interaction, but the interaction was stronger for female participants.

The ANOVA for high-potent/low-active ratings revealed a significant main effect for status, $F(1, 57) = 12.39$, $p = .001$, as well as a significant main effect for gender-typing, $F(1, 57) = 56.96$, $p < .001$. The expected status × gender-typing interaction was not significant, $F(1, 57) = 2.13$, *ns*. The status main effect was due to high-status individuals being rated lower than low-status individuals on the high-potent/low-active indices, both masculine- (e.g., stable) and feminine-typed (e.g., poised).

The ANOVA for high-potent/high-active ratings revealed main effects for both status, $F(1, 57) = 100.04$, $p < .001$, and valence, $F(1, 57) = 61.61$, $p < .001$, that were qualified by a status × valence interaction, $F(1, 57) = 76.33$, $p < .001$. The status main effect was due to high-status individuals being rated higher than low-status individuals on the high-potent/high-active indices, both negative (e.g., aggressive) and positive (e.g., active). The valence main effect was due to participants making higher ratings on the positive than the negative indices. The status × valence interaction was due to the valence effect being greater for participants' ratings of low-status individuals than of high-status individuals. In the latter case, the valence effect was marginally significant, $t(57) = 1.75$, $p = .086$. In addition, the status × valence × participant gender interaction was significant, $F(1, 56) = 6.02$, $p < .02$. This three-way interaction was because both female and male participants exhibited the status × valence interaction described above; the valence difference was greater for female participants' than for male participants' ratings of low-status individuals.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

As was the case for Study 1, findings of Study 2 show partial support for the hypothesis that lower status individuals are perceived more in feminine than in masculine terms and that higher status individuals are portrayed more in masculine than in feminine terms. The key tests of the hypothesis are the results on the status × gender-typing interactions for each quadrant. The interaction could be assessed in three of four cases in Study 2 given the design of the study. Results indicate that the interaction was significant in two of three cases in a manner consistent with expectations for both male and female participants. Similarly, in Study 1 the expected interaction emerged for all participants in one case, and for female participants in another.

Some other findings were also consistent with expectations, although the absence of feminine-typed terms limited the comparisons that could be made. In Study 2 there were only masculine-typed indices, one positive and one negative, for high potency and high activity (because of there being few feminine-typed ACL terms of high potency and high activity). As was expected, high-status individuals were rated higher than low-status individuals on these masculine-typed indices, but the fact that the indices were also of high potency makes interpretation difficult. The results may be due simply to higher status individuals being attributed characteristics of greater potency. The same can be said for the finding of Study 1 that high-status individuals were rated higher on the masculine-typed index of high potency and negative valence (as there was no corresponding feminine-typed index).

The feminine and masculine high-potency/low-activity indices in Study 2 failed to reveal the expected results. Higher status individuals were rated lower on both feminine- and masculine-typed indices. Even though not conforming to expectations, this finding highlights the fact that higher status individuals were not always attributed high-potency characteristics in the present studies, although that was the general trend.

Overall, the results of Studies 1 and 2 suggest that our hypothesis is valid only within a range of characteristics that are low in potency, or low in potency and activity. Specifically, status is gender-typed to a limited extent; constraints are apparently imposed by levels of potency and activity. Characteristics of high potency were attributed more consistently to either high- or low-status individuals regardless of gender-typing; high-potency characteristics generally were attributed to high-status individuals. It is also useful to note again that the derivation of feminine- and masculine-typed indices in the development of the measures on the basis of the 300 ACL terms was limited in a number of respects in the present studies. No feminine-typed terms of high-potency and negativity were used in Study 1 (as few such terms exist). No feminine-typed terms of high-potency and high-activity were used in Study 2 (for the same reason). It might have been possible to introduce additional terms, beyond those of the ACL, which might have met these criteria. One example is *bitch*, which refers to "a malicious, spiteful, and domineering woman" (Webster, 1981, p. 112). We did not do this because we wanted to ensure a clear comparison of the present research to other studies based on the ACL.

There are limitations to the present research. The studies were conducted with a particular description of low- and high-status individuals being presented to participants. One might argue that other results might have emerged with other status manipulations. This is possible, but it is important to note that the selection of the present status manipulation was quite deliberate. The status manipulation was one designed to avoid confounds with other characteristics or activities often associated with status, such as social roles or occupations. In contrast, if one conducted a study in which individuals in low- or high-status occupations were judged on the ACL trait terms considered here, there would be a number of limitations. First, those individuals would be identified as being either female or male, which would complicate interpretation of the results. If a gender effect emerged, it would be unclear whether this gender effect was due to gender operating as a status cue or whether the gender effect was due to other characteristics associated with gender. Second, the pairing of low- and high-status occupations cannot be definitively made on theoretical grounds (Conway et al., 1996). For example, people's perceptions of a lawyer could be compared with people's perceptions of either a legal clerk or a legal secretary, and it is not clear which comparison should be made.

Another limitation of the present research is that the scales were derived based on ratings of potency, evaluation, activity, and gender-typing that were reported by Williams and Best (1990). Their ratings were obtained from United States in the 1970s. In contrast, the present research was conducted with Canadian students more than 25 years

later. The most significant concern may be with ratings of gender-typing, as these were used to define the masculine and feminine indices used in the present studies. It seems unlikely that there are significant differences between United States and Canadian views with regard to gender-typing. Williams and Best (1990) reported that there was a high amount of shared variance in the gender-typing of trait terms across their Canadian and US samples. With regard to potency, evaluation, and activity ratings, it seems very unlikely that there would be significant differences that would affect the present results. These ratings refer to the meaning of the terms, and such meaning is linked closely to language use, which is very similar in Canada and the United States. Finally, one might question the language skills of the participants in the present studies and raise the possibility that their more limited competence (recall that many indicated speaking languages other than English at home) may have influenced the results obtained. This seems unlikely given the consistency in results across studies, and participants were, after all, enrolled at an English language university.

In sum, the present findings suggest that status groups are distinguished both in terms of gender and in terms of the fundamental dimensions of potency and activity that exist in people's representation of others in their social worlds. These findings support, in part, the argument that there is a basic conceptual relation in people's minds between status and gender. The present findings have broad implications, as status is a major dimension in social life.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The present research was supported by research grants from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) and from the Fonds pour la Formation des Chercheurs et l'Aide a la Recherche du Quebec, both awarded to Michael Conway.

REFERENCES

Ashmore, R. D. (1981). Sex stereotypes and implicit personality theory. In D. L. Hamilton (Ed.), *Cognitive processes in stereotyping and intergroup behavior* (pp. 37–81). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Berger, J., Wagner, D. G., & Zelditch, M. (1985). [Introduction] Expectation states theory: Review and assessment. In J. Berger & M. Zelditch (Eds.), *Status, rewards, and influence: How expectations organize behavior* (pp. 1–72). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Biernat, M., & Kobrynowicz, D. (1997). Gender- and race-based standards of competence: Lower minimum standards but higher ability standards of devalued groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *72,* 544–557.

Brewer, M. B., & Lui, L. N. (1989). The primacy of age and sex in the structure of person categories. *Social Cognition*, *7,* 262–274.

Brody, L. R., & Hall, J. A. (1993). Gender and emotion. In M. Lewis & J. M. Haviland (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (pp. 447–460). New York: Guilford Press.

Bugental, D. B. (2000). Acquisition of the algorithms of social life: A domain-based approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, *126,* 187–219.

Conway, M., Di Fazio, R., & Mayman, S. (1999). Judging others' emotions as a function of the others' status. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *62,* 291–305.

Conway, M., Irannejad, S., & Giannopoulos, C. (2005). Status-based expectancies for aggression, with regard to gender differences in aggression in social psychological research. *Aggressive Behavior*, *31,* 381–398.

Conway, M., Pizzamiglio, M. T., & Mount, L. (1996). Status, communality, and agency: Implications for stereotypes of gender and other groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *71,* 25–38.

Conway, M., & Vartanian, L. (2000). Status in gender stereotypes: Beyond communality and agency. *Sex Roles*, *43,* 181–199.

Conway, M., Wood, W.-J., Dugas, M., & Pushkar, D. (2003). Are women perceived as engaging in more maladaptive worry than men? A status interpretation. *Sex Roles*, *49,* 1–10.

Craig, R. J., & Bivens, A. (2000). Psychological needs associated with MMPI-2 scales in a nonclinical sample. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *74,* 439–446.

Deaux, K., & LaFrance, M. (1998). Gender. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & L. Gardner (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (Vol. 1, 4th ed., pp. 788–827). New York: McGraw Hill.

Dépret, E., & Fiske, S. T. (1993). Social cognition and power: Some cognitive consequences of social structure as a source of control deprivation. In G. Weary, F. Gleicher, & K. L. Marsh (Eds.), *Control motivation and social cognition* (pp. 176–202). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Deschamps, J. (1982). Social identity and relations of power between groups. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Social identity and intergroup relations* (pp. 85–98.). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin*, *129,* 569–591.

Fiske, A. P. (1992). The four elementary forms of sociality: Framework for a unified theory of social relations. *Psychological Review*, *99,* 689–723.

Fiske, S. T., & Taylor, S. E. (1991). *Social cognition* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Foschi, M. (1996). Double standards in the evaluation of men and women. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *59,* 237–254.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1999). Sexism and other "isms": Independence, status, and the ambivalent content of stereotypes. In W. B. Swann Jr. (Ed.), *Sexism and stereotypes in modern society: The gender science of Janet Taylor Spence* (pp. 193–221). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Gough, H. G., & Heilbrun, A. B. J. (1980). *The Adjective Check List manual*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Jackson, L. M., Esses, V. M., & Burris, C. T. (2001). Contemporary sexism and discrimination: The importance of respect for men and women. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *27,* 48–61.

Jacobs, J. A. (1999). The sex segregation of occupations: Prospects for the 21st century. In G. N. Powell (Ed.), *Handbook of gender and work* (pp. 125–141). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

John, O. P. (1990). The "big five" factor taxonomy: Dimensions of personality in the natural language and in questionnaires. In L. A. Pervin (Ed.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 66–100). New York: Guilford Press.

LaFrance, M., Brownell, H., & Hahn, E. (1997). Interpersonal verbs, gender, and implicit causality. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *60,* 138–152.

Lenski, G. E. (1966). *Power and privilege: A theory of social stratification*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Linton, R. (1936). *The study of man: An introduction*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Lonner, W. J. (1980). The search for psychological universals. In H. C. Triandis & W. W. Lambert (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 143–204). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Mayer, K. B., & Buckley, W. (1970). *Class and society* (3rd ed.). New York: Random House.

Ng, S. K. (1980). *The social psychology of power*. New York: Academic Press.

Osgood, C. E., May, W. H., & Miron, M. S. (1975). *Cross-cultural universals of affective meaning*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., & Tannenbaum, P. H. (1957). *The measurement of meaning*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1964). *A profile of the Negro American*. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.

Raven, B. H., & Kruglanski, A. W. (1970). Conflict and power. In P. G. Swingle (Ed.), *The structure of conflict* (pp. 69–110). New York: Academic Press.

Rhoodie, E. M. (1989). *Discrimination against women: A global survey*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland.

Ridgeway, C. J., & Diekema, D. (1992). Are gender differences status differences? In C. J. Ridgeway (Ed.), *Gender, interaction, and inequality* (pp. 157–180). New York: Springer.

Ridgeway, C. L., & Balkwell, J. W. (1997). Group processes and the diffusion of status beliefs. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *60,* 14–31.

Rosenberg, S., Nelson, C., & Vivekananthan, P. S. (1968). A multidimensional approach to the structure of personality impressions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *9,* 283–294.

Rosenberg, S., & Sedlak, A. (1972). Structural representations of implicit personality theory. In B. Leonard (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 235–297). New York: Academic Press.

Shaver, P., Schwartz, J., Kirson, D., & O'Connor, C. (1987). Emotion knowledge: Further exploration of a prototype approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *52,* 1061–1086.

Shils, E. A. (1975). *Center and periphery: Essays in macrosociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Stewart, T. L., Vassar, P. M., Sanchez, D. T., & David, S. E. (2000). Attitude toward women's societal roles moderates the effect of gender cues on target individuation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *79,* 143–157.

Tracey, T. J. (1994). An examination of the complementarity of interpersonal behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *67,* 864–878.

Valian, V. (1998). *Why so slow? The advancement of women*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Webster, M. (1981). *Webster's new collegiate dictionary* (10th ed.). Springfield, MA: Merriam.

Williams, J. E., & Best, D. L. (1990). *Sex and psyche: Gender and self viewed cross-culturally*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Williams, J. E., Satterwhite, R. C., & Saiz, J. L. (1998). *The importance of psychological traits: A cross-cultural study*. New York: Plenum.

Zelditch, M. (1992). Interpersonal power. In E. Borgatta & M. Borgatta (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of sociology* (Vol. 2, pp. 994–1001). New York: Macmillan.