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This study investigates the existence of sex-based differences in attitudes toward social relations in the work environment. Both sex role (male vs. female) and gender-identity (agentic and communal aspects of self-conception) were related to work attitudes within the context of situational (attitude disclosure) and dispositional (public self-consciousness) factors. Subjects' attitudes toward the work environment were measured by a newly-developed Work Attitude Questionnaire (WAQ) which assessed preferences for personal vs. counterpersonal and preferences for conflict vs. conflict-avoidance in social relations in the work environment.

Significantly different work attitudes were expressed by male and female subjects: males expressed greater counterpersonal and lower conflict-avoidance attitudes than females. Hypotheses relating public attitude disclosure and subjects' level of public self-consciousness to work attitudes were generally unsupported. The relationship of gender-identity to work attitudes differed for males and females. Among males, a more agentic identity related to lower conflict-avoidance while a more communal identity was associated with lower counterpersonal attitudes. Among females, a more agentic identity was associated with more counterpersonal attitudes.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Differences between males and females have long provided a topic of debate for virtually all people with even a passing interest in human affairs. Theologians, philosophers, and scientists alike have expressed views on how and why the sexes are different. Stereotyped accounts of what constitutes masculine and feminine characteristics abound in society. Yet, there are few areas of personality or behavior in which indisputable, biologically based sex differences have been found to exist (see Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974; Freize, Parsons, Johnson, Ruble & Zallman, 1978 for a review of research on sex differences). Cross-cultural research has revealed that expectations relative to gender may vary from one society to another. Attributes and characteristics considered masculine in one culture may be considered feminine in another culture (Mead, 1935; Whiting & Edwards, 1973).

Traditionally, popular opinion has held that men and women are innately and absolutely different in their thinking, feeling and acting. Contemporary thought, however, suggests that learned behavior accounts for the majority of the variability found in people's behavior, regardless of their biological sex (Richardson, 1981). All societies attempt to socialize their members to conform,
within a certain latitude of acceptance, to cultural standards of correctness. This includes conforming to the sex-role standards appropriate for one's gender.

A major institutional area of concern on the existence of sex-based differences in American society focuses on gender difference in orientations toward roles in the work environment. This study will examine male and female attitudes toward social relations in the work environment from the theoretical perspectives provided by role theory and identity theory.

As increasing numbers of women enter the business world, an important issue has arisen over the difference in male and female attitudes toward work and success, and whether women are handicapped by the attitudes they internalize in the process of being socialized into the female sex role. Horner (1969) has argued that because women are socialized to view achievement as aggressive and therefore masculine, they develop a motive to avoid success. Competition and striving for success are equated with being non-feminine and therefore considered undesirable traits for women to possess. Socially held sex-role expectations are thought to be a major factor which may influence one's attitude toward social relations in the work environment. This study will provide further insight into male-female differences in work-related attitudes and examine the relationship of sex-role expectations and gender-identity with the expression of work attitudes.
Sex Role-Expectations

In American society there is a general consensus as to what males and females should be like. In general, males are viewed as being independent, active, objective, self-confident, ambitious and competitive. Females, in general, are seen as being more dependent, passive, subjective, and less competent and competitive (Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman & Broverman, 1968). For the most part, the traits associated with being male are more highly valued in our society than the traits associated with being female (MacBrayer, 1960; McKee & Sheriffs, 1957; Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson & Rosenkrantz, 1972). Positively valued traits associated more with females than with males are those centered around expressiveness and warmth, such as being tactful, gentle, aware of others' feelings, and expressive. Men are typically viewed as being somewhat lacking along these lines, being considered inexpressive, unperceptive, and blunt (Broverman, et al., 1972). These socially held sex-role expectations, although a stereotyped image of males and females, actually influence the differential socialization of the sexes in the United States (see Frieze, et al., 1978, for a review of theories of sex role socialization).

Many of the traits associated with males, such as competitiveness, aggressive and self-confidence, are considered as being highly desirable in the business world. For this reason, males are often assumed to be better qualified than females to perform in most jobs (Feldman-Summers & Kiesler, 1974). Shaffer and Wegley (1974) found that both male and female college students perceived women who
expressed masculine values as being more employable than women who expressed traditional feminine values. It also appears that the role of middle manager is perceived, by people employed in managerial positions, as being incompatible with the role of female (Schein, 1973; 1975). Schein (1975) found that both male and female middle line managers described "men in general" and "successful middle managers" using numerous common characteristics such as having leadership ability, competitiveness, self-confidence, objectiveness, aggressiveness, forcefulness, ambitiousness and desiring responsibility. "Women in general" and "successful middle managers" were perceived as having far fewer characteristics in common, those being intuitiveness, helpfulness, having humanitarian values and being aware of feelings of others.

Crowley, Levitin and Quinn (1973) conducted a survey of the work attitudes of 539 working women and 933 working men to determine if certain stereotyped beliefs about male and female employees had a basis in reality. The stereotyped view of women employees that they were concerned with is the assumption that:

The American woman works for pin money. She does that only when she has to. She is indifferent to intellectual challenge, not interested in finding work that contributes to her identity. What concerns her are friendly co-workers and whether or not she gets home in time to fix dinner (Crowley, et al., 1983, p. 94).

The findings of the survey revealed that the attitudes held toward work by males and females are more similar than the stereotype suggests. Significant sex differences in attitudes were found, however, on some specific questions. Employed women were more likely
than men to say that having helpful and friendly co-workers was very important to them (68 percent to 61 percent). Women also placed more importance on having pleasant physical surroundings, convenient travel to and from work, and good working hours, than men. Crowley, et al., also found a sex difference in desire to be promoted—with males expressing a greater desire to be promoted than females—but determined that the desire to be promoted was largely a function of expectation of promotion.

Herzberg (1957, 1966) argues that a job consists of only two sets of characteristics: content or task characteristics and hygiene characteristics. The content characteristics are the intrinsic aspects of the job itself. All of the extrinsic aspects of the job, including social relations in the work environment, are the hygiene characteristics. Herzberg felt that "In general, intrinsic aspects of the job appear to be more important to men than to women" (1957, p. 72).

Agassi (1982) in a study comparing the work attitudes of men and women found that, in the sample gathered in the U.S., "Men put more emphasis on chances for promotion; women emphasize friendly relations with management, convenient work hours, and a boss who knows his job" (p. 65). However, the author noted that, despite efforts to measure the work attitudes of men and women in similar work situations, "...the quality of women's jobs in the sample was found on the average to be considerably poorer than that of the men's jobs in the sample" (Agassi, 1982, p. 81).
There is some evidence that the emphasis women place on the social aspects of their work is a consequence of being in dead-end jobs, and that men as well as women deny the importance of their jobs when they perceive little or no opportunity for advancement (Kanter, 1976a). Orth and Jacobs (1971) point out that the stereotyped attitudes held by men in authority positions hinder the opportunity for women to advance in the business world. Other authors have suggested that aspects of the way in which businesses are organized into hierarchial networks with sponsor-protege systems may result in women behaving in a stereotyped manner (Richardson, 1981, pp. 199-216; Kanter, 1975; 1976b). Also, the fact that household responsibilities tend to fall primarily on women legitimates, to some extent, the notion that females are more concerned with family matters than career success (Angrist & Almquist, 1975; Paloma, 1972; Bem & Bem, 1970).

The first major goal of this study is to examine whether or not males and females express significantly different attitudes toward social relations in the work environment. Attitudes held toward social relations in the work environment are viewed as developing in the course of one's socialization experience, and are not considered to be innate, or biologically determined. It is also assumed that the subjects who take part in this research will have encountered similar sex-role expectations relative to their gender in the socialization process. Any observed differences in expression of attitudes toward social relations in the work environment between males and females can then be attributed to the influence of dif-
ferential sex-role expectations associated with the social positions of male and female.

Self-Focused Attention

In addition to assessing male and female attitudes toward work, this study will investigate how sex-related social expectations influence the expression of work attitudes under conditions of public and private attitude disclosure. As suggested by Kanter (1975; 1976b), some aspects of the work situation may influence women to behave in a sex-typed fashion. That is, certain situations tend to make sex-role expectations more salient, influencing people to conform to the social expectations relative to gender. Enacting behavior in the presence of others has been shown to accentuate behavioral differences between males and females. Leventhal and Lane (1970) found that for allocation behavior, women are more generous than men when their behavior was enacted in public. However, when the allocation occurred in private there was no significant difference in levels of allocation between males and females. Similarly, Phyllis Berman (1975) asked subjects to rate pictures of infant and adult monkeys and apes on a five point scale in terms of their emotional appeal. Some subjects answered privately while others answered in the presence of an audience. Berman found that males and females differed in their reactions to the pictures only in the public condition, in which women showed a greater emotional response than men. When there was no audience, however, the level of emotional response shown by men was not significantly different from
the level shown by women. Within each sex group, differences in levels of emotional response were found between the public and private conditions. Females in the public condition scored higher (indicating a high emotional response) than females in private, while males in the private condition scored higher than did the males in the public condition.

Whether observation by an audience will influence people to behave in a sex role stereotyped manner may depend on the specific make-up of the audience. Thus, males have been found to behave more aggressively when being observed by other males than when they were being observed by females or when they were not being observed at all (Borden, 1975).

Buss (1980) states that being observed by others induces a state of public self-awareness, a condition in which one's attention becomes focused on self as a social object. He hypothesized that being in a state of public self-awareness results in a concern for how others are perceiving you and leads to greater conformity to social expectations. When a person is being observed by others, there is a greater concern with enacting behavior that conforms to social sex-role expectations. Sex role differences, then, tend to be accentuated when there is an audience present and to be diminished in the absence of an audience.

Self-consciousness theory (Fenigstein, Scheier & Buss, 1975; Buss & Scheier, 1976; Buss, 1980) contends that some individuals have a dispositional tendency to focus on self as a social object to a greater degree than others. These individuals are said to be high in
public self-consciousness, and are likely to conform to social expectations to a greater degree than people who are low in public self-consciousness, because of their acute concern with their self-presentations. Similar to people in a state of self-awareness, people who are high in public self-consciousness should also have a greater concern with enacting behavior that conforms to social sex-role expectations. This should hold true for those high in public self-consciousness as they are motivated to behave in a manner that meets the expectations of others. In the absence of specific knowledge concerning the expectations of the observing others, it is likely that social sex-role expectations will be used as the standard of acceptable behavior for those high in public self-consciousness.

This study will look at expressed attitudes toward work by males and females across two experimentally manipulated conditions—public disclosure and private disclosure. Whether significant sex differences in expressed attitudes toward work will be found in public but not private, as has been the case with other behaviors, will be a major question to be answered. It has been argued that the presence of an audience will motivate males to present themselves in a more masculine image than they would in private. Likewise, females will be motivated to present themselves in a more feminine manner in the presence of an audience than in private. Additionally, self-consciousness theory predicts that subjects high in public self-consciousness will be more affected by public disclosure than subjects low in public self-consciousness. Therefore, whether males high in public self-consciousness will express attitudes toward work
that are more stereotypically masculine, and whether females high in public self-consciousness will express attitudes that are more stereotypically feminine, when in the public disclosure condition, will also be investigated.

Internalized Gender Identity

This study will also go beyond examining male-female differences in attitudes toward social relations in the work environment by investigating the influence of individual differences in gender-related aspects of self-conception. Therefore, in addition to examining the influence of sex-role expectations by comparing the work attitudes of males and females, subjects' identification of self in terms of gender-related characteristics will be examined in relation to the expression of attitudes toward social relations in the work environment.

Bakan (1966) described two fundamentally different orientations to social life, which he labeled agency and communion, and which parallel the stereotyped male and female sex roles. Agency is similar to the stereotyped conception of masculinity while communion resembles the stereotyped image of femininity. A person with an agentic orientation toward social life is characterized by a concern with self as an active agent in the environment, and a strong desire to succeed. A communal orientation is characterized by a concern for others as well as self, and a strong desire to facilitate warm and harmonious relationships. Bakan contends that both agency and communion are orientations which coexist in males and females. Due to
social pressures encountered in the process of socialization, however, males typically develop a more agentic orientation and females typically develop a more communal orientation.

Based on the contention that an individual can internalize both agentic and communal orientations toward life, recent work within the field of psychology has focused on the concept of androgyny, rather than continuing to view masculinity and femininity as polar opposites (Bem, 1974; Block, 1973, Spence & Helmreich, 1978). In order to measure androgyny, Bem (1974) developed a questionnaire consisting of two scales—one that measures masculine characteristics and one that measures feminine characteristics. Just as agency and communion are conceptualized as independent dimensions of one's orientation to social life, the masculinity and femininity scales are statistically independent. Androgyny, in Bem's definition, reflects a balance between the two scores. In contrast to Bem's view of androgyny, Spence, Helmreich and Stapp (1974) conceive of an androgynous person as having a high percentage of both characteristics rather than merely a balance between the two. These authors developed the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) to measure the psychological dimensions of masculinity and femininity (Spence, et al., 1974). These dimensions are "... clusters of socially desired attributes stereotypically considered to differentiate males and females and thus to define the psychological core of masculine and feminine personalities" (Spence & Helmreich, '1978, p. 3). The traits which define a masculine personality (e.g., independent, competitive, self-confident, active) can be seen as reflecting Bakan's concept of
agentic orientation. The traits which are representative of a feminine personality (e.g., helpful to others, aware of feelings of others, understanding of others) correspond to Bakan's communal orientation.

The debate over what constitutes the best method for categorizing people into sex-related personality types has yet to be resolved (see Kelly & Worel, 1977; Kelly, Furam & Young, 1978; Downing, 1979; Sedney, 1981). What is important, however, is not so much the concept of androgyny per se, but the dualism of masculinity and femininity. The predictive ability of measures of agentic and communal orientations of individuals is ultimately what is relevant. It has been argued that on some occasions a measure of a single dimension, either agency or communion, may be most predictive, while on other occasions a combination of the two may be preferred (Deaux, 1976). The approach used in this study is to consider the masculine or agentic scale and the feminine or communal scale as two separate dimensions, weighing the effect that each has on work-related attitudes of males and females.

There have been research findings which indicate that boys with some feminine traits and girls with some masculine traits are more creative, and generally higher in intelligence than boys and girls with more traditional orientations (Maccoby, 1966). Bem has conducted research which suggests that girls with a traditional or strong communal orientation express more anxiety and show lower psychological adjustment than girls with a less traditional orientation (Bem, 1972; cited in Deaux, 1976). Bem has also conducted
research that revealed a similarity in conformity behavior between communal males and communal females (low agency, high communion), with these subjects conforming to the opinions of others to a greater degree than masculine or androgynous subjects (Bem, 1975). Additionally, Bem has reported that communal and androgynous males were more likely to enact a cross-sexed type of behavior (playing with a kitten) than agentic males (Bem, 1975). The results obtained in the experiment involving the kitten were contrary to expectations for the female subjects, as the more communal women played with the kitten less than either androgynous or agentic women (Bem, 1975). While substantive findings relating agentic and communal orientations to behavior have been limited, this relatively new avenue of research is viewed as holding much promise as a means of clarifying sex differences in various areas of human endeavor (Lenny, 1979; Spence & Helmreich, 1976).

The second major goal of this study will look at internalized identity or self-conception along the two dimensions which relate to gender—agency and communion—and determine its value for predicting attitudes toward the work environment independent of sex role. Agency represents an orientation to social life which can be held by both men and women but which is comparable to stereotyped masculine sex-role expectations. An individual with a more agentic orientation should exhibit work attitudes similar to those which are stereotypically male. Communion, on the other hand, represents an orientation to social life that emphasizes stereotyped feminine sex-role expectations. A man or woman with a highly communal orientation
should exhibit work attitudes similar to those which are stereotypically female.

Contributions of Research

One of the primary contributions this study will make is the development of the Work Attitude Questionnaire (WAQ). Previous research investigating sex differences in attitudes toward work have focused on specific questions concerning areas of workers' satisfaction (e.g., Crowley, et al., 1973). The WAQ was designed, however, to measure subjects' general attitudes toward the work environment. The generality of the WAQ allows for a wider application of the instrument than those with more specific questions. The wider applicability of the WAQ allows its use in samples from populations, such as college students, who may not have an extensive background in work situations.

The WAQ was designed to measure general attitudes toward social aspects of the work environment. As the subjects to be used in this research were expected to have little if any work experience, any questions concerned with the content or task characteristics of any particular job would be of little value. Also, attitudes toward social relations at work is an area in which sex-differences have been found but have not clearly been explained. Whether sex-differences are inherent and observable between all males and females, or whether sex-differences are influenced by situational and individual factors is one issue that will be addressed in this research.
In developing the WAQ, a pre-test of the instrument revealed the existence of two orthogonal dimensions of attitudes toward social relations in the work environment. The first dimension taps subjects' preference for personal vs. counterpersonal social relations in the work setting. The second dimension contained in the WAQ measures subjects' preference for conflict vs. avoidance of conflict in interpersonal behavior within the work environment. The items which comprise the first dimension of the WAQ were combined to create the first of two dependent variables used in this study: counterpersonal attitudes. The items which make up the second dimension were also summed to produce the second dependent variable: conflict-avoidance attitudes.

Both of these dimensions of attitudes toward social relations in the work environment can be viewed as being aspects of what has been described as one's fundamental interpersonal relations orientation (Schultz, 1960). Schultz described three fundamental interpersonal needs: the need for inclusion, the need for control, and the need for affection. The need for inclusion refers to having satisfactory social relations with others; being interested in others and having others interested in you (Schultz, 1960, p. 18).

The measurement of counterpersonal attitudes results in a continuum showing the degree of social interaction people would most prefer in the work setting. People who feel more comfortable with social relations at work which involve limited and impersonal social interactions will score high on counterpersonal attitudes. People who need greater and more personal social interaction to feel
comfortable with social relations at work will score lower on counterpersonal attitudes.

The measurement of conflict-avoidance attitudes results in a continuum showing the degree of conflict in social interaction people would be willing to tolerate in the work environment. People who feel more comfortable with social relations in the work setting that involve little conflict or competition will score high on conflict-avoidance attitudes. People who feel more comfortable with social relations at work that involve some degree of conflict or competition will score low on conflict-avoidance attitudes. That these two approaches to interpersonal behavior can be identified as statistically separate dimensions of attitudes towards social relations represents a relevant finding.

A second contribution of this study results from examining the question of whether males and females differ significantly in the expression of attitudes toward social relations in the work environment. If there are significant sex differences, males are expected to express greater counterpersonal attitudes than females, and females are expected to express greater conflict-avoidance attitudes than males. This prediction is based on the concept of differential socialization. Males are socialized, in U.S. society, in a culture which defines the masculine sex role with traits that could lead to internalizing counterpersonal attitudes. Such traits as independence, autonomy, and inexpressiveness are all components of the ideal masculine sex role (Broverman, et al., 1972). Females are socialized in a culture that defines the feminine sex role with
characteristics such as dependence, concern for others, and expressiveness (Broverman, et al., 1972). These traits should lead away from internalizing counterpersonal attitudes. Females are expected to express greater conflict-avoidance attitudes than males due to ideal feminine sex-role expectations consisting of being passive, submissive, non-competitive, and not aggressive; and males being socialized to be active, dominant, competitive, and aggressive (Broverman, et al., 1972).

A third contribution of this study can be found in the expansion of theory and research on the relation of sex roles to behavior. The major focus is on the conditions under which sex-role expectations become a salient feature of the actor's definition of the situation and therefore influence the actor's behavior. The presence or absence of an audience is one condition which could affect the relationship between sex role and behavior, while another factor might be found in the subjects' tendency toward self-conscious reflection, especially public self-conscious reflection. People high in public self-consciousness will, theoretically, be concerned with conforming to social expectations. Previous research has demonstrated that the presence of an audience influences males and females to behave in accordance with sex-role expectations (Leventhal & Lane, 1970; Berman, 1975; Borden, 1975) but there has been little research that has included public self-consciousness as a contingency variable.

The final contribution of this research resides in looking at the relationship between gender-related aspects of generalized
identity and the expression of work attitudes. Gender-related aspects of generalized identity will be assessed by measuring each subject's agentic and communal orientations. Expressed counterpersonal and conflict-avoidance attitudes will be compared, within each sex-group, for those who have a strong agentic identity with those who have a weak agentic identity, and for those who are high in communion with those who are low in communion. These comparisons will allow for a determination of whether agentic identity or communal identity goes beyond sex-role expectations in explaining variation in expression of attitudes toward social relations in the work environment.
CHAPTER II

THEORY

The theoretical focus of this study is concerned with developing an explanation of why males and females might express significantly different attitudes toward social relations in the work environment. One theoretical approach to this problem is found in role theory, and a major focus of this chapter is on the concept of socially held role expectations and the influence that role expectations have on human conduct. This study will also examine how role performance is influenced by situational and dispositional factors. Inclusion of attitude disclosure condition and public self-consciousness in the study should help clarify why and when males and females might express significantly different attitudes toward social relations in the work environment. A second theoretical approach to this problem is provided by identity theory, which examines how one's internal view of self is related to the expression of work attitudes.

Role Theory

The concept of a social role is central to the theoretical foundation of this research. Unfortunately, there is no universally agreed upon definition of what constitutes a role. Broadly defined, in an introductory sociology text book, a role is "...the behavior expected of one who holds a certain status" (Horton & Hunt, 1976, p. 99). Deutsch and Krauss (1965) point out, however, that the term role is used in at least three distinctly different ways. Role is
conceptualized as (1) the system of expectations existing in the social world regarding an occupant of a particular social position in relation to occupants of some other social position—the proscribed role, (2) those specific expectations the occupant of a social position perceives as applicable to his or her behavior when he or she interacts with the occupants of some other social position—the subjective role, and (3) the actual behavior of the occupant of a social position when interacting with the occupant of some other social position.

Traditionally role theory has focused on the first of the three conceptions of a role—the proscribed role. Role theory is premised on the conception of a social role as socially shared expectations held toward an occupant of a given social position. These expectations may be shared by only a few people, or in some cases, they may be shared by virtually all members of a given culture. Role expectations also vary in their specificity. Some positions may have very specific role expectations associated with them, while for others the expectations may be extremely broad. Generally, role expectations are viewed as delineating a range of acceptable behavior for the occupant of the associated position.

The person occupying a given social position has a certain latitude in terms of how he or she perceives the role expectations associated with the position. A person is also allowed a certain latitude in enacting the role performance. As long as the actor's role performance falls within the range of acceptable role expectations, he or she should receive positive social feedback from others.
in the social environment. When an actor's behavior deviates from the role expectations, he or she will receive negative feedback from others. In this sense there is external pressure on the occupant of a social position to conform to the appropriate role expectations. Conformity to role expectations results in rewards from others, while deviation from the acceptable range of behavior defined by role expectations results in negative sanctions from others.

That a more or less consensus exists, in the social world, of what role accompanies a given position, allows social interaction to proceed in a relatively harmonious manner. In social interaction, most of the people we encounter can be identified as occupants of a particular social position. In fact, there is reason to believe that we define a person as a stranger only when we encounter an individual who cannot be placed into the system of social positions (see Goffman, 1971, p. 7). In identifying a person as an occupant of a social position, the role expectations associated with that position provide us with information as to how we should behave toward him or her, as well as what sort of behavior we can expect him or her to perform.

The importance of role expectations in social interaction is emphasized by considering the anticipatory nature of role expectations and the normative quality of role expectations (Second, Backman & Slavitt, 1976, pp. 262-263). The anticipatory nature of role expectations refers to how we are able to anticipate the behavior of another based on his or her social position. Similarly, identifying those we are to interact with as occupants of a particular social
position allows us to determine, in advance, how they will likely react to our behavior.

The normative quality of role expectations refers to the importance placed on conforming to the expectations attached to a given social position. The socially shared understanding of what behavior is appropriate for an occupant of a given position in a particular situation often has an obligatory quality. Not only is an individual expected to conform to a particular role, he or she is virtually required to conform. Role expectations influence behavior by providing normative guidelines of what is considered acceptable to others. Failure to conform to the normative standard, or within an acceptable range of the norm, is likely to provoke negative sanctions from others.

Role expectations can also become internalized, thus influencing one's behavior independent of external social control. In the process of social interaction, conformity to role expectations brings rewards from others and deviance from role expectations brings punishment. People will eventually come to believe in the rightness of role expectations and internalize the social control aspects of interaction. In internalizing the role expectations, conformity is no longer performed solely to gain rewards and avoid negative sanctions from others. Conformity to internalized role expectations provides intrinsic rewards to the actor, thus regulating behavior in the absence of a sanctioning audience.

The concept of a social role can be a beneficial means of examining sex-based differences in attitudes and behavior. In the
United States, as in other cultures, there are certain behavioral characteristics and personality traits which are considered masculine and others which are considered feminine. The social position of male or female has certain associated sex-role expectations just as do more specific social positions. The social positions of male and female, however, are very broad categories and the expectations associated with these positions are also broad. As part of their sex role, males are expected to be more independent, active, objective, self-confident, ambitious and competitive than females, and females are expected to be more dependent, passive, subjective, incompetent and cooperative than males (Rosenkrantz, et al., 1968). Expectations associated with broad social positions, such as male and female, tend to be more widely held than expectations associated with more specific social positions.

In developing a theoretical perspective for investigating sex-based, differential expression of work attitudes, role theory contributes two major points. First, role theory suggests that the occupants of a social position will attempt to conform to the appropriate role expectations in order to gain the rewards and avoid the punishments which others may exercise. Conformity in this case is due to the existence of an external source of social control. The second major point of role theory is that role expectations influence behavior by being internalized by people. Social control becomes internal to the individual and he or she will attempt to conform to the relevant role expectations in the absence, as well as presence, of a sanctioning audience.
The emphasis of role theory is on conformity to role expectations. It is assumed that without a consensual agreement on what is expected from the occupant of a given social position, and without conformity to the role expectations, social order would break down. Role behavior, from this perspective, must conform to role expectations in order for social interactions to function in a smooth manner.

Identity Theory

Identity theory represents a theoretical perspective quite similar to role theory, but which has a subtle difference in emphasis. With role theory, the emphasis is on conformity to role expectations and social control. Role behavior is viewed as analogous to a scripted performance. Identity theory emphasizes the expression of self in role behavior. The analogy here is of role behavior as an improvised performance. The concept of scripted behavior is replaced by the idea of a performance, guided, but not completely determined, by the broad outlines of a script and the characters involved. Identity theory is grounded in the symbolic interactionist tradition and in the concepts found in the work of G. H. Mead (1934). Mead emphasized the importance of social interaction and the ability to symbolically communicate in the process of developing a self identity.

In interacting with others, the individual pays close attention to how others, especially significant others, react to him or her. This concern with the reaction of others motivates the individual to learn to perceive the world as the others do, so that he or she can
behave in an acceptable manner. In the socialization process the child learns to communicate with those in his or her environment, gaining access to the symbolic world of names and meanings. The child also learns to name or to identify himself or herself as well, developing a conception of who he or she is, based on the reaction of others. Eventually, the reactions and expectations of others become internalized by the individual.

Sex-role expectations are one of the earliest set of social expectations one encounters. Virtually from the moment of birth interaction with others is influenced by sex-role expectations. Parents, grandparents, teachers, and others perceive males and females as possessing different physical, emotional, and behavioral traits. Sex-role expectations, in turn, influence the behavior of others, by providing a clue as to how their actions will be received (see Tavris & Offir, 1977, especially Chapter 6; Richardson, 1981; Brooks-Gunn & Matthews, 1979). Sex-role expectations are such a prevalent aspect of social life that they tend to be inescapable during the process of socialization (Howe, 1979).

Males learn, in the socialization process, that certain attitudes, emotions and behavior are masculine and therefore acceptable behavior. Other attitudes, emotions and behaviors are feminine, and should be avoided. Masculine behavior from males results in positive sanctions from others; feminine behavior from males leads to negative sanctions from others. Eventually, many of the attitudes, emotions and behaviors expected of a male in U.S. culture become internal to the individual. Females undergo a similar experience in which social
expectations and social control relative to appropriate female sex role traits become internalized.

The concepts of masculinity and femininity have traditionally been regarded as being the polar ends of a one-dimensional continuum. That is, masculinity was equated with non-feminine and femininity was equated with non-masculine. Recently, however, masculinity and femininity have come to be viewed as two separate, statistically independent, dimensions. Bakan (1966), in discussing the dualistic nature of humanity, described two fundamentally different orientations toward social life which he labeled agency and communion. Persons with an agentic orientation to social life strive to achieve self-rewards and tend to display such traits as assertiveness and competitiveness. Persons with a communal orientation to social life have a concern for others as well as a concern for themselves, and tend to behave in a manner which facilitates warm and harmonious social relations. Bakan contends that both agency and communion are orientations which coexist in males and females. Due to the differential socialization that occurs between males and females, however, males tend to develop the agentic orientation to a much greater degree than the communal orientation, while females tend to develop the communal over and above the agentic. Building on Bakan's work, Bem (1974) developed the concept of androgyny, which views a person, regardless of sex, as possessing, in some amount, both agentic and communal traits. Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp (1974) similarly view individuals as potentially having both agentic and communal aspects to their personality and self-image. Spence et al. (1974) devised the
Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) to measure how people view themselves in relation to traditional or stereotyped sex role expectations. According to Spence and Helmreich (1978), the PAQ scale measures the agentic and communal traits that an individual has incorporated into his or her personality.

Use of the PAQ scale results in two separate measures for each person—one score for the agentic traits and one score for the communal traits. The score one receives on the agentic dimension will indicate the extent to which the person has internalized the social role of masculinity—the higher the score on the agentic dimension the more masculine, in the traditional sense, he or she is. Conversely, the person's score on the communal dimension will indicate the degree to which he or she has internalized the traditional feminine sex role. While Spence and Helmreich describe their sex typing scale as measuring an internal variable representing the core attributes of masculinity and femininity, the subjects are responding to general questions concerning what type of person they are and therefore are defining themselves along the agentic and communal dimensions independent of any specific social situation or social position. For this reason the PAQ is viewed as measuring gender-related aspects of subjects' generalized identity. The theoretical link between the PAQ scale, as a measure of masculinity and femininity, and identity can be better understood by reviewing McCall and Simmons' (1978) role-identity model.
The Role-Identity Model

McCall and Simmons' role identity model is based on Mead's conceptualization of the "I" and the "me" engaged in an internal conversation of gestures—what Mead referred to as the inner forum—and also draws heavily on the dramaturgical perspective. An essential point of Mead's work is that in internalizing the perspectives of others and having the ability to engage in reflexive observation, we continuously engage in a process of self-appraisal, monitoring and evaluating our thoughts and behaviors relative to the standards of correctness we have internalized. In viewing the self as an inner forum, the standards of correctness are represented by the numerous perspectives developed from others which are the "me(s)." Using a theatrical analogy, McCall and Simmons view the "I" as the actor or performer and the "me" as "... a very important internal audience of that performer" (McCall & Simmons, 1978, p. 57). The concept of audience, then, refers not only to actual witnesses of an actor's performance but also to the actor's response to his or her own behavior.

While McCall and Simmons feel that the analogy between the theater and human behavior is useful, their main concern is explaining social interaction, that is, social behavior. Consistent with the general ideas of symbolic interactionism (see McCall and Simmons, 1978, p. 58-60; Stryker, 1977, p. 150), the definition of the situation must be established before meaningful interaction between individuals can occur. It is necessary to ascertain the identity and
meaning of everything we encounter in order to fit them into our plan of action. As noted by McCall and Simmons:

Once one has placed something in such a system of categories, he knows how to act toward it from the perspective of the underlying plan of action. In this way, identification (as an act of categorization, placement, or naming) serves to release or inhibit certain acts toward things (p. 1978, p. 63).

Certainly in studying human interaction the most critical "things" to be identified are the people involved in the situation. We are able to identify others by their social identity, consisting of broad social categories, as well as by their personal identity, "... which is derived by identifying (an individual) in terms of a set of categories referring to unique individuals" (McCall & Simmons, 1978, p. 62).

Identifying those we are to interact with as occupants of particular social positions allows us to determine, in advance, our plan of action in the interactional setting. This is clearly explained by McCall and Simmons:

By identifying persons we meet in terms of their social positions, we are afforded lead time in coping with them, for we may know what implications people in such positions have for our plans of action and we can modify our conduct accordingly. As some theorists have put it, we hold certain expectations toward the occupant of a given position, and these expectations exhibit a normative as well as an anticipatory aspect. The set of expectations held toward a given position is said to constitute the social role associated with occupancy of that position (1978 p. 64).

Role theory's definition of a social role, as an element of social structure consisting of the given set of expectations held toward a particular social position, is rejected by McCall and Simmons as having little value in explaining human behavior. They prefer to focus on the actual role performance which is expressive of
the personality of the character. Role, in their usage, is referred
to as, "... the interactive role, as opposed to the social role
(and it) is not specified by the culture but is improvised to deal in
some variable fashion with the broad demands of one's social position
and one's character" (McCall & Simmons, 1978, pp. 64-65). The inter-
active role, then, consists of an actor conforming to the essential
expectations associated with the social position he or she occupies,
but doing so in an idiosyncratic manner which expresses the actor's
individuality. An interactive role performance should be representa-
tive of an individual's identity, and would not necessarily conform
to the more static role expectations.

A role-identity is defined as:

... the character and the role that an individual devised
for himself as an occupant of a particular social position.
More intuitively, such a role-identity is his imaginative
view of himself as he likes to think of himself as an
occupant of that position (McCall & Simmons, 1978, p. 65).

Using the above definition, then, McCall and Simmons view the concept
of role-identity as a major analytical tool in explaining social
interaction. Consistent with the general ideas of symbolic interac-
tion, the definition of the situation must be established before
meaningful interaction between individuals can occur. Defining one's
own role-identity as well as the role-identity of others is a major
aspect of the total definition of the situation. Here again the
ability to take the role of others is crucial, as pointed out by
Burke:

The meanings of the self are learned by the person because
others respond to the person in a particular role as if the
person had an identity appropriate to that particular role
performance. Such responses provide cues to appropriate role performance and, by implication, to an appropriate identity for one who performs in appropriate ways. In this fashion one's actions develop meaning through the reactions of others, and, over time, gradually call up in the person the responses that are called up in others' (1980, p. 19).

McCall and Simmons note that the role-identity of an individual in a given position:

"... is usually rather idealized, incorporating standards of conduct and achievement that are unlikely to be consistently attained (or perhaps, even approached) in the individual's actual day-to-day performances relevant to that role" (McCall & Simmons, 1978, p. 65).

This is not to say that one's imaginative view of self is total fantasy. As McCall and Simmons illustrate, "One imagines, and often actually play-acts in the inner forum, specific performances like writing a short story, building a boat in the basement, approaching the boss for a raise, asking the girl in study hall for a date, and catching one's limit of lunker bass on some faraway lake" (1978, p. 66). An important aspect of these vicarious role-performances is how other people might react to one's accomplishments. "In this way," say McCall and Simmons, "other persons--real, live individuals--are built into the very contents of one's role-identities" (McCall & Simmons, 1978, p. 66).

Just as each individual in society occupies a multitude of social positions, so too will each individual incorporate a multitude of social roles into his or her view of self. James was perhaps the first to formulate the idea of multiple selves, though Mead also noted that we have many "mes" within our inner forum and so adapt our identities depending on which audience we are playing to. Both of these theorists, however, tended to concentrate on the global self in
their work. Perhaps for this reason the notion of the self as being comprised of sub-units has received little attention by those who have followed the symbolic interactionist traditions. Likewise, scholars schooled in psychological social psychology, who have recently begun to include the Meadian conception of the self into their research, have treated it as if it were an undifferentiated unity. McCall and Simmons and others (Stryker, 1968; Burke, 1980) have expanded on the idea of multiple selves, conceptualizing the self as a complex and differentiated, albeit organized unity.

These role-identities are not separate, each into itself, but are woven into a complex pattern of identities. That is, they mutually influence one another and are organized into a more or less systematically interrelated whole. This organization of role-identities as it exists at a given point in a person's life span, corresponds to what many theorists have called the "ideal self" (McCall & Simmons, 1978, pp. 73-74).

Within one's overall organization of role-identities there may be some identities which are quite similar to each other and some which are rather incompatible. Some identities may seldom, if ever, be acted out, while others may be enacted in numerous situations. The fact that some identities are more important than others leads McCall and Simmons to suggest that, "... identities are loosely patterned in a somewhat plastic hierarchy of prominence (McCall & Simmons, 1978, p. 74).

The factors that determine the relative prominence of a given role-identity are numerous and undoubtedly vary in importance from person to person. The determining factors include the person's level of support and commitment to the contents of the role-identity, the
amount of support relevant others give to the actor, and the
rewards—both extrinsic and intrinsic—obtainable through enacting
the role-identity.

One's prominence hierarchy of identities, or one's ideal self,
represents the global view of self that a given person has. It is
not immune to change over time, yet it remains rather stable across
situations within a single time-frame. The stability of one's promi­
nence hierarchy can be contrasted with what McCall and Simmons refer
to as the situational self, which is the organization of role-identi­
ties into a salience hierarchy, and which "... represents their
relative order of priority as possible sources of performance in the
situation" (McCall & Simmons, 1978, p. 82). Based on the situation,
the individual attempts to give a performance that reflects that
subset of role-identities which are most salient at the time, while
those identities low in the salience hierarchy fade into the back­
ground.

Role-Identity and Behavior

The major significance of role-identities is not found in the
manner in which people daydream about themselves nor in the manner in
which identities are organized in the prominence hierarchy. The true
significance of role-identities lies in how they influence the actual
experience of one's day-to-day existence. "In the first place,"
according to McCall and Simmons, "they serve as perhaps the primary
source of plans of action" (McCall & Simmons, 1978, p. 67). Thus, we
imagine ourselves as we would like to be as an occupant of a given
social position, and we symbolically rehearse how we shall act in a given situation. By mentally constructing an image of ourselves we are able to devise a course of behavior that should provide us with the most rewarding experience possible. The rewards available include both self-satisfaction and social rewards. By imagining how others will react to us, we are able to proceed with a plan of action designed with respect to how others will react and evaluate our behavior.

A second major importance of role-identities may be found in examining their function in the process by which people govern their behavior. Individuals monitor their behavior and attempt to maintain a degree of consistency between their imaginative views of self, i.e., their role identities, and their actual behaviors. Consciousness of oneself provides the mechanism by which one evaluates his or her behavior, while one's role-identity provides the standard to which he or she compares the actual behavior. This function of role-identities can be more clearly understood by thinking of it from a cybernetic perspective (see Burke, 1980). In monitoring and comparing one's behavior to an internalized standard, a person is able to adjust or change his or her actions that are deviating from his or her imaginative view of self.

In interacting with others, the actors will be motivated to maintain conceptions of themselves consistent with their role identities. As stated by McCall and Simmons: "As a creature of ideals, man's main concern is to maintain a tentative hold on these idealized conceptions of himself, to legitimate his role-identities" (McCall &
Simmons, 1978, p. 69). The primary way that one can legitimate his or her role-identities is by giving an appropriate role-performance. Giving a role-performance congruent with one's role-identity involves satisfying one's own standards of correctness held toward self as an occupant of a given social position. It is possible, according to McCall and Simmons, to legitimate a particular role-identity by imagining a performance. However, unless one lives in a world of total fantasy and social isolation, he or she will, of necessity, have to eventually perform before an audience. Also, unless one engages in real interaction, one will not receive valid information and social feedback nor will one receive real rewards available from social interaction.

In social interaction not only does the actor define the situation and identify the others in the encounter, the others will also define the actor in regard to the social position he or she is perceived to be occupying. If the actor fails to establish an identity, others "... are unsure how to classify him and, consequently, are not sure how to act toward him" (McCall & Simmons, 1978, p. 70). With an audience present the actor must convince the audience that the role-identities he or she has staked out are legitimate. If the audience accepts the actor's role-identities as legitimate, its response is a source of positive feedback to the actor. If the audience rejects or disconfirms the actor's role-identities, the feedback is negative.

The importance of audience reaction to an actor's role-performance is made evident by McCall's and Simmons' discussion of
role-support. They define role-support as "... the expressed support accorded to an actor by his audience for his claims concerning his role-identity" (McCall & Simmons, 1978, p. 70). Role-support goes beyond the minimum requirements of providing social approval of one's conduct. Likewise it is more than legitimation of one's claim to the right to occupy a particular social position, with its accompanying rights and obligations.

It is instead a set of reactions and performances by others the expressive implications of which tend to confirm one's detailed and imaginative view of himself as an occupant of a position. Role-support is centrally the implied confirmation of the specific contents of one's idealized and idiosyncratic imaginations of self (McCall & Simmons, 1978, p. 71).

Role-support can be provided to the actor by unintentional as well as intentional expressions. The actor also may interpret the audience's reaction as a sign of support when, in fact, the audience rejects the actor's performance as being out of character. This point is made by McCall and Simmons who note that "... because it is expressive implications of others' reaction that count as role-support, such support is not a thing to be simply perceived and weighted but is rather a matter of interpretation construction" (McCall & Simmons, 1978, p. 71). Actors will also place greater importance on receiving role-support from certain audiences than others. Some audiences are considered more important by virtue of their expertise, social positions, and relationships to the actor. The most important source of role support to the actor, according to McCall and Simmons, is the role-support that comes from within,
because ". . . unlike other audiences, this one cannot be escaped"
(McCall & Simmons, 1978, p. 71).

McCall's and Simmons's role-identity model, although similar to role theory, differs in emphasis. Where role theory emphasizes the consensual nature of role expectations and focuses on how this leads to conformity, the role-identity model holds that people define themselves in terms of public expectations. Both orientations recognize an internal as well as an external aspect of how social expectations influence behavior but the role-identity model recognizes that an individual's self-definition may differ from the consensual view of a social role, resulting in much individual variation in perception and enactment of a given role. Role-identity theory stresses that identity standards may be entirely personal, hence not subject to conformity effects.

Gender as a Role-Identity

The development of a gender-identity is an early step in the process of self-identification. Parents and others tend to hold different expectations for a child depending on the sex of the child. In adopting and internalizing the perspectives of others, the attitudes and expectations of others become incorporated into the individual's view of self. In interacting with others, a child becomes aware that one is a boy or one is a girl. Along with the awareness of one's gender comes an understanding that one's maleness or femaleness is a permanent trait.
In addition to the awareness of one's gender and the realization that gender is a permanent trait, one must also learn to behave in accordance with his or her gender role. The gender role represents behavioral expectations attached to the gender-identity. Learning to behave in accordance with the appropriate gender role, just as in learning to identify oneself as either a male or female, is accomplished through social interaction. Many of the attitudes and expectations relative to gender held by a child's significant others are reflective of how society in general regards gender. In internalizing the attitudes and expectations of those influential in the child's life, he or she is also, to some degree, internalizing socially held attitudes and expectations. In this manner, one could expect that cultural attitudes relative to gender will, to some degree, be incorporated into each individual's gender-identity, as well as his or her behavior. Therefore, even though few of the stereotyped views of differences between males and females have been found to realistically reflect reality, cultural expectations relative to gender probably do enter importantly into each individual's idiosyncratic view of self-as-male or self-as-female. It is this idiosyncratic view of self-as-male or self-as-female that is conceptualized as being one's gender identity. It is the individual's imaginative view of self as an occupant of the social position of male or female.

Gender-identity, when viewed from the perspective of the role-identity model, fits into the overall organization of role-identities.
in a significant manner. As Burke noted, identities that are at the top of the prominence hierarchy:

... are by definition more likely to be invoked, to be invoked in different situations, and, as organizers of identities lower down, are more temporally stable. These identities, like gender or race or ethnicity or age, are thus sociologically interesting for they parallel those great structural divisions of society in which sociologists have traditionally been interested (1980, pp. 19-20).

The fact that gender-identity figures so highly in the prominence hierarchy suggests that it will have a high probability of being included in a person's subset of identities, comprising his or her situational self, in many situations. For instance, a young woman may be in an interaction in which the specific role-identity she is enacting is that of student. In addition to defining herself as a student—planning and evaluating her behavior with respect to perceived expectations of appropriate student behavior—she may also define herself as a female student, enacting her gender-identity in combination with her student-identity. While these two role-identities would probably be compatible, the female/student-identity may have very different consequences from the student-identity.

In addition to representing a very important role-identity, one's gender should, given the importance placed on gender appropriate behavior in society, figure prominently into one's ideal self or generalized identity. The generalized identity of a person consists of a more or less consistent view of self as an individual. McCall and Simmons take the position that one's generalized identity is made up of a systematic organization of role-identities as it exists at a given time in the person's life span. One's role-
identity, then, is the person's view of self as an occupant of a particular social position while one's generalized identity is the person's view of self as a person in general. Gender-identity can be viewed as being a specific role-identity, but one must also recognize that identification of self by gender is an important component of the generalized identity.

The advantage of McCall and Simmons' conceptualization of a role-identity over the more static concept of role expectations lies in measuring the degree to which each subject has internalized traits associated with stereotyped sex-role expectations. In measuring subjects' idiosyncratic gender-identity, a better understanding of sex differences in behavior and cognition is possible as it allows for examining within sex-group as well as between sex-group differences. A contrasting view to the role-identity model is found in the perspective offered by self-presentation theory (Arkin, 1980) and situated-identity theory (Alexander & Lauderdale, 1977).

Situational Perspective

Self-presentation theory (see Arkin, 1980, for a review) and situated-identity theory (Alexander & Lauderdale, 1977) place far greater emphasis on how external sources influence behavior than does McCall and Simmons's theory. The concept of self-presentation refers to "... the manner in which individuals plan, adopt, and carry out strategies for managing the impression they make on others" (Arkin, Appelman & Burger, 1980, p. 23). McCall and Simmons' theory views people as enacting behavior which legitimizes their internal
identity. With the role-identity approach, people are viewed as behaving consistently with their internal view of self. The situational perspective views people as behaving in a manner which will create an appropriate impression on others.

Self-presentation theory views the primary motivation of behavior as being a concern with receiving social approval. The role-support of others involved in the interaction is seen as being more valuable to the actor than internal role-support. In this perspective the primary motivation for behavior is to gain social approval and avoid social disapproval. Hence, self-presentation theory is essentially concerned only with public behavior.

Situated-identity theory (Alexander & Lauderdale, 1977) is an identity theory that parallels the orientation of self-presentation. Actors are viewed, from this perspective, as being motivated to adopt identities that will impress relevant audiences. The specific identity one attempts to enact, therefore, will be dependent on the audience to which the actor is playing. As with self-presentation theory, situated identity theory is concerned only with behavior that occurs in the presence of others.

McCall and Simmons's role-identity theory assumes that individuals are primarily motivated to enact their imaginative view of themselves when giving a role-performance. Behavior is therefore seen as the expression of one's role-identity, and the most important audience for gaining role-support is oneself. From this perspective, there should be little variation in behavior relevant to a given
identity when in the presence or absence of an audience. The situational approaches, however, suggest that people are primarily motivated to enact an identity that will elicit positive sanctions from the audience. If the situational approaches are correct in their assumptions, there should be noticeable variation in behavior, depending on the presence or absence of an audience. It is possible to assess the divergent identity perspectives by comparing the behavior of people in private with those in public along some relevant dimension of identity.

In this research, the focus is on whether sex-role expectations or internal identity standards influence the expression of work attitudes. Research in this area suggests that the presence of an audience will result in greater conformity to sex-role expectations than is observed when behavior occurs in private (Levinthal & Lane, 1970; Berman, 1975; Borden, 1975). Role-identity theory would predict that people would express attitudes consistent with their internal standards, regardless of whether or not they were being observed, as they are motivated to legitimize their internal identities. The situational approaches, however, would predict that people would, when being observed, attempt to anticipate the reaction of the others and express attitudes which would result in their producing a favorable reaction from the others.

Public vs. Private Behavior

To further investigate the alternative predictions of role theory, the role-identity model, and the situational perspectives,
subjects in this research will be experimentally divided into public and private disclosure conditions. Experimentally manipulating disclosure condition will allow for a comparison of the effect of role expectations and internal identity standards on expressed work attitudes, across the two conditions. Although role theory recognizes that role expectations become internalized, the emphasis is on conformity to external standards as a means of receiving positive sanctions and avoiding negative sanctions. It is expected that sex-role expectations will be more salient in the public disclosure condition than in the private disclosure condition, resulting in publicly expressed work attitudes being more sex-typed than privately expressed work attitudes.

If people are motivated to enact their imaginative view of self, as predicted by the role-identity model, there should be little variability in conformity to identity standards across the two conditions. However, if people attempt to present an identity that conforms to the expectations of the audience, there should be a significant difference in the correspondence of identity standards with behavior between those in the public disclosure condition and those in the private disclosure condition. An additional problem to be addressed is that all people may not be equally sensitive to external role expectations or internal identity standards. In order to make an attempt at addressing this issue, it is necessary to delve into some pertinent theories from psychological social psychology: self-
awareness theory (Duval & Wicklund, 1972) and self-consciousness theory (Fenigstein, Scheier & Buss, 1975; Buss, 1980).

Self-Focused Attention

Duval and Wicklund's theory of self-awareness, like McCall and Simmons' work, begins from a theoretical base grounded in the work of Mead. The major thesis of their work is that "... states of awareness are directed either toward an aspect of oneself or toward the external environment" (Duval & Wicklund, 1972, p. 1). They maintain that one's attention cannot be focused on an aspect of self and an aspect of the environment at the same time, although attention may move from one to the other extremely quickly. Duval and Wicklund differentiate between the two states, calling one objective self-awareness and the other subjective self-awareness. Subjective self-awareness was defined as "... a state of consciousness in which attention is focused on events external to the individual's consciousness, personal history, or body," while in the state of objective self-awareness, "consciousness is focused exclusively upon the self and consequently the individual attends to his conscious state, his personal history, his body, or any other personal aspect of himself" (Duval & Wicklund, 1972, p. 2). The concept of objective self-awareness has, in more recent writings, been shortened so that it is usually referred to solely as self-awareness, while the idea of subjective self-awareness is usually referred to as an absence of self-awareness.
Duval and Wicklund also state that, "An awareness of self acts as a feedback system which forces the individual to alter aspects of himself in the direction of his conception of what a correct person should be . . . the self-conscious person responds not only to external stimuli but also to himself as stimulus" (1972, p. ix). The concept of role-identity also has been viewed as analogous to a feedback system, indicating the part it plays in one's self-control of behavior (Burke, 1980). The self and presumably one's identity, in Duval's and Wicklund's perspective, would only be actively involved in the behavior of a person in a state of self-awareness. When the individual is not reflecting on his or her self, when attention is focused solely on external stimuli, behavior will be carried out without involvement of his or her self-identity.

Mead also recognized that the self, as an experience of one's self, does not come into play in all of one's activities. "Reflection or reflective behavior arises only under the conditions of self-consciousness, and makes possible the purposive control and organization by the individual organism of its conduct, with reference to its social and physical environment, i.e., with reference to the various social and physical situations in which it becomes involved and to which it reacts" (Mead, 1934, p. 91). Duval and Wicklund observed that an awareness of self can be aroused in people by directing their attention toward some aspect of themselves by using a mirror or a tape recording of their own voice.
Wicklund and Frey (1980) suggest a chain of events that give rise to self-involvement in behavior as consisting of: (1) situational demands for a certain kind of behavior, (2) thinking about relevant standards regarding correct behavior, and (3) the behavioral outcome. When such a situation so described occurs, the actor in question is said to be in a state of self-awareness. One consequence of being in a state of self-awareness is that people are motivated to conform to the relevant standards of correct behavior. Self-awareness has been shown to increase behavioral conformity to internal, idiosyncratic values (Carver, 1975; Gibbons, 1978) and external, general social values (Diener & Wallbom, 1976; Beaman, Klentz, Diener & Svanum, 1979; Scheier, Fenigstein & Buss, 1974).

Carver (1975) compared the correspondence of subjects' self-reported favorability toward using punishment as a teaching method with their actual use of electric shock as punishment to students when teaching. With no manipulation of subjects' self-awareness, there was no correspondence between the self-reports and actual behavior. The group of subjects who taught in the presence of a mirror, however, enacted behavior that reflected their previously reported views on punishment.

Gibbons (1978) reported similar findings in a study that compared female subjects' self-reported attitudes, measured on a sex guilt test, with their ratings of pornographic literature. When the reading material was rated with no inducement of self-awareness, there was little correspondence between the earlier
reported attitudes and how they rated the pornography \((r = .20)\). When a mirror was present, however, the correlation of the sex guilt test with the rating of the literature was quite high \((r = .70)\).

Diener and Wallbom (1976) found that self-awareness increased conformity to the societal proscription against cheating among college students. In taking a timed I.Q. test, with no inducement to self-awareness, some 70 percent of the students exceeded the time limit. With the group subject to self-awareness the rate of those who went over the time limit dropped to only seven percent.

Beaman et al., (1979) reported that children also are influenced to conform to societal standards by directing their attention to self. In a situation where trick-or-treaters were instructed to take only one piece of candy from an unguarded candy bowl, the incidence of taking more was greatly reduced by the presence of a mirror directly behind the candy bowl.

Scheier et al. (1974) found that when male subjects were self-aware they were less likely to give shocks to female victims than males not induced into self-awareness. In this case, a general societal value against cruelty provided the standard to which self-aware subjects conformed.

The research cited here suggests that the self-aware person will be motivated to keep his or her behavior consistent with whatever standards of correctness are salient at that particular time. (See Wicklund, 1975, for a comprehensive review of
research.) The standard of correctness by which the self-aware person judges his or her behavior may be either personal internalized values or general societal values. The internalized values should reflect the person's identity while societal values should reflect role expectations.

In some situations, the individual may not have internalized any standards or values that are applicable, and therefore will depend entirely on standards provided by situational cues or values held by others, such as a reference group (see Pryor, Gibbons, Wicklund, Fazio & Hood, 1977). In the case where neither personal nor societal standards are clearly salient, one possible factor determining whether a person will evaluate his or her behavior by comparison to an internal or an external value is provided by the theory of self-consciousness.

Self-Consciousness

Self-consciousness theory (Fenigstein et al., 1975; Buss & Scheier, 1976; Buss, 1980) is quite similar to Duval and Wicklund's theory of self-awareness. However, a major difference between the two theories is that self-consciousness theory makes a distinction between the transient state of self-awareness and the dispositional trait of self-consciousness. The former is produced by situational manipulations such as mirrors, videotapes, tape recorders, and other external stimuli which cause one to reflect upon his or her self. The latter is conceptualized as a personality disposition where people are found to vary in terms
of the proportion of the time they are self-aware. According to Fenigstein et al.:

The consistent tendency of persons to direct attentions inward or outward is the trait of self-consciousness. Self-awareness refers to a state: the existence of self-directed attention, as a result of either transient situational variables, chronic disposition, or both (1975, p. 522).

In order to investigate the existence of the trait of self-consciousness, Fenigstein and his co-authors devised a scale to "... identify behaviors that constitute the domain of self-consciousness" (Fenigstein et al., 1975, p. 523). Factor analysis of their scale resulted in the identification of three, statistically independent, dimensions of self-consciousness: private self-consciousness, public self-consciousness, and social anxiety. It is the first two of these dimensions that are relevant to self-reflection. Social anxiety refers to unpleasant reactions—embarrassment, shame, stage-fright, and shyness—that are associated with acute public self-consciousness (see Buss, 1980). The social anxiety dimension will not be discussed, since it is not considered relevant to this research.

Self-consciousness theory is premised on the idea that one's attention can be focused either on the environment or directed toward self. It differs from Duval and Wicklund's self-awareness theory in making the distinction between the private and public aspects of self. The private component of the self includes those aspects that can only be known by the person directly experiencing them. The public component of the self consists of those aspects that are entirely overt, observable by others.
Private self-consciousness, according to Fenigstein et al. "... deals with a cognitive, private mulling over the self," and is considered to be "... similar to the Jungian conception of introversion" (Fenigstein, et al., 1975, p. 525). A private self-conscious person should have a clear understanding of his or her identity standards, and should strive to enact behavior reflective of his or her identity.

Public self-consciousness, on the other hand, "... emphasizes an awareness and concern over the self as a social stimulus" (Fenigstein, et al., 1975, p. 525). A public self-conscious person should have a clear understanding of social standards and should strive to enact behavior consistent with role expectations.

Research based on the theory of self-consciousness has supported the contention, first revealed by a factor analysis of the self-consciousness scale, that self-consciousness has both public and private aspects. A significantly different description of people can be drawn, depending on whether they are high in private self-consciousness or high in public self-consciousness. Privately self-conscious people tend to know themselves quite well and are not easily influenced by others. Publicly self-conscious people are quite concerned with how others perceive them and are more easily influenced by the evaluations of others.

Private self-consciousness has been the focus of research more often than has public self-consciousness. Research into private self-consciousness has progressed along two major lines...
of inquiry. The first line of inquiry is based on the theoretical proposition that people who are privately self-conscious will know their own mind better than others. Experimental research has supported this proposition (Gibbons, Carver, Scheier and Hormuth, 1979; Scheier, Buss & Buss, 1978).

A second major line of research into private self-consciousness has focused on the influence of private self-consciousness on the intensity of subjects' reactions to affective and motivational stimuli. This proposition has also been supported by experimental research (Scheier & Carver, 1977; Scheier, Carver, Schultz, Glass, Wishnik & Katy, 1978; Scheier, 1976; Scheier, Carver & Gibbons, 1981). Assessing the relationship of private self-consciousness on the variables included in this study, while potentially interesting, is beyond the scope of this research. Therefore, private self-consciousness was not included into this study.

Public self-consciousness has not been the focus of as much research as has private self-consciousness. In the major study on public self-consciousness, Fenigstein (1979) conducted an experiment in an interpersonal situation involving rejection by a group. Women were used as subjects in this experiment and divided into two groups; one group was the control group and the other group received the experimental manipulation—being shunned by experimental accomplices. Of those subjects who were rejected, those that were high in public self-consciousness reacted more negatively to the rejection than did those low in
public self-consciousness. Public self-consciousness had no significant influence in the control group. This study provides evidence that individual differences in public self-consciousness have strong effects on reactions to negative evaluations from others. Persons high in public self-consciousness were more sensitive to being shunned by others, presumably because they were more aware of how others were perceiving them. Private self-consciousness had no impact on subjects' reactions to rejection in this research.

The remaining studies to be reviewed examined both private and public self-consciousness. These focused on the issue of attitude-behavior consistency. Scheier (1980) conducted an experiment in which subjects' attitudes toward using punishment as an aid to learning were measured on a pre-test, consisting of a questionnaire measuring attitudes toward punishment. A few months later, subjects were taken to a laboratory in groups of two to four subjects and instructed to write an essay concerning the use of physical punishment and the obtained scores were correlated with the attitude scores gathered on the questionnaire. The correlations between the questionnaire scores and the essay scores were then compared for four groups of subjects: high private/high public, high private/low public, low private/high public, and low private/low public. The only group of subjects that had a significant correlation (.64) was the high private/low public group. The other three groups of subjects had correlations near zero. Scheier's findings support the theoretical
proposition that only people high in private self-consciousness know themselves well enough to be consistent, and that only people low in public self-consciousness are unaffected by what others may think of them.

Turner (1978) conducted an experiment concerned with consistency between attitudes of dominance and dominance behavior. In this study, subjects were required to report how dominant they typically were (typical) and how dominant they were capable of being (maximal). Dominance behavior was then scored for each subject for a typical and maximal situation based on their behavior in a group discussion. Private and public self-consciousness was also included as a variable in Turner's study.

Turner found that self-report of maximal dominance was a better predictor of dominance behavior for both typical and maximal situations. He also found that being high in private self-consciousness and being low in public self-consciousness improved the predictiveness of both typical and maximal self-reports.

The studies investigating public self-consciousness, either by itself or in combination with private self-consciousness, suggest that persons high in public self-consciousness are more concerned with their self-presentation than persons low in public self-consciousness. Persons who are public self-conscious should be more concerned with expressing attitudes that are consistent with social expectations than low public self-conscious persons. High public self-conscious persons would not be expected to
express attitudes consistent with their imaginative view of self when publicly expressing these attitudes. Rather, public self-conscious persons should strive to express attitudes that conform to role expectations that are perceived as being relevant in the situation.

Contrary to most previous research involving the influence of self-consciousness on attitude-behavior consistency, the present study takes a more sociological approach. Previous attitude-behavior studies have usually focused on a unidimensional value and compared the correspondence between attitude and behavior. The present research is focusing on a broader issue by examining the impact of gender—as a social position and as a component of one's identity—and examining the degree to which gender is reflected in the expression of attitudes held toward work, controlling for situational and dispositional factors. These issues will be empirically examined by testing specific research hypotheses in this study.

Roles, Identities, and Work Attitudes

The empirical issues to be addressed in this research include an investigation of sex differences in attitudes toward social relations in the work environment and the conditions under which the expression of attitude differences are expected. This study will also explore when and how gender-related identity influences attitudes toward the work environment. Bakan's (1966) conception of the duality of human existence suggests that each
individual internalizes both agentic and communal traits. Thus, every individual should have two aspects of his or her generalized identity which are related primarily to gender. In general, males are expected to internalize agentic traits to a greater degree than they will internalize communal traits. Females, on the other hand, are typically expected to internalize communal traits more than agentic traits (Garnets & Pleck, 1979; Spence and Helmreich, 1978). A person with an agentic orientation should strive for self-rewards and display traits such as assertiveness and competitiveness, while a person with a communal orientation should strive to maintain harmonious social relations. As males should, in general, be more agentic than females, and females more communal than males, we should expect to find males and females expressing significantly different attitudes toward social relations in the work environment.

Attitudes toward social relations in the work environment were measured on a two-dimensional scale, consisting of a measure of counterpersonal attitudes and conflict-avoidance attitudes. Counterpersonal attitudes and conflict-avoidance attitudes are viewed as being aspects of one's fundamental interpersonal orientation (Schults, 1960). A highly agentic person should express stronger counterpersonal attitudes, due to having a concern with self-rewards, and weaker conflict-avoidance attitudes, due to having internalized traits such as assertiveness and competitiveness. A highly communal person should express weaker counterpersonal attitudes, because of having a concern for others, and
stronger conflict-avoidance attitudes, due to the desire to maintain harmonious social relations. As males should, in general, have a more agentic orientation than females, and females, in general, should have a more communal orientation than males, males and females are expected to express different attitudes toward the work environment.

Additionally, it is expected that certain conditions, such as the presence of an audience, will accentuate sex differences in attitudes toward work. This is believed to occur due to the existence of social expectations that males should demonstrate agentic traits and values, and that females should demonstrate communal traits and values. It is assumed that the subjects will, in the process of publicly expressing their attitudes, be concerned with how their responses reflect upon the type of person they wish to be perceived as being (see Alexander & Knight, 1971).

A number of beliefs concerning the work habits of men and women have been shown to be widely held. Many people expect men to be better than women in most jobs (e.g., Feldman-Summers and Kiesler, 1974). Traits associated with masculinity, such as aggressiveness, competitiveness and self-confidence, are considered more valuable in the business world than the traits associated with femininity, and women who possess more masculine values are seen by many people as being more employable than women with more feminine values (Shaffer & Wegley, 1974). The view that women are too concerned with family matters to fully
dedicate themselves to a career has long been accepted as fact, and has probably been encouraged by the reality of the primary responsibilities of the household falling to the woman even when she is responsible for a career outside of the home (Angrist & Almquist, 1975; Paloma, 1972; Bem & Bem, 1970). Furthermore, O'Leary (1974), Kanter (1975), and Schein (1973, 1975) have all discussed the significance of how sex role stereotypes impinge upon the definition of the situation in the work place, resulting in barriers which hinder the opportunities of women in the business world.

To the extent that the expectations associated with male and female sex roles influence the behavior of men and women, the first set of hypotheses to be tested can be stated as follows:

1. Males will express stronger counterpersonal attitudes than females.
2. Females will express stronger conflict-avoidance attitudes than males.

In addition to examining the extent that sex role expectations influence the behavior of men and women, it is necessary to include an examination of factors that might make sex role expectations more salient in a given situation. Research has shown that sex-role expectations tend to affect how males and females present themselves when their behaviors are enacted in public. In private conditions, fewer differences between males and females are found, presumably because, in the absence of an audience, sex-role expectations are not a salient feature of the
situation (Levinthal & Lane, 1970; Berman, 1975; Borden, 1975).

To test the influence of public vs. private disclosure on the relationship between sex-role expectations and behavior, a second set of hypotheses can be stated as follows:

3. (a) Males in the public disclosure condition will express stronger counterpersonal attitudes than males in the private disclosure condition.

(b) Females in the public disclosure condition will express weaker counterpersonal attitudes than females in the private disclosure condition.

4. (a) Males in the public disclosure conditions will express weaker conflict-avoidance attitudes than males in the private disclosure condition.

(b) Females in the public disclosure condition will express stronger conflict-avoidance attitudes than females in the private disclosure condition.

The relationship between sex-role expectations and behavior can be more thoroughly examined by including an analysis of individual differences in subjects' levels of public self-consciousness.

It has previously been postulated that public disclosure will increase the impact of social standards such as sex-role expectations on people's behavior. Therefore, it was hypothesized that males will express attitudes toward work which are more "masculine," and females will express attitudes toward work which are more "feminine," when they are in public than when they are in private.
Public self-consciousness, the tendency to reflect on self as a social object, becomes relevant only when an awareness of self as a social object is induced. Without the presence of an audience, or a mechanical substitute for an audience, one's level of public self-consciousness is irrelevant. People high in public self-consciousness should be more concerned about their self-presentations before an audience than people low in public self-consciousness. When in the presence of others, people high in public self-consciousness should be more influenced by social expectations than people low in public self-consciousness. Therefore, males high in public self-consciousness should express attitudes which are more "masculine" than males low in public self-consciousness, when in the public condition. And, females who are high in public self-consciousness should express attitudes, in the public condition, which are more "feminine" than females low in public self-consciousness. Sex-role expectations are not salient in the private condition to the degree they are in the public condition, therefore, there should be less pressure to express attitudes which reflect either masculinity or femininity.

To test the influence of public self-consciousness on the relationship between sex-role expectations and expressed attitudes toward work, a third set of hypotheses has been stated as follows:

5. Within the public condition:
   (a) Males high in public self-consciousness will express stronger counterpersonal attitudes than males low in public self-consciousness.
(b) Females high in public self-consciousness will express weaker counterpersonal attitudes than females low in public self-consciousness.

6. Within the public condition:

(a) Males high in public self-consciousness will express weaker conflict-avoidance attitudes than males low in public self-consciousness.

(b) Females high in public self-consciousness will express stronger conflict-avoidance attitudes than females low in public self-consciousness.

Having outlined the preceding hypotheses concerned with gender, sex-role expectations, disclosure condition, and public self-consciousness, the next aspect of this study involves an examination of individual differences in sex role orientation as an independent variable. Males and females alike, according to Bakan, will internalize both agentic and communal traits into their generalized identity. Whether or not the gender-related aspects of a person's generalized view of self can be used to explain variations in expressed attitudes toward the work environment, beyond what can be explained by using biological gender categories, will be addressed in the hypotheses. These hypotheses will also examine the effects of audience presence and self-consciousness on the relationship between identity and expressed attitudes toward the work environment.

The effects of identity on expressed work attitudes are to be examined by looking at males and females separately. This decision is based on the premise that the subjective experience of agentic and
communal orientations to social life may be very different for males and females. If gender-related aspects of generalized identity, consisting of agentic and communal components, proves to be a significant predictor of behavior, then the more agentic individuals, regardless of gender, should express attitudes toward the work environment which are more typical of males than females. Likewise, the more communal individuals should express attitudes toward the work environment which are more typical of females. Therefore, the hypotheses concerned with gender-identity as an independent variable can be stated as follows:

7. Subjects who are high in agency will express greater counterpersonal attitudes than subjects who are low in agency.

8. Subjects who are high in communion will express lower counterpersonal attitudes than subjects who are low in communion.

9. Subjects who are high in agency will express lower conflict-avoidance attitudes than subjects who are low in agency.

10. Subjects who are high in communion will express greater conflict-avoidance attitudes than subjects who are low in communion.

Summary

This chapter is intended to provide a theoretical basis for this study. Central to this research is the theoretical view of how and
when sex-role expectations influence the behavior of males and females. Role theory provides two theoretical answers to the first question. Sex-role expectations influence behavior in that conformity to the expectations results in positive sanctions from others and deviance from expectations results in negative sanctions from others. This implies that male and female behavior will have greater differences in the public disclosure condition than in the private disclosure condition. Secondly, sex-role expectations become internalized so that social control which initially comes from others becomes internal to the individual. This implies that male and female behavioral differences will occur in private, as well as in public. Both of these propositions will be empirically tested.

Another major theoretical basis of this study is found in the perspectives of identity theory. At issue is whether gender-related aspects of generalized identity are related to the expression of attitudes toward work. McCall and Simmons' role-identity perspective views people as enacting behavior which legitimizes their identity. Situated identity theory, however, views people as enacting behavior that will create a favorable impression on others. If the former is correct, then there should be male-female differences in both public and private disclosure conditions. If the latter is correct, public behavior should conform more to socially held expectations than to idiosyncratic, identity standards.

Self-consciousness is viewed as being an important contingency variable that might explain whether a person's behavior will reflect social expectations or internal standards. Public self-
consciousness should interact with disclosure condition such that in the public condition the individual who is high in public self-consciousness will conform more to social standards than the individual who is low in public self-consciousness.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

One goal of this research is to investigate how and under what conditions sex-role expectations influence the expression of attitudes toward social relations in the work environment. Another goal is to determine whether gender-related aspects of generalized identity are related to the expression of work attitudes. Attitudes toward social relations in the work environment are measured, in this study, along two dimensions which are expected to be related to stereotyped sex-role expectations. The first dimension represents attitudes toward the type of social interaction most preferred in the work setting, ranging from a preference for personal relations to a preference for impersonal relations. This dimension of attitudes toward social relations is referred to as counterpersonal attitudes. The second dimension refers to the degree of conflict and competition in interpersonal relations people would accept in the work environment. This dimension of attitudes toward social relations is referred to as conflict-avoidance attitudes. At issue is how the expression of attitudes toward social relations in the work environment reflect, (1) sex-role expectations, and (2) gender-related generalized identity; and whether situational or dispositional factors significantly enter into the process by which sex-role expectations influence the expression of work attitudes.
The relevant situational factor is the experimentally manipulated attitude disclosure condition. Half of the subjects expressed attitudes toward social relations in the work environment under the assumption that their response would be revealed to others. The other half of the subjects expressed attitudes toward social relations in the work environment under the assumption that their responses would be kept confidential. The attitude disclosure condition is viewed as a possible determinant of whether a person enacts behavior consistent with external expectations or internalized identity. It was hypothesized that publicly disclosed attitudes will conform to sex-role expectations to a greater degree than privately disclosed attitudes. The individual's dispositional tendency to reflect on public or private aspects of self is also to be investigated to determine whether internal or external standards guide behavior.

It was expected that the subjects used in this study, in the absence of extensive work experience, would not have formed any concrete and specific opinions on social relations in the work environment. Since the work attitudes were measured along dimensions related to sex-role expectations it was expected that subjects who base their behavior on external cues would find sex-role expectations to be salient standards of correctness. The subjects that look to an internal cue were expected to base their behavior on gender-related aspects of generalized identity.

Subjects who publicly disclose their attitudes are expected to conform to the external standards provided by sex-role expectations.
to a greater degree than subjects whose attitudes are not made public. The presence of an audience should induce subjects to anticipate the others' expectations and enact behavior consistent with those expectations. Subjects with a dispositional tendency to reflect on public aspects of self are expected to be especially concerned with how others perceive them. Conformity to sex role expectations in expressing work attitudes should be highest among subjects who are in the public disclosure condition and who are high in public self-consciousness.

Subjects

Subjects in the experiment were undergraduate students enrolled in one of four lower level sociology courses at Western Michigan University. Two of the courses from which subjects were drawn, both introductory social psychology classes, had participation in the experiment as a course requirement. In the remaining two courses, both introductory sociology classes, students were offered extra credit as an incentive to participate in the experiment. Two-hundred and twenty-five students were contacted and completed the preliminary instruments. Fifty-one of the students who initially indicated an interest in participating in the experiment did not follow through and take part. Seven subjects who did participate in the experiment failed to correctly follow instructions and were eliminated from the final sample. After excluding these seven students, the total sample size numbered 167. The final sample included 108 females, approxi-
mately 65% of the total, and 59 males, or approximately 35% of the sample.

Procedures

A six-page questionnaire (Appendix A) was distributed to students during a regular class session. On the cover page each potential subject was requested to provide background information: name, sex, class rank, major, phone number where he or she could be reached, and times when participation in the experiment would be possible. The remaining five pages consisted of the Rosenberg (1965) Self-Esteem Scale, the short version of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (Spence, et al., 1974), and the Self-Consciousness Scale (Fenigstein, et al., 1975). A modified version of the Fiedler (1967) Least Preferred Co-Worker Scale also was administered, but was not used in this study.

Students who expressed an interest in taking part in the experiment were contacted by phone and an appointment was made for their participation. An attempt was made to schedule eight subjects for each experimental session. Four of the eight were randomly assigned to the public disclosure condition and four to the private disclosure condition. It was not always possible to schedule eight subjects per session. In some sessions, six subjects were scheduled with three randomly assigned to the public disclosure condition and three to the private disclosure condition.

At times it was necessary to schedule only three or four subjects for a given session. When this situation occurred the subjects...
were all placed in one group and a bogus second group was created using confederates. The bogus group consisted of students not actually taking part in the experiment but who volunteered their time to create the impression of having two groups. Thus, when four real subjects were scheduled for a session, an equal number of confederates played the role of the other group. In such a case it was decided to randomly assign the first single group of subjects to one of the disclosure conditions and then to alternate disclosure condition for the other sessions involving a single group.

Another difficulty in conducting the experiment arose when scheduled subjects failed to appear. Missed appointments resulted, on occasion, in an odd number of subjects reporting for the experiment. When this occurred, the subjects in the group with the greater number were told, after an approximate ten minute wait, the missing subject finally arrived for the other group. The subjects in the group with the fewer subjects were then told that one member of the other group had been rescheduled. Thus, subjects in both groups were informed that both groups had an equal number of subjects.

Once subjects were scheduled for a session, they were instructed to report to one of two rooms where they would be met by an assistant to the main experimenters. The experimental assistant introduced himself or herself\(^1\) and informed the subjects that he or she was helping conduct the experiment for the principal researchers. At a prearranged time, the experimental assistant escorted subjects to a social psychology lab, where the experiment was conducted.
The experimental laboratory consisted of three connecting rooms, the middle room was used by the principal researchers, and the groups of subjects were escorted to each of the outer rooms, with the public group in one and the private group in the other. At this time, if there was an odd number of subjects, the false information was relayed to the subjects to create an impression of equal group size. In each of the outer rooms there were four tables and chairs arranged so that subjects could not observe each other during the experiment, to avoid possible distraction.

This research was conducted in conjunction with a separate study of allocation behavior. The principal researcher for the allocation study and the principal researcher for the present study had worked together in the obtaining and scheduling of subjects. Subjects were under the impression that both researchers were involved in the same study and that only one experiment was being conducted. The two principal researchers occupied the middle room while the two experimental assistants interacted with the subjects.

When the subjects arrived at the social psychology lab, they participated in the first part of the allocation experiment. The allocation experiment also involved the manipulation of public and private disclosure condition, with this manipulation being consistent for both experiments. After completing the first aspect of the allocation experiment, which involved an editing task, subjects were informed that their editing task was going to be evaluated by a group of people in the middle room and that there would be a short wait of approximately 15 minutes.
While waiting for the editing task to be evaluated, the experimental assistant asked the subjects if they would be willing to participate in a separate study being conducted by the assistant. Subjects were told by the assistant that he or she was designing a questionnaire on work attitudes that would be used in a thesis in industrial sociology, and that he or she needed to pre-test the instrument. Subjects were informed that the assistant had permission to pre-test the work attitudes questionnaire as long as subjects were aware that it was not related to the allocation experiment. The assistant read a description (Appendix B) of the research he or she was doing.

Subjects who were in the public disclosure condition were informed that they would all discuss their responses to the questions on the WAQ when all were finished. This was to allow the assistant to discover if there were ambiguous questions as well as to receive feedback on the questionnaire. Subjects were also told that they should be prepared to explain the reasoning they used in responding to the questions. Subjects in the private disclosure condition, however, were informed that their responses would be kept confidential.

When all subjects had completed the questionnaire they were informed that the editing task had been evaluated. Subjects in the public disclosure condition were told that there was not sufficient time remaining for a discussion of the WAQ. All subjects were then thanked for their cooperation by the experimental assistant. Subjects then resumed their participation in the allocation experiment.
When the allocation experiment was completed, subjects were debriefed by the experimenter and their questions, if they had any, were answered. After debriefing, subjects were requested not to reveal information concerning the experiment to their classmates.

Operationalization of Variables

When subjects were contacted and scheduled for a given experimental session, they were randomly assigned to a disclosure condition. This was accomplished by randomly assigning the first subject scheduled to either the private disclosure condition or the public disclosure condition. As other subjects were scheduled, they were alternately assigned to either the private disclosure or the public disclosure condition. The attitude disclosure condition represents the experimentally manipulated variable in this study.

In the private disclosure condition, subjects were informed that their responses would be kept confidential. They were told that they could not, in any way, be identified and that their responses would be statistically analyzed without regard to individual answers. They were also told it was unnecessary to write their names on the questionnaires. When they had finished filling out the WAQ, the assistant collected them and placed them in order based on the letter written on an index card at their table. The assistant, in this manner, was able to insure which questionnaire was completed by which subject.

In the public disclosure condition, subjects were told that upon completion of the questionnaire they would be questioned on, and
asked to discuss with other group members, how and why they answered particular items on the WAQ as they did. They were asked to write the letter appearing on the index card at their table on the questionnaire. They were also informed that they would be able to compare their answers with those given by others in the group. The public disclosure condition was manipulated following Scheier (1980) who contends that merely anticipating public disclosure of one's answers will induce a concern with how one is being perceived by others.

Gender-related generalized identity was a major dispositional variable. Two gender-related aspects of generalized identity were identified, an agentic component and a communal component. The agentic aspect of one's generalized identity refers to the extent to which the individual conceives of self as possessing the traits associated with the social stereotype of maleness. The communal aspect of one's generalized identity refers to the extent to which the individual conceives of self as possessing the traits associated with the social stereotype of femaleness. The gender-related aspect of each subject's generalized identity was measured on the short form of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) developed by Spence, et al. (1974).

The PAQ consists of 16 questions designed to measure traits characterized as being related to masculinity and femininity. Eight items on the PAQ measure masculine traits and eight items measure feminine traits. The masculine and feminine dimensions of the PAQ are statistically independent. Separate scores for the masculine and
feminine dimensions were obtained by summing the responses given for each of the sub-scales contained in the questionnaire.

Subjects completed the PAQ when first contacted about participating in the experiment. A single score was obtained for the agentic component of generalized identity, for each subject, by summing the responses given on the eight items measuring masculine traits. The minimum score obtained on this variable was 18 and the maximum 38. The mean subject score on agentic identity was 28.713.

A score was also obtained, for each subject, by summing the eight items measuring feminine traits. This score represents the second gender-related identity variable and was named communal identity. The obtained communal identity scores ranged from a low of 19 to a high of 39 with a mean score of 31.94.

Both public and private aspects of self-consciousness were measured as dispositional (trait) variables. Self-consciousness was measured on the 23 item self-consciousness questionnaire (Fenigstein, et al., 1975), which was administered to the subjects during the initial contact. The self-consciousness questionnaire was designed to measure individual differences in three aspects of self-consciousness--public self-consciousness, private self-consciousness and social anxiety. The questionnaire consisted of seven items which measure public self-consciousness, ten items which measure private self-consciousness, and six items which measure social anxiety. The social anxiety variable was not used in this study.

A single score for each subject's level of public self-consciousness was computed by summing the seven items measuring the
public aspect of self-consciousness. The scores obtained for public self-consciousness ranged from a minimum of 12 to a maximum of 35, with a mean score of 26.521.

The ten-item private self-consciousness sub-scale was summed to produce a single score indicative of subjects' level of private self-consciousness. The independent variable of private self-consciousness had a low score of 23 and a high score of 48, with a mean score of 33.557.

The obtained scores for females were higher than for males on both public and private self-consciousness. The mean public self-consciousness score for females was 27.176 and 25.322 for males (t = 2.48, p = .014). Mean private self-consciousness scores were 36.976 for females and 34.424 for males (t = 2.48, p = .014).

In addition to the major independent variables, information was collected on subjects' level of self-esteem as measured on the Rosenberg (1965) Self-Esteem Scale. This was included as a control variable. Masculine traits have traditionally been more highly valued in American society than feminine traits, therefore self-esteem should be highly correlated with agentic identity. The correlation of self-esteem with agency was relatively strong (r = .53, p < .001) in the sample population. The correlation of self-esteem with communal identity, however, was relatively weak (r = .14; p = .032), although indicating a positive relationship.

The dependent variables in this study were subjects' expressed attitudes toward social relations in the work environment. These were measured on the self-administered Work Attitudes Questionnaire.
(WAQ). The WAQ consists of 22 items, each presenting two statements concerning social relations in the work world. One statement was labeled A and the other statement was labeled B. Subjects were instructed to select from each pair of statements the one they most agreed with. The available range of responses allowed subjects to indicate the strength of their preference of one statement over the other by circling one of four responses—+A, -A, -B, or +B. If a subject strongly agreed with statement A and disagreed with B, he or she was instructed to circle +A. If statement A was slightly or moderately favored over statement B, the appropriate response was -A. If statement B was strongly favored over A, the subject's appropriate response was to circle +B. If statement B was slightly preferred to statement A, the subject was instructed to circle -B. Subjects were instructed to select the statement which they on the whole most agreed with, even though the choice might at times be difficult.

The WAQ was designed with the intention of measuring two dimensions of attitudes toward social relations in the work environment. Pre-testing of the instrument indicated that this was possible, as a factor analysis of the WAQ yielded two orthogonal dimensions of work attitudes.

Table 1 shows the results of the factor analysis of the experimental subjects' responses on the WAQ. The 14 items making up factor 1 represent respondents' attitudes toward personal vs. counterpersonal social relations in the work environment. Examples of the personal vs. counterpersonal statements are: A. The best group is one in which people maintain businesslike, impersonal
relationships with each other. B. The best work group is one in which people relate to each other in a close, personal manner; A. I prefer a leader who acts cool and impersonal toward me in a group. B. I prefer a leader who acts close and personal toward me in a group; and, A. Being satisfied with a job depends primarily on having personally challenging duties. B. Being satisfied with a job depends primarily on having warm friendly relationships with my co-workers.

Factor 2 consists of 6 items that gauge subjects' attitudes toward conflict or conflict-avoidance in interpersonal relations in the work environment. Examples of the statements included in the conflict-avoidance dimension are: A. I would prefer a job in which co-workers do not compete; B. I would prefer a job which involves some degree of competition with co-workers and which gives rewards to the best competitors; A. Co-workers should be free to criticize one another's performance in a group; B. Making interpersonal criticisms public in a group is usually detrimental to morale and productivity; and A. The best task group involves some amount of disagreement and competition among members; B. The best task group has a relaxed easy-going atmosphere. Appendix C shows the specific items that were scaled in order to produce the two dependent variables.\(^4\)

The 14 items from the WAQ that measure counterpersonal attitudes were summated to create the first dependent variable and the 6 items from the WAQ that measure conflict-avoidance attitudes were also summed, resulting in the second dependent variable.\(^5\) The obtained scores on the measure of counterpersonal attitudes ranged from a low...
of 19 to a high of 46, with a mean score of 31.018. The scores obtained on the conflict-avoidance attitudes measure ranged from a low of 9 to a high of 23, with a mean score of 15.198.

Table 1

Results from factor analysis of Work Attitude Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item*</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13^a</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>-.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5^a</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19^a</td>
<td>-.396</td>
<td>-.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10^a</td>
<td>-.369</td>
<td>-.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1^a</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14^a</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td>.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21^a</td>
<td>-.337</td>
<td>-.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4^a</td>
<td>-.315</td>
<td>-.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21^a</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>-.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17^a</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7^a</td>
<td>-.264</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12^a</td>
<td>-.259</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8^a</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15^a</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11^b</td>
<td>-.335</td>
<td>.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2^b</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3^c</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9^c</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>-.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16^c</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>-.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20^c</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6^c</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18^c</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aItems scaled to produce "Counterpersonal Attitudes."

^bItems not included in either sub-scale.

^cItems scaled to produce "Conflict-Avoidance Attitudes."

*Certain items were recoded to reverse their direction before being scaled. The items which were reversed are: For factor 1 - 1, 5, 8, 13, 14, 15, 17, 21; For factor 2 - 6, 9, 16.
Design and Analysis

To study the effects of sex-role expectations, gender-related generalized identity, and self-consciousness on expression of attitudes toward social relations in the work environment, attitude disclosure condition was experimentally manipulated to create a public and a private condition. To determine if males and females expressed significantly different work attitudes, and to see if attitude disclosure condition influenced the expression of work attitudes, a sex x condition two-way analysis of variance was used. This analysis provides information on (1) whether males and females express significantly different work attitudes, (2) whether subjects in public express significantly different work attitudes than subjects in private, and (3) whether the attitude disclosure condition affects males and females in a significantly different manner. Once these questions were answered, for both dependent variables, the effect of public self-consciousness on the expression of work attitudes was examined.

To examine whether public self-consciousness affects conformity to sex-role expectations of persons publicly expressing work attitudes, a one way analysis of variance for males in the public disclosure condition, and a one-way analysis for females in the public disclosure condition, was used. To avoid problems caused by unequal cell size, one-way ANOVA for males and one-way ANOVA for females was chosen as the appropriate analysis rather than two-way
ANOVA. Public self-consciousness was dichotomized into high and low by a median split technique when included in the one-way analysis of variance. These analyses provide information on whether subjects who are high in public self-consciousness will publicly express significantly different work attitudes than subjects who are low in public self-consciousness.

After the effect of public self-consciousness on the public expression of work attitudes were analyzed for males and females, the same variables were examined for males and females in the private disclosure condition. Theoretically, public self-consciousness only becomes relevant when external stimuli which serve as an inducement to reflect on public aspects of self are present. The public disclosure condition is such an inducement. Therefore, public self-consciousness should have a significant effect only on the public expression of work attitudes, and should not have a significant effect on subjects' expression of work attitudes in private. A one-way analysis of variance for males in the private disclosure condition and a one-way analysis of variance for females in the private disclosure condition was computed to allow a comparison of the public self-consciousness effect on males and females for the two disclosure conditions.

The effects of sex and agency, and sex and communion, on the expression of work attitudes were examined in the next set of analyses. The effects of sex and agency, dichotomized into high and low by a median split technique, on both dependent variables, were examined using one-way analysis of variance. These analyses will
provide information on whether agency affects the expression of either counterpersonal or conflict-avoidance attitudes. The effects of sex and communion, also divided into high and low by a median split technique, on both dependent variables were also examined by using one-way analysis of variance. These analyses will determine whether communion affects the expression of work attitudes by either males or females.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

The initial issue addressed in this research concerns the influence of sex-role expectations on the expression of attitudes toward the work environment. The dependent variables in question consist of two orthogonal dimensions of interpersonal attitudes that are relevant in the work environment. The first attitude dimension measured subjects' personal vs. counterpersonal approach to interpersonal relations in the work environment. The second dimension measured on the work attitude questionnaire gauged subjects' attitudes toward conflict or avoidance of conflict in interpersonal behavior in work settings.

Sex Roles

It was hypothesized that males and females, by virtue of the process of differential socialization into sex roles, would differ significantly in their expression of work attitudes along the two dimensions of interpersonal behavior. The masculine sex role provides an ideal for males that should encourage an emphasis on expressing counterpersonal attitudes in interpersonal relations, and should diminish the concern with avoiding conflict in interpersonal behavior. The feminine sex role provides an ideal for females that emphasizes the expression of personal rather than counterpersonal attitudes and also encourages a concern with avoiding conflict in
interpersonal relations. It was also hypothesized that the expected difference between males and females would be most pronounced when their attitudes were expressed in public, due to a concern with presenting a gender-appropriate self image to others.

Table 2 shows the mean counterpersonal attitude scores for males and females broken down by disclosure condition. As hypothesized, the mean counterpersonal attitude scores for males are higher than the mean scores for females in both disclosure conditions. The main effect for sex in the two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) is statistically significant ($F = 7.278, p = .008$). The hypothesized influence of disclosure condition, however, is not evident, as the difference in mean counterpersonal attitude scores between males and females is slightly higher in the private disclosure condition than in the public disclosure condition. Neither the main effect for disclosure condition nor the two-way sex by condition interaction effect in the two-way ANOVA is statistically significant.

Table 2
Counterpersonal attitude scores by sex and disclosure condition: mean scores, standard deviations and number of subjects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Private Condition</th>
<th>Public Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 32.21$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 32.63$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$s = 3.78$</td>
<td>$s = 5.56$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n = 29$</td>
<td>$n = 30$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 29.84$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 30.68$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$s = 5.17$</td>
<td>$s = 4.91$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n = 55$</td>
<td>$n = 53$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3, showing the mean conflict-avoidance attitude scores broken down by sex and disclosure condition, exhibits a similar pattern. Mean conflict-avoidance attitude scores are higher for females than for males in both disclosure conditions.

Table 3
Conflict-avoidance attitude scores by sex and disclosure condition: mean scores, standard deviations and number of subjects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Private Condition</th>
<th>Public Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 14.83$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 14.13$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$s = 2.42$</td>
<td>$s = 2.47$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n = 29$</td>
<td>$n = 30$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 15.58$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 15.60$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$s = 3.07$</td>
<td>$s = 2.42$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n = 55$</td>
<td>$n = 53$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main effect for sex in the two-way ANOVA is statistically significant ($F = 6.6676, p = .011$). As with the previous analysis, however, the main effect for disclosure condition and the two-way sex by condition interaction effect are not statistically significant.

The finding that disclosure condition has no significant effect on the expression of either counterpersonal or conflict-avoidance attitudes was contrary to the relationship hypothesized.

Sex Roles and Public Self-Consciousness

Further insight into the relative influence of sex role expectations was sought by assessing the impact of public self-consciousness on the relationship between sex-role expectations and expressed work
attitudes. It was hypothesized that subjects in the public disclosure condition who are high in public self-consciousness would conform to the gender appropriate sex role to a greater degree than subjects who are low in public self-consciousness. In terms of counterpersonal attitudes expressed in the public disclosure condition, it was hypothesized that males who are high in public self-consciousness would express significantly greater counterpersonal attitudes than those who are low in public self-consciousness. For females in the public condition it was hypothesized that those who are high in public self-consciousness would express significantly lower counterpersonal attitudes than those who are low in public self-consciousness.

Table 4 shows the mean counterpersonal attitude scores for subjects in the public disclosure condition broken down by sex and public self-consciousness. The mean score for males who are high in public self-consciousness is slightly lower than the mean scores for males who are low in public self-consciousness. This finding is opposite to what was hypothesized. However, a one-way ANOVA reveals no statistically significant effect of public self-consciousness on the public expression of counterpersonal attitudes for males (F = .092, p = 7.64).
Table 4

Counterpersonal attitudes expressed in the public disclosure condition by sex and public self-consciousness: mean scores, standard deviations and number of subjects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Public Self-Consciousness</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 32.89$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 32.25$</td>
<td>$s = 6.46$</td>
<td>$s = 4.07$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 32.70$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 29.45$</td>
<td>$s = 5.24$</td>
<td>$s = 4.33$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean counterpersonal attitude score for females who are high in public self-consciousness is, as hypothesized, lower than the mean counterpersonal attitude scores for females who are low in public self-consciousness. The public self-consciousness effect on females in the public disclosure condition is shown by a one-way ANOVA to be statistically significant ($F = 5.960$, $p = .018$).

These results suggest the hypothesized relationship of public self-consciousness on the public expression of counterpersonal attitudes holds for females but not for males. It is apparent that males who are high in public self-consciousness are not publicly expressing greater counterpersonal attitudes than males who are low in public self-consciousness. There also was no significant difference in mean counterpersonal attitude scores, among males, between the public and private disclosure condition (Table 1). It is
conceivable that the counterpersonal attitude scale is measuring an orientation to social life that is deeply internalized by males, so that it is not affected by external stimuli such as an audience.

The results obtained for the female subjects support the hypothesis that those who are high in public self-consciousness will express weaker counterpersonal attitudes than those who are low in public self-consciousness. This finding suggests that among female subjects, those who tend to focus on themselves as social objects are more likely to publicly express counterpersonal attitudes which are consistent with feminine sex-role expectations. The statistically significant and relatively large difference in mean counterpersonal attitude scores between the females who are low in public self-consciousness ($\bar{X} = 32.70$) and the females who are high in public self-consciousness ($\bar{X} = 29.45$) also suggests that females may be more sensitive to the combined effects of public disclosure and public self-consciousness than males.

Table 5 shows the mean conflict-avoidance attitude scores of subjects in the public disclosure condition broken down by sex and public self-consciousness. Consistent with what was hypothesized, males who are high in public self-consciousness publicly express lower conflict-avoidance attitudes than males who are low in public self-consciousness. However, a one-way ANOVA for males shows that the difference in mean scores is not statistically significant ($F = .287$, $p = .596$).
Table 5
Conflict-avoidance attitudes expressed in the public disclosure condition by sex and public self-consciousness: mean scores, standard deviations and number of subjects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Public Self-Consciousness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 14.33$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$s = 2.61$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n = 18$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 15.65$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$s = 2.37$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n = 20$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among female subjects, there was only a very slight difference in mean conflict-avoidance scores between high and low public self-consciousness groups. A one-way ANOVA for the female subjects reveals this difference to be non-significant ($F = .011, p = .915$). These analyses suggest that public self-consciousness has no real effect on the public expression of conflict-avoidance attitudes.

From the results presented above, it appears that the expression of counterpersonal attitudes and conflict-avoidance attitudes are not affected in the same manner by the independent variables. The public expression of counterpersonal attitudes is significantly influenced by public self-consciousness for females but is not for males. The public expression of conflict-avoidance attitudes, however, is not
significantly influenced by public self-consciousness for either sex. To further investigate the influence of the independent variables on the expression of counterpersonal and conflict-avoidance attitudes, analyses of subjects in the private disclosure condition will be compared to the previously discussed analyses of subjects in the public disclosure condition. No formal hypotheses were stated in regard to the private disclosure condition as this comparison is undertaken for an exploratory analysis only.

Table 6 shows the mean counterpersonal attitude scores of males and females in the private disclosure condition broken down by public self-consciousness. The mean counterpersonal attitude scores for males are higher than the mean counterpersonal attitude scores for females for both levels of public self-consciousness. Males who are high in public self-consciousness express greater counterpersonal attitudes than males who are low in public self-consciousness. However, a one-way ANOVA reveals this difference to be non-significant (F = .565, p = .459). Females who are high in public self-consciousness express greater counterpersonal attitudes than females who are low in public self-consciousness. This difference, however, was also not statistically significant, as shown in a one-way ANOVA (F = 1.977, p = .166).
Table 6

Counterpersonal attitudes expressed in the private disclosure condition by sex and public self-consciousness: mean scores, standard deviations and number of subjects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Public Self-Consciousness</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X = 31.85</td>
<td>X = 33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s = 4.12</td>
<td>s = 2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 20</td>
<td>n = 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>X = 28.44</td>
<td>X = 30.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s = 3.91</td>
<td>s = 5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 18</td>
<td>n = 37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 shows the mean conflict-avoidance attitude scores for subjects in the private disclosure condition broken down by sex and public self-consciousness. The mean conflict-avoidance attitude scores for females are higher, overall, than the mean conflict-avoidance attitude scores for males, although the mean scores for males and females who are high in public self-consciousness are equal. The mean conflict-avoidance scores for males is greater for those who are high in public self-consciousness than for those who are low in public self-consciousness. The public self-consciousness effect is not statistically significant, however, in a one-way ANOVA ($F = .174$, $p = .680$).
Table 7

Conflict-avoidance attitudes expressed in the private disclosure condition by sex and public self-consciousness: mean scores, standard deviations and number of subjects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Public Self-Consciousness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>( \bar{X} = 14.70 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( s = 2.58 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( n = 20 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>( \bar{X} = 16.56 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( s = 3.17 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( n = 18 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean conflict-avoidance score for females who are high in public self-consciousness is lower than the mean conflict avoidance score for females who are low in public self-consciousness. This difference, although very close, is shown by a one-way ANOVA as not being statistically significant (\( F = 2.778, p = .101 \)).

Self-consciousness theory (Buss, 1980) predicts that public self-consciousness will have no influence on behavior unless public self-awareness is induced by the presence of an audience or a similar stimulus. The findings of this study support this prediction. It is not surprising, therefore, to find no significant public self-consciousness effect on the private expression of either counterpersonal or conflict-avoidance attitudes.

In examining Tables 4 to 7, and the accompanying results from the one-way ANOVA's, the major finding appears to be that public self-consciousness has a statistically significant effect only on
females' publicly expressed counterpersonal attitudes. Public self-consciousness does not have a significant effect on the expression of counterpersonal attitudes in the private disclosure condition. The lack of influence of public self-consciousness in the private disclosure condition is consistent with self-consciousness theory.

Public self-consciousness did not have a significant effect on the expression of conflict avoidance attitudes for either sex, in either disclosure condition. Evidently, conflict-avoidance attitudes are internalized to the degree that they are not affected by external stimuli.

That males were virtually unaffected by public self-consciousness on both dependent variables suggests that perhaps males are less concerned with how they are being perceived by others than females. It is apparent that in regards to expressing counterpersonal attitudes this is the case.

Gender Identity

In addition to examining the influence of sex roles on the expression of work attitudes, this study hypothesized that gender-related aspects of subjects' generalized identity would influence the expression of work attitudes. Specifically, it was predicted that subjects, regardless of sex, who are high in agency will express greater counterpersonal attitudes than subjects who are low in agency. Highly agentic subjects were also hypothesized to express lower conflict-avoidance attitudes than subjects who are low in
agency. Subjects who are high in communion, on the other hand, should express lower counterpersonal attitudes than subjects low in communion.

The relationship of both agency and communion with the two dependent variables are examined for males and females without regard for disclosure condition. Preliminary analysis of possible joint effects from the identity measures and disclosure condition revealed that disclosure condition has no significant effect on either dependent variable and disclosure condition does not interact with either agency or communion.

Table 8 shows the mean counterpersonal attitude scores for males and females broken down by high and low agency. The mean counterpersonal attitude scores for males are higher than the mean scores for females for both categories of agency.

A one-way ANOVA for males reveals that agency has no statistically significant effect on the expression of counterpersonal attitudes ($F = .016, p = .900$). A one-way ANOVA for females, however, shows there is a statistically significant agency effect on the expression of counterpersonal attitudes ($F = 6.808, p = .010$). As predicted, females with a strong agentic identity expressed significantly greater counterpersonal attitudes than females with a weak agentic identity.
Table 8

Counterpersonal attitude scores by sex and agency: mean scores, standard deviations and number of subjects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Number of Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 32.52$</td>
<td>$s = 4.38$</td>
<td>$n = 23$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 32.36$</td>
<td>$s = 5.00$</td>
<td>$n = 36$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 29.40$</td>
<td>$s = 4.47$</td>
<td>$n = 73$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 32.03$</td>
<td>$s = 5.71$</td>
<td>$n = 35$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 shows the mean conflict-avoidance attitude scores broken down by sex and agency. As hypothesized, males with a strong agentic identity expressed lower conflict-avoidance attitudes than did males with a weak agentic identity. A one-way ANOVA for males shows a statistically significant agency effect on the expression of conflict-avoidance attitudes ($F = 11.912, p = .001$).

The difference in mean conflict-avoidance attitude scores between females high in agency and females low in agency is very slight. A one-way ANOVA for females, reveals that there is no statistically significant agency effect on the expression of conflict-avoidance attitudes.

Analysis of the effect of agentic identity on the expression of work attitudes reveals two major findings. First, agency has a significant effect on females' expression of counterpersonal attitudes, but does not have a significant effect on males' expression of
counterpersonal attitudes. The second major finding is that, among male subjects, agency has a significant effect on the expression of conflict-avoidance attitudes but agency does not have a significant effect on the expression of counterpersonal attitudes among females.

Table 9
Conflict-avoidance attitude scores by sex and agency: mean scores, standard deviations and number of subjects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>X = 15.74</td>
<td>s = 2.38</td>
<td>n = 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>X = 13.67</td>
<td>s = 2.16</td>
<td>n = 36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>X = 15.62</td>
<td>s = 2.85</td>
<td>n = 73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>X = 15.54</td>
<td>s = 2.59</td>
<td>n = 35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 shows the mean counterpersonal attitude scores for males and females broken down by communion. As expected, the mean counterpersonal attitude scores for males are higher than the mean counterpersonal attitude scores for females. A one-way ANOVA for males reveals the difference in mean counterpersonal attitudes scores between high and low communion is statistically significant (F = 3.581; p = .064). Communion does not, however, have a significant effect on females' expression of counterpersonal attitudes (F = 1.104, p = .296).
Table 10

Counterpersonal attitude scores by sex and communion: mean scores, standard deviations and number of subjects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Communion</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 33.00$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 30.17$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$s = 4.69$</td>
<td>$s = 4.37$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>$n = 47$</td>
<td>$n = 12$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 30.83$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 29.80$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$s = 5.35$</td>
<td>$s = 4.78$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$n = 47$</td>
<td>$n = 61$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next table to be discussed, Table 11, shows the mean conflict-avoidance attitude scores for males and females broken down by communion. The mean conflict-avoidance attitude scores are, as expected, higher for females than they are for males. Communion had no apparent effect on the expression of conflict-avoidance attitudes. There is little difference between the mean scores of subjects who are low in communion and subjects who are high in communion. A one-way ANOVA for males shows that communion had no significant effect on the expression of conflict-avoidance attitudes for males ($F = .688, p = .410$) or females ($F = .216, p = .368$).
Table 11
Conflict-avoidance attitude scores by sex and communion: mean scores, standard deviations and number of subjects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Communion</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 14.34$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 15.00$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$s = 2.27$</td>
<td>$s = 3.13$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n = 47$</td>
<td>$n = 12$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 15.32$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 15.80$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$s = 2.79$</td>
<td>$s = 2.74$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n = 47$</td>
<td>$n = 61$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the effect of communal identity on the expression of work attitudes also reveals two major findings. Communion does not have a significant effect on females' expression of either counterpersonal or conflict-avoidance attitudes. In contrast to the observed effect of agency, however, communion has a significant effect on males' expression of counterpersonal attitudes but does not significantly affect males' expression of conflict-avoidance attitudes.

To summarize the relationship of gender-related identity on the expression of work attitudes, two findings must be emphasized. Agency has a significant effect on males' expression of conflict-avoidance attitudes and on females' expression of counterpersonal attitudes. However, there is no significant agency effect on males' expression of counterpersonal attitudes or females' expression of conflict-avoidance attitudes. Both of the significant findings
regarding the influence of agency with expressed work attitudes supported the hypothesized relationship.

Communion, on the other hand, was found to have a significant effect only on males' expression of counterpersonal attitudes. The communion effect on males' expression of conflict-avoidance attitudes did not reach statistical significance. Among females, communion did not have a significant effect on the expression of either counterpersonal or conflict-avoidance attitudes.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to investigate sex differences in attitudes toward social relations within the work environment. The influence of sex-role expectations on attitudes toward social relations in the work environment was examined within the context of situational and dispositional factors which might affect the relationship between sex-role expectations and expressed work attitudes. The situational factor examined was the disclosure of one's attitudes to other individuals, while the dispositional factor investigated was subjects' level of public self-consciousness.

Another major goal of this research was to investigate how gender-related aspects of generalized identity influence the expression of attitudes toward social relations in the work environment. Agentic and communal dimensions of generalized identity were examined independently to assess the impact of each on the expression of counterpersonal and conflict-avoidance attitudes.

Discussion of Sex Role Findings

The first set of hypotheses examined in this study concerned the existence of sex differences in the expression of counterpersonal and conflict-avoidance attitudes. It was hypothesized that males hold and express greater counterpersonal and lower conflict-avoidance attitudes than females. The theoretical rationale for these expectations is
based on differential sex role socialization. If males and females encounter different social expectations relative to their gender, then there should be a significant difference between males and females in their expression of work attitudes.

In general, the findings of this study support the contention that males and females hold and express different work attitudes. A significant sex difference was found in the expression of counterpersonal attitudes, with males expressing more counterpersonal attitudes toward social relations in the work environment than females. This finding indicates that, in the process of sex role socialization, males develop attitudes toward the work environment which reflect a more independent, impersonal, decisive and non-compromising orientation to social life than females. Conversely, females develop attitudes toward the work environment which are more consistent with other-directed, personal, sharing and compromising orientation to social life than males.

A significant sex difference in the expression of conflict-avoidance attitudes was also evident in the findings of this study. Females expressed significantly greater conflict-avoidance attitudes than males. This finding is further evidence that males and females develop significantly different attitudes in the process of sex role socialization. Specifically, females develop attitudes toward the work environment which reflect a greater cooperative and socially harmonious orientation to social relations than males. Males' attitudes toward the work environment are more consistent with a competitive and socially combative orientation to social relations than females.
The second set of hypotheses presented in Chapter II concern the influence of public and private disclosure condition on the differential expression of counterpersonal and conflict avoidance attitudes. It was postulated that the public disclosure condition would increase the saliency of sex-role expectations, resulting in subjects expressing greater sex-typed attitudes in the public disclosure condition than in the private disclosure condition. It was hypothesized that males in the public disclosure condition would express greater counterpersonal attitudes and lower conflict-avoidance attitudes than males in the private disclosure condition, and that females in the public disclosure condition would express lower counterpersonal attitudes and greater conflict-avoidance attitudes than females in the private disclosure condition. None of these hypotheses were supported in the findings, as there were no statistically significant differences in expressed counterpersonal attitudes or in expressed conflict-avoidance attitudes between the public and private disclosure conditions.

The failure of the attitude disclosure condition to have a significant effect on either males' or females' expression of work attitudes might reflect the strength of both sexes' internalization of interpersonal attitudes. It is possible that the attitudes that were measured are reflective of deeply internalized orientations which develop in the process of sex role socialization. If the attitudes in question are central to the individual, they would not easily be affected by either the presence or absence of an audience. One's fundamental orientation to social life is undoubtedly an important product of early socialization experiences which are reinforced.
throughout the individual's life. Being deeply internalized, the attitudes would be a crucial part of one's total view of self and would probably remain constant across different situations.

Another explanation for there being no disclosure effect is that the manipulation of the public and private conditions was insufficient. Possibly the public disclosure condition did not increase the salience of sex-role expectations. As subjects were informed that they would have to discuss how they responded on the WAQ, but did not actually do so, it is possible that they never developed a feeling of being in a public condition. Another possibility is that the private condition did not provide subjects with a feeling of anonymity sufficient to insure their not becoming publicly self-aware. A partial combination of the above mentioned situations would certainly have worked against the disclosure condition having a significant effect on the expression of work attitudes.

The next group of hypotheses examined whether the dispositional factor of public self-consciousness influenced the public expression of counterpersonal or conflict-avoidance attitudes. It was expected that when publicly expressing attitudes, subjects high in public self-consciousness would express greater sex-typed attitudes than subjects low in public disclosure condition, males high in public self-consciousness would express greater counterpersonal attitudes and lower conflict-avoidance attitudes than males low in public self-consciousness. It was also hypothesized that, within the public disclosure condition, females high in public self-consciousness would
express lower counterpersonal attitudes and greater conflict-avoidance attitudes than females low in public self-consciousness.

Overall, the hypothesized affect of public self-consciousness on subjects in the public disclosure condition was not supported. Contrary to expectations based on self-consciousness theory (Buss, 1980), there was no significant public self-consciousness effect on the expression of either counterpersonal or conflict-avoidance attitudes among the male subjects. There also was no significant public self-consciousness effect on females' public expression of conflict-avoidance attitudes. However, there was a significant public self-consciousness effect on females' public expression of counterpersonal attitudes: females who were high in public self-consciousness expressed significantly lower counterpersonal attitudes than those who were low in public self-consciousness, as the theory predicts. Thus, the hypothesized influence of public self-consciousness on the public expression of work attitudes received only limited support in this study, having a significant effect in only one of four analyses.

Consistent with the proposition contained in self-consciousness theory, that public self-consciousness only enters into one's thoughts and behavior when he or she is in a state of self-awareness (Buss, 1980), public self-consciousness had no significant influence on the expression of work attitudes in the private disclosure condition. The private expression of both counterpersonal and conflict-avoidance attitudes was not significantly affected by public self-consciousness for either male or female subjects.
An interesting aspect of the public self-consciousness component of this study, however, may be seen by comparing Tables 4 and 6, showing the mean counterpersonal attitude scores in the public and private disclosure conditions. In the private disclosure condition (Table 6), the mean counterpersonal attitude score is lower for females who are high in public self-consciousness than for those who are low in public self-consciousness ($\bar{X} = 16.56$ vs. $15.11$). Although this is not a statistically significant difference, it deserves comment since it shows an opposite public self-consciousness effect to what can be observed among those in the public disclosure condition (Table 4).

One possible explanation for this is that in the absence of an audience, subjects may attempt to anticipate the type of attitudes the experimenter wants to see. It follows, then, that subjects who are high in public self-consciousness, having a tendency toward being concerned with pleasing others, will express attitudes consistent with their perceptions of the experimenter's expectations. As the WAQ is concerned with attitudes toward the work environment, and stereotyped views of the successful business person include characteristics which are agentic in nature, it is possible that an experimental demand toward expressing counterpersonal attitudes may have been perceived by the female subjects. With an audience present, the perceived expectations of a more general other is a more salient feature of the situation. Thus, the expressed attitudes of those who are high in public self-consciousness reflect a more general norm against expressing counterpersonal attitudes.
A similar pattern can be seen among the male subjects: in the public condition, counterpersonal attitude scores for those high in public self-consciousness were lower than for those low in public self-consciousness ($\bar{X} = 32.25$ vs. $\bar{X} = 32.89$) and in the public condition, the relative magnitude of the mean counterpersonal attitude scores were reversed ($\bar{X} = 31.85$ vs. $\bar{X} = 33.00$). Again, none of these differences were statistically significant.

In examining the mean conflict-avoidance attitude scores for males, across the two disclosure conditions, it is evident that the publicly expressed conflict-avoidance scores are lower than the privately expressed conflict-avoidance scores. Additionally, in the public disclosure condition, males who are high in public self-consciousness expressed markedly lower conflict-avoidance attitudes than males who are low in public self-consciousness. Masculine sex-role expectations emphasize aggressiveness and competitiveness, characteristics which may precipitate conflict in interpersonal relations. That males who are high in public self-consciousness publicly express lower conflict-avoidance attitudes than males who are low in public self-consciousness suggests that the sex difference in publicly expressing conflict-avoidance attitudes might be a consequence of differential sex-role expectations entering into self-presentations. It must be stressed, however, that although these differences are in the predicted direction, they are not statistically significant.
Discussion of Gender-Identity Findings

It was hypothesized that two gender-related aspects of generalized identity—agency and communion—would have a significant effect on subjects' expression of counterpersonal and conflict-avoidance attitudes toward social relations in the work environment. Within each sex group, subjects with a strong agentic identity were expected to express higher counterpersonal attitudes and lower conflict-avoidance attitudes than subjects with a weak agentic identity. Conversely, within same sex groups, subjects with a strong communal identity were expected to express lower counterpersonal attitudes and higher conflict-avoidance attitudes than subjects with a weak communal identity.

Research on the relationship of gender-related identity and expressed work attitudes yielded very different findings for females and males. Among the male subjects, there were two significant findings concerning the relationship of gender-identity with expressed work attitudes. Agentic identity was found to have a statistically significant effect on males' expression of conflict-avoidance attitudes while males' communal identity had a significant effect on their expression of counterpersonal attitudes. Among female subjects, there was only one statistically significant finding. Agency had a significant effect on females' expression of counterpersonal attitudes.

Males with a strong agentic identity, as hypothesized, expressed significantly lower conflict-avoidance attitudes than males with a weak agentic identity. Conflict-avoidance attitudes represent one's preference toward a work environment involving a degree of conflict vs.
the avoidance of conflict in social relations. A strong agentic identity refers to viewing self as being assertive and competitive, and being primarily concerned with gaining self-rewards from social relations. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that males with strong agentic identities expressed significantly lower conflict-avoidance attitudes than males with weak agentic identities.

Communal identity had a significant effect on males' expression of counterpersonal attitudes. As hypothesized, males with strong communal identities expressed significantly lower counterpersonal attitudes than males with weak communal identities. Counterpersonal attitudes represent one's preference for personal vs. non-personal social relations in the work environment. A strong communal identity refers to viewing self as having a strong concern for others, and a desire to maintain warm and harmonious social relations. Again, it is not surprising to find that males with a strong communal identity expressed a preference for personal social relations in the work environment.

The only significant relationship of gender-identity with work attitudes found among females in this study was of agency with counterpersonal attitudes. Females with relatively strong agentic identities expressed more counterpersonal attitudes than females with weak agentic identities.

That agency had a significant effect on males' expression of conflict-avoidance attitudes and on females' expression of counterpersonal attitudes suggests that the agentic dimension of one's generalized identity may hold a different subjective meaning for males and females. Agentic characteristics are commonly thought of as being
aspects of the male sex role. Exhibiting agentic characteristics could possibly result in different consequences depending on one's gender. Males would more likely be rewarded and females would more likely receive negative sanctions from others when enacting an agentic identity. Perhaps, then, females with a strong agentic identity feel they may face negative sanctions from others if they allow themselves to interact with the others on a personal level. That is, past experiences may have led highly agentic females to feel they must maintain a distance from others in social relations to avoid being punished for deviating from the stereotyped feminine sex-role expectations.

Limitations of Study

As with virtually all research, there are limitations inherent in the design and implementation of this study. One limitation of this study is its focus on work-attitudes as a dependent variable rather than on work-related behavior. Investigating the relationship of sex-role expectations and gender-identity with a behavioral measure might provide a better indicator of actual male-female differences in approach to social relations in the work environment than what was accomplished in this study. Attitudes clearly do not always correspond with behavior. This fact, however, should not detract from the relevance of this study. The finding of a sex-based difference in expressed work attitudes may be taken as evidence that, in general, males and females internalize different values relative to social
relations in the work environment as a result of differential socialization.

Another potential limitation of this study relates to the conceptual independence of the two dimensions of gender-related identity and the two components of work attitudes. The PAQ, used to measure subjects' agentic and communal identity, was used as an indicator of gender-related aspects of subjects' generalized identities. The WAQ, used to measure subjects' counterpersonal and conflict-avoidance attitudes toward work, was used as an indicator of subjects' orientations toward social relations in the specific context of the work environment. The PAQ measures one's generalized view of self as related to sex-typed attributes while the WAQ measures one's specific view of social relations in the work setting. The PAQ is an indicator of personality attributes and the WAQ is an indicator of attitudes toward a specific aspect of social life. Although there are certain similarities, the measures of agency and communion, and the measures of counterpersonal and conflict-avoidance attitudes differ in two fundamental respects. First, the PAQ and the WAQ have significantly different contents. An examination of the items contained in the two instruments reveals that they are focusing on very different concepts. Secondly, the two instruments significantly differ in their realm of application. The PAQ is applied to measure one's self-perceived personality as related to sex-typed characteristics, while the WAQ is applied to measure one's preference for social relations in the work environment. Thus, in spite of some overlap, these two measures are clearly theoretically and empirically separate constructs.
Another limitation of this research is found in the sampling procedure used to obtain the experimental subjects. As with many social psychological experiments, the subjects used in this study were obtained from a population of college students enrolled in particular courses. In this case the subjects were obtained from courses offered by the sociology department. This was necessary for convenience as well as budgetary reasons, but it limits the ability to generalize the findings obtained in this sample to the broader population. Nevertheless, a comprehensive review of sex role research (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974) suggests that the influence of differential socialization is a pervasive and somewhat similar experience for males and females across the United States. Therefore, even though the subjects used in this study were not randomly selected from the general U.S. population, it is reasonable to expect the finding of sex differences in expressed work attitudes to be reasonably representative of the total U.S. population.

The major strength of an experimental design is the degree of control available to the experimenter to exclude the influence of extraneous variables from the investigation. Males and females were randomly assigned to the experimental conditions to insure a random distribution of any extraneous characteristic present in the sample population. Care was also taken to insure that all subjects were treated in as identical a way as possible to avoid the introduction of experimenter bias. Conformity of treatment was maintained by having the experimental assistants read the same set of instructions to each group of subjects. The only difference in the instructions read to the
subjects was in the manipulation of the private and public disclosure condition.

That there were no clear, unambiguous findings concerning the influence of the disclosure condition on the expression of work attitudes may have been the result of having a weak experimental manipulation. Although Scheier (1980) found that the anticipation of public disclosure was sufficient to have a concern with public aspects of themselves, this research might have been improved by a stronger public and private attitude disclosure manipulation. One suggestion for future research along these lines would be for greater emphasis being placed on creating a stronger manipulation of public and private conditions.

**Contributions of Study**

One contribution to the field of sociology made by this study is the development of the Work Attitude Questionnaire (WAQ). The WAQ represents an attempt to measure general attitudes toward social relations in the work environment rather than workers' level of satisfaction, as has usually been the case in research of this nature. That two statistically independent dimensions of attitudes toward social relations in the work environment were revealed by a factor analysis of the WAQ represents a relevant finding. A word of caution, however, is necessary when discussing the WAQ: it is a new instrument that needs further investigation and refinement before its true value is established.
It should also be emphasized that stereotypical male attitudes have traditionally been considered as preferable in the work environment. However, this study makes no such assertion and the WAQ was designed with respect to measuring work attitudes from a non-judgmental standpoint. Certainly the ability to work cooperatively with others is as valuable an attribute as a willingness to compete with others. Very likely, the most preferred type of person in the work environment would have a healthy balance between agentic and communal traits.

This study provides evidence which emphasizes the strength and generality of sex role socialization as a force in social life. The finding of a sex-based difference in expressed work attitudes may be taken as evidence that males and females, in general, internalize different values relative to social relations in the work environment as a result of differential socialization.

A unique contribution of this study is found in its consideration of situational and dispositional factors as influencing the expression of attitudes. The public and private attitude disclosure manipulation failed to have a significant influence on the expression of attitudes, and public self-consciousness had only a marginal influence on the public expression of attitudes. However, inclusion of factors such as these represents a new direction in attitudinal research that holds much promise.

This study also provides evidence in support of including measures of individual's gender-related generalized identities when studying differences between males and females. The overall results from the gender-identity aspect of the study were not as conclusive as those
concerned with sex-role expectations. However, gender-identity did prove to be a significant factor in some instances, and future research will undoubtedly provide a better understanding of the relationship of gender-identity with sex-typed attitudes and behavior.
FOOTNOTES

1 Sex of the principal researchers, who contacted and scheduled the subjects, was one male and one female. Sex of the experimental assistants who interacted with the subjects was also one male and one female. To minimize potential bias, the experimental assistants were alternately assigned to the public and private disclosure conditions. The sex of the assistant was found to have no significant relationship with the other variables.

2 The factor analysis was conducted using the PA2 option of the SPSS statistical program package (Nie, et al., 1975, p. 480). A principal components analysis was performed using squared multiple correlations as communalities. Varimax rotation was performed on the first two unrotated principal factors. As varimax rotation is designed to spread variance equally across rotated factors, care must be exercised in choosing the number of factors to be rotated when unrotated factors are of unequal size. The decision was made to rotate the first two principal components factors for two reasons: first, the WAQ had been designed to measure two concepts, so that for theoretical reasons it was appropriate to select and rotate the two strongest principal factors. Second, eigenvalues associated with the unrotated factor matrix indicated that factor I was strong relative to other factors, factor II was of only moderate strength, but still relatively stronger than the remaining factors, while factor III and the succeeding factors were weak relative to the first two factors in the analysis.

3 Eight of the items used to construct the counterpersonal attitudes scale were reverse scored to make the direction of responses consistent.

4 Three of the items that comprised the conflict-avoidance attitudes scale were reverse scored to make the direction of responses consistent.

5 Two items contained in the WAQ were not used for either dependent variable. Item 2 did not have a significant loading on either factor 1 or factor 2, and item 11 loaded relatively high on both factors.

6 The classical, fixed-effect ANOVA model, which automatically controls for unequal and disproportionate cell sizes is used for all two-way analyses (Nie, et al., 1975).
APPENDIX A

SUBJECT QUESTIONNAIRE

Name ____________________________

Social Security # _____________

Please check one of the two:

___ I would like to participate in the experiment.

___ I am not interested in participating in the experiment.

(If not interested stop here)

If interested, please answer the following background questions:

1. Sex: ___ male ___ female

2. Class Rank: ___ freshman ___ sophomore ___ junior ___ senior
   ___ other (specify) ______________________________

3. Major: __________________________

Please sign up below for an experimental session during which you could participate. If none of the times are convenient for you, please indicate a day of the week and a time which would be convenient:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov 29</td>
<td>Nov 30</td>
<td>Dec 1</td>
<td>Dec 2</td>
<td>Dec 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 am</td>
<td>11:00 am</td>
<td>11:00 am</td>
<td>11:00 am</td>
<td>11:00 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 pm</td>
<td>3:00 pm</td>
<td>1:00 pm</td>
<td>3:00 pm</td>
<td>1:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 pm</td>
<td>3:30 pm</td>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
<td>3:30 pm</td>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dec 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dec 7</th>
<th>Dec 8</th>
<th>Dec 9</th>
<th>Dec 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 am</td>
<td>11:00 am</td>
<td>11:00 am</td>
<td>11:00 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 pm</td>
<td>3:00 pm</td>
<td>1:00 pm</td>
<td>3:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 pm</td>
<td>3:30 pm</td>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
<td>3:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We may need to contact you outside of class in order to confirm your time:

Phone Number: ______________ When you can be called ______________
Indicate how you feel about the following statements.

Circle the best choice.

1. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others.
2. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
3. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.
5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.
6. I take a positive attitude toward myself.
7. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.
9. I certainly feel useless at times.
10. At times I think I am no good at all.
The items below inquire about what kind of a person you think you are. Each item consists of a pair of characteristics, with the letters A-E in between. For example:
Not at all Artistic A...B...C...D...E... Very Artistic

Each pair describes contradictory characteristics—that is you cannot be both at the same time, such as very artistic and not at all artistic.

The letters form a scale between the two extremes. You are to choose a letter which describes where you fall on the scale. For example, if you think you have no artistic ability, you would circle A. If you think you are pretty good, you might circle D. If you are only medium, you might circle C, and so forth.

Circle the best responses:
Not at all independent A...B...C...D...E Very independent
Not at all emotional A...B...C...D...E Very emotional
Very Passive A...B...C...D...E Very active
Not at all able to devote self completely to others A...B...C...D...E Able to devote self completely to others
Very rough A...B...C...D...E Very gentle
Not at all helpful to others A...B...C...D...E Very helpful to others
Not at all competitive A...B...C...D...E Very competitive
Not at all kind A...B...C...D...E Very kind
Not at all aware of feelings of others A...B...C...D...E Very aware of feelings of others
Can make decisions easily A...B...C...D...E Has difficulty making decisions
Gives up very easily A...B...C...D...E Never gives up easily
Not at all self-confident A...B...C...D...E Very self-confident
Feels very inferior A...B...C...D...E Feels very superior
Not at all understanding of others A...B...C...D...E Very understanding of others
Very cold in relations with others A...B...C...D...E Very warm in relations
Goes to pieces under pressure A...B...C...D...E Stands up well under pressure
Please think of the person with whom you can work least well. This should be an actual person that you have encountered in some past situation or group or someone you know now. This person should be someone with whom you would have the most difficulty getting some job done, regardless of how much you like or dislike the person. Please describe this person by placing an "X" in one of the seven spaces between each pair of descriptive words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendly</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
<th>Quite</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Quite</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unfriendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Irresponsible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejecting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accepting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unreliable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frustrating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hard-Working</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unenthusiastic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gloomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Close</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncooperative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unintelligent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hostile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Efficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Assured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hesitant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quarrelsome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The statements which follow describe ways of thinking, feeling or behaving. Please describe the degree to which each statement is characteristic or uncharacteristic of yourself by circling the appropriate number.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I'm always trying to figure myself out.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I'm concerned about my style of doing things.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Generally, I'm not very aware of myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>It takes me time to overcome my shyness in new situations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I reflect about myself a lot.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I'm concerned about the way I present myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I'm often the subject of my own fantasies.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I have trouble working when someone is watching me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I never scrutinize myself</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I get embarrassed very easily</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I'm self-conscious about the way I look</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I don't find it hard to talk to strangers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I'm generally attentive to my inner feelings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I usually worry about making a good impression.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I'm constantly examining my motives.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I feel anxious when I speak in front of a group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>One of the last things I do before I leave my house is look in the mirror.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I sometimes have the feeling that I'm off somewhere watching myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I'm concerned about what other people think of me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I'm alert to changes in my mood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>I'm usually aware of my appearance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>I'm aware of the way my mind works when I work through a problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Large groups make me nervous.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ADMINISTERING THE WAQ.

(Read to subjects:)

It will take a few minutes for your tasks to be scored. In the meantime, I have a task that I'd like you to help me with. I am developing a questionnaire for a project with the School of Business. We hope that this questionnaire can be used to measure employee attitudes toward their work groups. I hope to use the questionnaire for my thesis in industrial sociology.

I have asked the main experimenter if it would be alright to give this questionnaire while we're waiting for the tasks to be scored. He said it would be o.k. if I would be sure to tell you that the questionnaire is not related to the experiment that you're participating in.

(Private Condition)

I am still working to improve the questions you will be answering. Your questionnaires will be analyzed statistically to determine which questions work best. You don't need to put your name or social security number on the questionnaire, because we won't need to identify you as individuals. What we are interested in is how groups of people answer the questions. I really appreciate your help with my project.

(Pass out questionnaires.)

Begin:

(Private Condition)

Let me check to see if the scoring of your tasks is about finished. (Leave room.)

(Return with allocation materials.)

The scoring is finished.

(Public Condition)

I am still working to improve the questions you will be answering. Your questionnaires will be analyzed statistically to determine which questions work best, but I'd also like to hear what your subjective opinion of the questions is. So, when everyone is finished I want to hear what everyone thought about the questions you answered. I'd really like it if each of you would tell the group how you answered each question and why you chose the answer you did to the question. Also, I'd like you to put your desk letter (A, B, C, etc.) on the cover of the questionnaire. I really appreciate your help with my project.
(Pass out questionnaire.)

Begin.

( Remain in room, and wait 15 minutes. When everyone seems finished, say the following:) Is everyone finished? (If yes) Let me check and see how much time we have left to go over the questions. (Leave the room; return with allocation materials.)

The scoring is finished, so I guess we'll have to skip going over the questionnaire. Please pass your questionnaires. (Collect questionnaires being sure they are marked A, B, C, etc.)
APPENDIX C

WAQ ITEMS BY FACTOR LOADING

Factor I

13. A. I prefer a leader who acts cool and impersonal toward me in a group.

B. I prefer a leader who acts close and personal toward me in a group.

5. A. The best work group is one in which people maintain businesslike, impersonal relationships with each other.

B. The best work group is one in which people relate to each other in a close, personal manner.

19. A. I would prefer a job in which I could share my task with others most of the time.

B. I would prefer a job in which I could perform my task by myself most of the time.

10. A. The best leader is one who has learned to listen to others, and makes compromises based on the viewpoints of other people.

B. The best leader is one who is completely self-confident, and able to proceed despite the opposition of others.

1 A. Being satisfied with a job depends primarily on having personally challenging duties.

B. Being satisfied with a job depends primarily on having warm friendly relationships with my co-workers.

14. A. I would prefer a job in which people work individually and receive rewards based on individual merit.

B. I would prefer a job in which people cooperate extensively and receive rewards as a group.

22. A. I would prefer a job whose primary focus is helping other people.

B. I would prefer a job whose primary focus is solving interesting problems.
4. A. A group leader should take time to confer with group members and try to make decisions in a way that expresses the will of most of the group.

B. A group leader should be able to make decisions quickly, even though many group members may not agree with the decision.

21. A. The best group leader is able to make decisions without much input from group members.

B. The best group leader is one who usually relies on group members' input in making most decisions.

17. A. The best group leader is one who seldom shows emotions and feelings, but approaches problems objectively.

B. The best group leader is one who shows emotions to group members, letting them know that the leader is human.

7. A. Having warm friendly relationships with my co-workers is of primary importance to me.

B. Finding enjoyment and personal satisfaction in the work I do on the job is of primary importance to me.

12. A. Good managers help their employees improve their performance, even if this is detrimental to their own work.

B. Good managers are primarily concerned with their own work, and hold their employees responsible for their performance.

8. A. The best manager tries to advance the goals of his company, even at the expense of his workers.

B. The best manager is able to understand the viewpoints of his workers, and represents their interests to the company.

15. A. Good leaders are generally competitive people who strive to do a better job than others.

B. Good leaders are seldom competitive but work well with others for the good of the group.
Factor II

18. A. The best task group involves some amount of disagreement and competition among members.

B. The best task group has a relaxed easy-going atmosphere.

6. A. I would prefer a job in which co-workers do not compete.

B. I would prefer a job which involves some degree of competition with co-workers and which gives more rewards to the best competitors.

20. A. Co-workers should be free to criticize one another's performance in a group.

B. Making interpersonal criticisms public in a group is usually detrimental to morale and productivity.

16. A. Work groups should be friendly and cooperative, without major differences of opinion.

B. Work groups should involve lively exchanges and some conflict among members, even if these exchanges divide the group.

9. A. I find it difficult to work with people who don't like me personally.

B. I have no difficulty working with people who don't like me personally.

3. A. I prefer a job that would allow me to gain others' respect by demonstrating how much I can accomplish.

B. I prefer a job in which I can feel that my work is not being constantly evaluated by others.

Items not included in either variable.

2. A. An employee caught stealing from his company should be fired.

B. An employee caught stealing from his company should be given an opportunity to explain and, under some circumstances, given a second chance.

11. A. I could work well in a group where people can freely express their personal criticisms and antagonisms.

B. I would have trouble working in a group where antagonism is expressed between group members.
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