

**“I like cooking and yoga.” When stereotypical expectancies influence the inferences about men’s suitability for a secretary job**

Alicia Le Gall, Pascal Morchain

► **To cite this version:**

Alicia Le Gall, Pascal Morchain. “I like cooking and yoga.” When stereotypical expectancies influence the inferences about men’s suitability for a secretary job. *Psihologia Socială, EDITURA POLIROM S.A*, 2016, 38 (II), pp.45-56. hal-01782480

**HAL Id: hal-01782480**

**<https://hal.univ-rennes2.fr/hal-01782480>**

Submitted on 24 May 2018

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L’archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d’enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

## **“I like cooking and yoga.” When stereotypical expectancies influence the inferences about men’s suitability for a secretary job**

**Abstract:** In 2011, Reinhard and his colleagues showed that a woman’s personal “strengths” and “weaknesses”, linked to gender stereotypes, affect students’ estimations of their suitability for a job. In the present study, in a very much lighter and minimal design, we hypothesize that a similar result would be noticed in the case of a male target presented as stereotypically masculine vs. feminine, and postulating to a stereotypically feminine job. In line with Heilman’s lack-of-fit model (1983), our results replicate those of Reinhard *et al.* (2011). Results are discussed in terms of stereotypic influence of gender in the context of hiring, and show that, as women, men may be, in some circumstances, victims of discrimination in recruitment.

**Keywords:** hiring, job suitability, personal strengths and weaknesses, sex-typed job, stereotypes

In a recruitment situation, many factors may influence the recruiter, at a more or less non-conscious level (Sczesny & Kühnen, 2004 ; Sczesny & Stahlberg, 2002). Some influences are linked to social norms (Desrumaux, 2005), or to physical appearance (Collins & Zebrowitz, 1991 ; Morchain & Kerneis-Pinelli, 2011 ; von Stockhausen, Koeser, & Sczesny, 2013)<sup>3</sup>. But other stereotypical factors, like personality traits, behaviours, or abilities are also taken into account by the “judge” (Desrumaux & Pohl, 2014) or by the candidate. For example, considering the behaviour of an applicant, Van Keer, Bogaert and Trbovic (2008) noticed that women adopt a masculine behaviour when they postulate to a high responsibility job. Coming back now to the “judge”. Stahlberg and Sczesny (2001) showed that recruiters consider communal traits as more important for typical feminine jobs. In a same vein, Reinhard, Schindler, Stahlberg, Messner, and Mucha (2011) tested the impact of a woman’s personal “strengths” and “weaknesses” on the perception of her suitability for a job. In their study the applicant, “Petra S.”, was described as stereotypically feminine vs. masculine, and was standing in a “masculine” (Information technology/Software engineering) vs. “feminine” (Public relation) job. Each job posting introduced the announced position as

- 
1. Psychologue du Travail et Ergonome, 22560 Pleumeur-Bodou, France.
  2. Université Européenne de Bretagne Rennes 2. Département de Psychologie. LP3C (EA 1285) – LAUREPS. Correspondence is to be addressed to Dr. Pascal Morchain: pascal.morchain@univ-rennes2.fr.
  3. But its impacts depend on the job (Cash, Gillen, & Burns, 1977 ; Heilman & Saruwatari 1979).

requiring typical masculine vs. feminine characteristics. One result of this study, which is in line with previous research, was that Petra's suitability for the job depends, of course, on her stereotypical characteristics<sup>1</sup>. This was the starting point of our study.

If the latter study focuses on discrimination about a feminine target, which is of course a real social problem (see for example Amadieu, 2004), what happens when the target is a masculine one? In our societies, men are usually dominant people and conceived as dominant (Lorenzi-Cioldi, 2002; Moliner, Lorenzi-Cioldi, & Vinet, 2009). They are preferred (DARES, 2009) or perceived as preferred for women in hiring (see for example CSA, 2012). May a man be rejected when he applies for a "feminine" job and when he displays masculine characteristics? In other words, will our study confirm the Heilman's lack-of-fit model (1983), even if it is conducted with non-expert participants and in a minimal design? Because stereotypes are defined as shared beliefs about behaviours, and/or personal characteristics of a group of people (Leyens, Yzerbyt, & Schadron, 1994), we think that lay persons will judge a target in a different way than expert people (Marlowe, Schneider, & Nelson, 1996, *cf.* Dipboye & Jackson, 1999), at least when having to produce a quick judgement. So, we wanted to replicate the rather trivial first result of the Reinhard *et al.*'s study (2011), but in a very much lighter design, and in the case of a masculine target applying for a stereotypically feminine job. It was hypothesized that, when postulating to a typically feminine job, a man presenting masculine characteristics (that is, in Reinhard *et al.*'s terms: masculine "*strengths*" and feminine "*weaknesses*") should be more rejected than a man presenting feminine characteristics (that is, in Reinhard *et al.*'s terms: feminine "*strengths*" and masculine "*weaknesses*"). If these characteristics are linked to stereotypical gender, the former should be perceived as more masculine, and the latter as more feminine.

## Method

### *Participants and design*

84 participants (25 men, 33 women, 26 do not indicate their gender, other sociological characteristics were not asked) volunteered to this unpaid study. They answered via a questionnaire on the Internet. The duration of the task did not exceed 10 minutes. Participants were randomly assigned to the experimental conditions. The experiment was conducted in a single session and followed a one factorial design ("*feminine description*": feminine strengths + masculine weaknesses + feminine activities vs. "*masculine description*": masculine strengths + feminine weaknesses + masculine activities).

## Procedure

Participants evaluated a male candidate, named "Ludovic", postulating for a secretary position (i.e., a typical feminine job). There were given some extracts of the hiring interview between the recruiter and the candidate. The excerpts contained the answers to a traditional question in a recruitment situation: "*what are your personal strengths and weaknesses?*" (Buzaud, 2013; Püttjer & Schnierda, 2008, *cf.* Reinhard *et al.*, 2011) and to another

1. The authors conclude: "*A female candidate's perceived femininity predicted job-suitability ratings – but only if she had applied for a 'feminine' job. In contrast, for the 'masculine' job, participants tended to prefer a candidate who was perceived as masculine*" (p. 153).

question : “*Now could you tell me of your free-time activities. What do you like to do during your free-time ?*” According to the conditions, Ludovic’s answers showed either masculine characteristics (in Reinhard *et al.*’s terms : masculine “*strengths*” and free time-activities, and feminine “*weaknesses*”); or feminine characteristics (in Reinhard *et al.*’s terms : feminine “*strengths*” and free-time activities, and masculine “*weaknesses*”). Namely, Ludovic’s answers refer to gender stereotypes. In this paper, we will use the terms “*characteristics*” and “*strengths*” indifferently.

## Materials

### *Selection of a stereotypically feminine job*

A pre-test was conducted with 20 participants, who had first to cite 3 to 5 jobs they perceived to be feminine, second to decide the degree of femininity of each job (Likert scales with 1=*not much feminine* and 5=*very feminine*). Results showed that *secretary* was perceived as the most feminine job, just before *nurse* – respectively  $M=4.5$ ,  $SD=.71$  and  $M=4$ ,  $SD=.68$ ,  $t(22)=-1.748$ ,  $p_{(unilateral)}=.0472$ ). Then, 127 students (103 women, 22 men, 2 did not indicate their gender) beginning the psychology curriculum (L1) answered the question : “*According to you, a secretary job in a medical enterprise is ...*” (Likert scale with 1=*Rather feminine* and 9=*Rather masculine*. We clearly indicated 5=*neither one nor the other*). Results show that such a job is clearly perceived as rather feminine –  $M=3.51$ ,  $SD=1.43$ ,  $t(126)=-11.73$ ,  $p<.0001$ .

### *Selection of stereotypically feminine/masculine free-time activities*

In order to determine the so-called candidate’s “*free-time activities*”, the same first 20 participants then had to cite feminine and masculine activities (see table 1 below, other frequencies = 1 not mentioned).

Table 1. *Participants’ most frequent activities cited as feminine or masculine*

<i>N</i>	<i>“Feminine” activities</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>“Masculine” activities</i>
24	Housework (ironing, dishes, food shopping, laundry)	19	Sport (football, bodybuilding, fighting sports, cycling, rugby, archery)
17	Sport (gymnastics, footing, bicycle, volley, aerobic, dance, fitness, yoga)	15	Do-It-Yourself, Paintwork
8	Shopping	10	Videogames, Money games (poker...)
8	Cooking	8	Mechanics

We selected those stereotypical activities and built the so-called Ludovic’s answers to the question “*free-time activities*”. For the “feminine” ones, his “answer” was : “*I belong to a workshop in which I give cooking lessons, where I spend a lot of my free time. I like to feel well in my body, so I like to practice yoga, and dance. I spend a lot of time shopping, researching new tendencies. In fact I prefer inside activities, housework is not a coercion for me.*” The “masculine answer” was : “*I belong to a bodybuilding club, where I spend*

*a lot of my free time. I am very sportive, and I like to touch everything. That's why I practice fighting sport, football, or hunting. I spend a lot of time to do crafts like renovation, Do It Yourself, mechanics... In fact I prefer outside activities, if I stay home it's only to play poker or videogame with friends."*

### **Selection of the personality traits of the candidate**

In order to build the so-called "answers" to the stereotypical "*forces and weaknesses*" question, traits were chosen after a re-evaluation of the Bem Sex Role Inventory (Auster & Ohm, 2000). So, the feminine "answer" was: "*I am said to be comprehensive, listening others, likeable and warm. My previous professional experiences permit me to develop a sense of relation with others ; I like contact, exchanges with others, I am sensitive to the needs of clients. Sometimes one can criticize my shyness and unobtrusiveness in work, but I think that my reserve is an asset. Truly, I don't have a competitive mind, I am rather passive*". The masculine "answer" was: "*I am said to be self-sufficient, individualist, dynamic, and able to take risks. My previous professional experiences permit me to develop a certain determination ; I have no fear to make a stand. Sometimes one can criticize my rigidity and my lack of compassion in work, but I think that my strong character is an asset. Truly, I don't like to stand in a passive position, I am rather enterprising.*" (see the appendix for the French text).

### **Measures**

After reading the excerpt, participants had first to decide if Ludovic was suitable for the job (*Yes/No*). They had then to determine his degree of masculinity (Likert scale, with 1=*not at all masculine* ; 5=*completely masculine*) and his degree of femininity (Likert scale, with 1=*not at all feminine* ; 5=*completely feminine*). These two measures were counterbalanced. These items were first proposed in order for us to stay as close as possible to Reinhard *et al.*'s study (2011). Second, according to Bem (1974), masculinity and femininity form two independent dimensions (see Colley, Mulhern, Maltby, & Wood, 2009). Finally, participants' gender was asked (see image 1, in the appendix). If they wanted, a debriefing was proposed. None answered.

## **Results**

### **Suitability for the job**

As expected, results show that the candidate is judged much less suitable for the job when he displays masculine characteristics than when he shows feminine ones ( $Chi^2=47.069$ ,  $p<.0001$ , see table 2 below). The participants' sex has no impact on their decision ( $Chi^2=1.384$ ,  $p=.2393$ ).

Table 2. *Perceived suitability for the job according to the candidate's "strengths"*

	No	Yes	Total
Feminine " <i>strengths</i> "	9	33	42
Masculine " <i>strengths</i> "	40	2	42
Total	49	35	84

### ***Perceived femininity/masculinity of the candidate***

First, there is no order effect in the participants' responses to the femininity and masculinity scales. Respectively *Mann-Whitney's*  $U=735.5$ ,  $z=-.695$ ,  $p=.4494$  and *Mann-Whitney's*  $U=801.5$ ,  $z=-.079$ ,  $p=.9368$ . Second<sup>1</sup>, as expected, the candidate is perceived as more feminine when he shows feminine characteristics than when he displays masculine ones (respectively  $M=3.714$ ,  $SD=.805$  and  $M=1.381$ ,  $SD=.539$ ), *Mann-Whitney's*  $U=49$ ,  $z=-7.452$ ,  $p<.0001$ . In a same way, he is perceived as more masculine when he displays masculine characteristics than when he shows feminine ones (respectively  $M=4.524$ ,  $SD=.74$  and  $M=2.476$ ,  $SD=.917$ ), *Mann-Whitney's*  $U=105$ ,  $z=-6.951$ ,  $p<.0001$ . Moreover, the candidate is perceived as more masculine when he displays masculine characteristics than feminine when he displays feminine ones (respectively  $M=4.524$ ,  $SD=.74$  and  $M=3.714$ ,  $SD=.805$ ), *Mann-Whitney's*  $U=370$ ,  $z=-4.58$ ,  $p<.0001$ . So, the candidate is perceived as a man when he shows masculine characteristics, and is still perceived as a man, but at a lesser degree, when he displays feminine ones. Third, the measures of femininity and masculinity highly correlate ( $r=-.833$ ,  $z=-10.782$ ,  $p<.0001$ ): the more the candidate is perceived as feminine, the less he is perceived as masculine. This is congruent with the literature on social judgment (see for example Devos-Comby & Devos, 2001 ; Judd, James-Hawkins, Yzerbyt, & Kashima, 2005), and is due to the fact that participants judge a same target on two different and complementary dimensions.

### **Post-test : discrimination, or not discrimination ?**

In order to test whether the judgment of suitability for the job refers to discrimination or not, we conducted an additional post-test : a very small inquiry, which was conducted on different participants. They first had to read Ludovic's answers (same presentation like in the experimental conditions). Then, they answered the question : “*What is your general impression about Ludovic ?*”<sup>2</sup> (*Circle only one digit*) (Likert scale, with  $-5 = \textit{Rather negative}$  and  $+5 = \textit{Rather positive}$ ). A second question, conceived as a manipulation check, referred to the perceived gender of the candidate : “*Overall, according to you, the candidate seems...*”<sup>3</sup> (Likert scale with  $1 = \textit{Rather feminine}$  and  $9 = \textit{Rather masculine}$ . We clearly indicated  $5 = \textit{neither one nor the other}$ ). This Likert scale was built according the previously observed correlation. Third, they had to indicate their own gender.

117 psychology students (beginning their L1<sup>4</sup>; 93 women – 79.48%, 12 men – 10.26%, 12 participants did not mention their gender) volunteered to this unpaid study, in a 2 (condition : *contextual* vs. *control*) X 2 (presentation : *feminine* vs. *masculine*). The “contextual” condition was the same as the previous experimental one (namely, an applicant for a secretary job in a medical service). The control condition did not mention the job. We hypothesize that, if there were to be discrimination, in a contextualized situation the applicant would be judged less positively, even more negatively, when he displays masculine characteristics than when he shows feminine ones.

A two-way ANOVA was conducted. Considering the global evaluation, results show only a main effect of the applicant's presentation, which is judged less positively when he displays

- 
1. Of course, these results could be interpreted, too, as a manipulation check.
  2. *Quelle impression générale ressentez-vous par rapport à Ludovic ? Entourez un seul chiffre.*
  3. *Globalement, le candidat vous semble... Plutôt féminin-Plutôt masculin.*
  4. 1<sup>st</sup> year of the psychology curriculum.

masculine characteristics, than when he displays feminine ones (respectively  $M_{Masculine}=2.22$ ,  $SD=2.23$  and  $M_{Feminine}=2.91$ ,  $SD=1.22$ ;  $F(1,115)=4.2$ ;  $p=.04$ ), regardless of context. So, we cannot really conclude to discrimination in a contextualized condition. But participants were mostly women. So, considering only the female participants' answers in the contextualized condition, according to the hypothesis, we then ran a post-hoc one-tailed  $t$ -test, and noticed that the applicant is much more positively evaluated when he shows feminine characteristics, than when he shows masculine ones (respectively  $M_{Feminine}=3$ ,  $SD=1.32$ ,  $N=25$ ; and  $M_{Masculine}=1.73$ ,  $SD=2.78$ ,  $N=22$ ;  $t(45)=2.04$ ;  $p_{(one\text{-tailed})}=.023$ ). Clearly, this result is the manifestation of an in-group bias (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Brewer, 1999), but is it really discrimination? We don't think so. We interpret this as a first step of discrimination but, as the participants of the post-test were different than those of the main study, it is difficult for us to firmly conclude.

Considering the perception of femininity/masculinity of the applicant (all participants), clearly he is perceived as more masculine when he shows masculine characteristics than when he displays feminine ones (respectively  $M=7.89$ ,  $SD=1.22$  and  $M=4.58$ ,  $SD=2.27$ ;  $F(1,115)=97.81$ ,  $p<.0001$ ). This confirms our previous results and the effectiveness of the gender manipulation. Moreover, the analysis reveals a non-significant but, maybe, interesting interaction ( $F(1,115)=2.67$ ,  $p=.10$ ). Namely, when the applicant is described as stereotypically masculine, he is always perceived with a high degree of masculinity. But when feminine characteristics are used, he seems to be perceived with a higher degree of femininity in the contextualized condition (*post-hoc*  $t(56)=1.78$ ,  $p_{(one\text{-tailed})}=.045$ ). However because of the  $p$ , the global interaction has to be taken with circumspection, and a new study is clearly required.

Table 3. *Perceived femininity/masculinity of the candidate according to his presentation and the context*

	Contextual <i>M (SD)</i>	Control <i>M (SD)</i>
Feminine presentation	4.06 (2.2)	5.1 (2.26)
Masculine presentation	7.86 (1.33)	7.93 (1.12)

## Discussion

The aim of our study was to replicate, partially of course, the study of Reinhard *et al.* (2011). Indeed, the present study differs from the latter. Firstly, the scenario proposed by Reinhard and colleagues presented a woman displaying personal “*weaknesses*” or personal “*strengths*”, and applying either to a typically feminine job or to a typically masculine one. We wanted to test a similar situation, in a much simpler one-factor design: namely, a male candidate showing feminine vs. masculine “*strengths*” during an interview for a typically feminine job. To describe the applicant's so-called “*strengths*”, we used stereotypical personality traits and free-time activities<sup>1</sup>. Additionally, if Reinhard *et al.* (2011) measured job suitability via several items, we used only a dichotomous one. Finally, these authors assessed the candidate's perceived femininity/masculinity with Likert scales associated to

1. It must be noted that the pre-test was built to collect stereotypical “*activities*”, not only “*free-time activities*”.

a short presentation using six items (3 feminine, 3 masculine) coming from *Bem's Sex Role Inventory* (1974). We used Likert scales too, but we measured the applicant's degree of femininity and degree of masculinity with only one item by dimension. We did so because it seemed to us that, in their daily exchanges, people answer in a quite dichotomous way, even if they are not (or not really) experts in the domain<sup>1</sup>. Nevertheless, because the actual study is rather limited and because Internet questionnaires obviously lack control, it would be pertinent, firstly, to conduct a study in much more controlled conditions. Secondly, in order to better understand the underlying mechanisms, it would be necessary to fully replicate the original Reinhard *et al.*'s study (2011), using more items by dimension and, much more importantly, manipulating the gender of the target.

Finally, despite of these differences between the Reinhard *et al.*'s original study (2011) and the present study, despite the fact that maybe the feminine and masculine “answers” proposed here were not of the same qualities, and despite the fact that it is unclear whether the effect is due to the “*strengths*”, to the “*weaknesses*”, to the “*free-time activities*”, or to a combination of them, the present study confirms the results of Reinhard's findings. As in Reinhard *et al.*'s study (2011), the personal characteristics of the candidate, expressed via personality traits and via free-time activities, guide the inferences of his suitability for a job. Here, a man displaying feminine characteristics is judged as suitable for a feminine job, but as not suitable when he shows masculine ones. Secondly, as in Reinhard *et al.*'s study, the gender of the participants does not affect their judgment of the candidate's adequacy to the job. That is probably due to the experimental context (see footnote 1, p. 50). Furthermore, the post-test (conducted mostly with female participants) suggests that the global evaluation of the applicant may be the manifestation of an in-group bias, variable according to the context of the evaluation (see for example Graves & Powell, 1996). Moreover, results show a correlation between the dimensions of masculinity and femininity. If they usually are conceived as two independent dimensions (Bem, 1974; Colley *et al.*, 2009), the present study indicates that masculinity-femininity may form one single dimension, at least when people have to judge a single person in a specific situation (see Judd, James-Hawkins, Yzerbyt, & Kashima, 2005<sup>2</sup>). It could be, also, the result of some desire of coherence in participants. This result may finally be due to the operationalization: first, we used one-item measure; second, the applicant was clearly described as feminine *or* masculine. The present study indicates, also, some differences in the perception of the candidate according to the personal characteristics he displays. He is perceived as more “masculine” when he shows masculine forces, than “feminine” when he displays feminine ones. So, the interpretation of people characteristics seems to be different according to their gender (Cole, Feild, & Giles, 2004). This is in line with Reinhard *et al.*'s study (2011) and refers to the role congruity<sup>3</sup> linked to gender expectations (Cejka & Eagly, 1999; Eagly & Karau, 2002). Results are also coherent with the lack-of-fit model (Heilman, 1983;

- 
1. Moreover, in a questionnaire about “*first impressions*”, implying that there were “*neither good nor bad answers*”, people are allowed to judge others. They are in a “*social judgeability*” position (Schadron & Yzerbyt, 1991, 1993; Leyens, Yzerbyt, & Schadron, 1992).
  2. They showed that the two dimensions of social judgement (*warmth* and *competence*, which are incidentally linked to *femininity* and *masculinity*) might correlate when people judge one isolated target.
  3. This perceived congruity should have a more important impact in a real setting of recruitment, in which recruiters have to treat a great deal of information in a short time before taking a decision (Laberon, 2011; see, too, Leyens, 1990; Kruglanski & Fishman, 2009).



Heilman, 2012). Otherwise, they suggest that a man could be a victim of “backlash”<sup>1</sup> (Rudman, Moss-Racusin, Phelan, & Nauts, 2012 ; Rudman & Phelan, 2008). Nevertheless, it is unclear in our study if there were or not backlash. But our study confirms Abele’s statement that “*gender stereotypes are pervasive in spite of the changing roles of men and women*” (2003, p. 776). To conclude, even if a certain evolution in gender roles can be noticed in western societies (see for example Barrère-Maurisson, 2012), just like women, because of their gender, men<sup>2</sup> may continue to suffer of the inferences made by others, at least in recruitment for gender oriented jobs.

**Note :** Authors’ respective contributions : Alicia Le Gall initiated and conducted the original study under Pascal Morchain’s direction. First draft : Alicia Le Gall. Revision of the paper : Pascal Morchain. Proof reading : Alicia Le Gall.

The authors thank the anonymous reviewers for their comments.

### **«J’aime le yoga et j’aime cuisiner». Quand des attentes stéréotypées influencent les inférences relatives à la pertinence des hommes à un poste de secrétaire**

**Résumé :** En 2011, Reinhard et ses collègues montrèrent que les «forces» et «faiblesses» d’une candidate, en lien avec les stéréotypes de genre, affectaient les évaluations concernant sa compatibilité pour un poste. Dans la présente étude, et dans un protocole minimal beaucoup plus simple, nous testons l’hypothèse selon laquelle un résultat similaire devrait être retrouvé dans le cas d’un candidat présenté comme stéréotypiquement masculin ou féminin, et postulant à un poste typiquement féminin. Les résultats répliquent ceux de Reinhard *et al.* (2011), et sont cohérents avec le modèle du manque d’ajustement de Heilman (1983). Ils sont discutés en termes d’influence des stéréotypes de genre dans le recrutement, et montrent que, tout comme les femmes, les hommes dans certaines circonstances, peuvent être victimes de discrimination à l’embauche.

**Mots-clés :** recrutement, pertinence à un poste, forces et faiblesses personnelles, emploi genré, stéréotypes

### **„Îmi plac yoga și gătitul”. Atunci când așteptările stereotipice influențează inferențele legate de compatibilitatea bărbaților pentru un post de secretar**

**Rezumat :** În 2011, Reinhard și colaboratorii săi au arătat că „punctele forte” și „punctele slabe” ale unui candidat, legate de stereotipurile de gen, afectează evaluările de compatibilitate pentru o anumită poziție. În acest studiu, și într-un design mult mai simplu, am testat ipoteza că un rezultat similar este de așteptat să apară și în cazul unui candidat prezentat ca stereotipic masculin sau feminin, și care aplică pentru un loc de muncă tipic feminin. Rezultatele noastre le reproduc pe cele ale lui Reinhard și colab. (2011), și sunt în concordanță cu modelul lipsei de ajustare al lui Heilman (1983). Ele sunt discutate în ceea ce privește influența stereotipurilor de gen în recrutare, și arată că, la fel ca și femeile, bărbații, în anumite circumstanțe, pot fi victime ale discriminării la angajare.

**Cuvinte-cheie :** recrutare, puncte forte, puncte slabe, ocuparea forței de muncă de gen, stereotipuri

1. Social and economic reprisals for behaving counter stereotypically.
2. And, maybe, more largely, dominant people.

## Appendix

*French original version of the “applicant’s responses” to the recruiter and modalities of answers (screen capture)*

Présentation «féminine»	Présentation «masculine»
<p>Le texte qui suit est extrait d’un entretien d’embauche.                      Nous appellerons Ludovic le candidat face au recruteur.                      Ludovic vient postuler pour un emploi à temps plein en tant que secrétaire dans une entreprise médicale.</p>	
<p>(...) Recruteur : <i>«Pouvez-vous me dire quels sont vos points forts, vos points faibles ? »</i></p> <p>Ludovic : <i>«On me dit compréhensif, à l’écoute, aimable et chaleureux. Mes précédentes expériences professionnelles m’ont permis de développer mon sens du relationnel ; j’aime le contact, l’échange avec les autres, je suis sensible aux besoins de la clientèle. On peut parfois me reprocher ma timidité et d’être plutôt effacé au travail, mais je pense que ma réserve constitue un atout. Puis il est vrai que je n’ai pas un esprit compétitif, je suis plutôt passif.»</i></p> <p>Recruteur : <i>«Maintenant parlez-moi de vos centres d’intérêts. Qu’aimez-vous faire de votre temps libre ? »</i></p> <p>Ludovic : <i>«Je fais partie d’un atelier dans lequel je donne des cours culinaires, j’y consacre beaucoup de mon temps libre. Aimant me sentir bien dans mon corps, je prends plaisir à pratiquer le yoga, ainsi que la danse de salon. Je passe beaucoup de temps à faire les boutiques à la recherche des nouvelles tendances. En fait, je préfère les activités d’intérieur, les activités ménagères ne sont pas une contrainte pour moi.»</i></p> <p>(...)</p>	<p>(...) Recruteur : <i>«Pouvez-vous me dire quels sont vos points forts, vos points faibles ? »</i></p> <p>Ludovic : <i>«On me dit autonome, individualiste, dynamique et prêt à prendre des risques. Mes précédentes expériences professionnelles m’ont permis de développer une certaine détermination ; je n’ai pas peur de prendre position. On peut parfois me reprocher ma rigidité et mon manque de compassion au travail, mais je pense que mon fort caractère constitue un atout. Puis il est vrai que je n’aime pas rester dans une position passive, je suis plutôt entreprenant.»</i></p> <p>Recruteur : <i>«Maintenant parlez-moi de vos centres d’intérêts. Qu’aimez-vous faire de votre temps libre ? »</i></p> <p>Ludovic : <i>«Je fais partie d’un club de musculation, j’y consacre beaucoup de mon temps libre. Etant très sportif, je prends plaisir à toucher un peu à tout, c’est la raison pour laquelle je pratique aussi le sport de combat, le football ou encore la chasse. Je passe beaucoup de temps à faire des travaux manuels comme de la rénovation, du bricolage, de la mécanique... En fait, je préfère les activités d’extérieur, si je reste chez moi c’est seulement pour jouer au poker ou aux jeux vidéo avec des amis.»</i></p> <p>(...)</p>

Pensez-vous que cette personne convient pour le poste proposé? \*

Oui

Non

Indiquez dans quelle mesure vous percevez le degré de féminité du candidat. \*

1=pas du tout féminin; 2=plutôt pas féminin; 3=moyennement féminin; 4=plutôt féminin; 5=tout à fait féminin

1 2 3 4 5

Pas du tout féminin      Tout à fait féminin

Indiquez dans quelle mesure vous percevez le degré de masculinité du candidat. \*

1=pas du tout masculin; 2=plutôt pas masculin; 3=moyennement masculin; 4=plutôt masculin; 5=tout à fait masculin

1 2 3 4 5

Pas du tout masculin      Tout à fait masculin

Pour finir, merci de préciser votre sexe \*

Masculin

Féminin

Image 1. *The Internet questionnaire* (screen capture)

## References

- Abele, A.E. (2003). The Dynamics of Masculine-Agentive and Feminine-Communal Traits : Findings From a Prospective Study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(4), 768-776. doi : 10.1037/0022-3514.85.4.768
- Amadiou, J.-F. (2004). *Enquête testing sur CV*, ADIA/Paris1/Observatoire des discriminations, Mai. <http://cergors.univ-paris1.fr>, retrieved September 8<sup>th</sup>, 2016, from [www.cemea.asso.fr/IMG/article\\_PDF/article\\_2054.pdf](http://www.cemea.asso.fr/IMG/article_PDF/article_2054.pdf).
- Auster, C.J. & Ohm S.C. (2000). Masculinity and Femininity in Contemporary. American Society : A Reevaluation Using the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. *Sex Roles*, 43(7/8).
- Barrère-Maurisson, M.-A. (2012). L'évolution des rôles masculin et féminin au sein de la famille. *Les Cahiers français : documents d'actualité.La Documentation Française*, numéro spécial «Comment va la famille?», 371, 22-29. Retrieved June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2016, from <https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-00760973>
- Bem, S.L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42, 155-162. doi : 10.1037/h0036215
- Brewer, M.B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice : ingroup love or outgroup hate?. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55(3), 429-444. doi : 10.1111/0022-4537.00126
- Buzaud, E. (2013). *Les 34 questions importantes en entretien d'embauche*. Published April 4<sup>th</sup>, 2013. Retrieved May 31<sup>th</sup>, 2016, from <http://www.cadremploi.fr/editorial/actualites/actu-emploi/detail/article/les-34-questions-les-plus-courantes-en-entretien-dembauche.html>.
- Cash, T.F., Gillen, B., & Burns, D.S. (1977). Sexism and beautyism in personnel consultant decision making. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62(3), 301-310. doi : 10.1037/0021-9010.62.3.301
- Cejka, M.A. & Eagly, A.H. (1999). Gender-stereotypic images of occupations correspond to the sex segregation of employment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25(4), 413-423.
- Cole, M.S., Feild, H.S., & Giles, W.F. (2004). Interaction of recruiter and applicant gender in resume evaluation : a field study. *Sex Roles*, 51(9/10), 597-608. doi : 10.1007/s11199-004-5469-1

- Colley, A., Mulhern, G., Maltby, J., & Wood, A.M. (2009). The short form of BSRI: Instrumentality, expressiveness and gender associations among a United Kingdom sample. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *46*, 384-387. doi : 10.1016/j.paid.2008.11.00
- Collins, M.A. & Zebrowitz, L.A. (1991). The contributions of appearance to occupational outcomes in civilian and military settings. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *2*, 129-163. doi : 10.1111/j.1559-1816.1995.tb01588.x
- CSA (2012). *Perception des discriminations au travail. Regard croisé salariés du privé et agents de la fonction publique*. Retrieved September 8<sup>th</sup>, 2013, from <http://www.csa.eu/multimedia/data/sondages/data2012/opi20111218-barometre-sur-la-perception-des-discriminations-dans-le-monde-du-travail.pdf>
- DARES (2009). *Hommes et femmes recrutés en 2005 : les préférences des employeurs*. Retrieved June 6<sup>th</sup>, 2016, from <http://www.discriminations.inegalites.fr/IMG/pdf/Hommes-et-femmes-recrutes-en-2005.pdf>
- Desrumaux, P. (2005). Informations normatives et stéréotypiques : effets de l’internalité/externalité, du genre, de l’apparence physique et du type hiérarchique et sexuel du poste sur les décisions de recrutement. *Revue Internationale de Psychologie Sociale/International Review of Social Psychology*, *18*(4), 65-199.
- Desrumaux, P. & Pohl, S. (2014). Juger la recrutabilité des candidats : quels effets de l’apparence et des aptitudes en fonction des types de postes ?. *Psychologie Française*. doi : 10.1016/j.psfr.2013.12.001
- Devos-Comby, L. & Devos, T. (2001). Social norms and judgments of responsibility. *Swiss Journal of Psychology*, *60*, 35-46.
- Dipboye, R.L. & Jackson, S.L. (1999). Interviewer experience and expertise effects. In R.W. Eder & M.M. Harris (Eds.), *The employment interview handbook* (pp. 259-278). Thousand Oaks, CA : Sage.
- Eagly, A.H. & Karau, S.J. (2002) Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychology Review*, *109*(3), 573-598. doi : 10.1037/0033-295X.109.3.573
- Graves, L.M. & Powell, G.N. (1996). Sex similarities, quality of the employment interview and recruiter’s evaluation of actual applicants. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *69*, 243-261. doi : 10.1111/j.2044-8325.1996.tb00613.x
- Heilman, M. & Saruwatari, L. (1979). When beauty is beastly. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *23*, 360-372. doi : 10.1016/0030-5073(79)90003-5
- Heilman, M.E. (1983). Sex bias in work settings : The lack of fit model. In B. Staw & L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*, Vol. 5, pp. 269-298). Greenwich, CT : JAI.
- Heilman, M.E. (2012). Gender stereotypes and workplace bias. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *32*, 113-135. doi : 10.1016/j.riob.2012.11.003
- Judd, C.M., James-Hawkins, L., Yzerbyt, V., & Kashima, Y. (2005). Fundamental dimensions of social judgment : understanding the relations between judgments of competence and warmth. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *89*, 899-913. doi : 10.1037/0022-3514.89.6.899
- Kruglanski, A.W. (1990). Motivations for judging and knowing : Implications for causal attribution. In R.M. Sorrentino & E.T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation and cognition : Foundations of social behavior* (Vol. 2, pp. 333-368). New York : Guilford Press.
- Kruglanski, A.W. & Fishman, S. (2009). The need for cognitive closure. In M.R. Leary & R.H. Hoyle (Eds.), *Handbook of individual differences in social behavior* (pp. 343-353). New York : Guilford Press.
- Laberon, S. (2011). *Psychologie et recrutement : Modèles, pratiques et normativités*. Bruxelles : De Boeck.
- Leyens, J.-Ph., Yzerbyt, V. & Schadron, G. (1992). Stereotypes and social judgeability. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European Review of Social Psychology*, *3* (pp. 91-120). Chichester : Wiley.

- Leyens, J.-Ph., Yzerbyt, V., & Schadron, G. (1994). *Stereotypes and social cognition*. London : Sage. Traduction française (1996). *Stéréotypes et cognition sociale*. Bruxelles : Mardaga.
- Lorenzi-Cioldi, F. (2002). *Les représentations des groupes dominants et dominés. Collections et agrégats*. Grenoble : Presses Universitaires de Grenoble.
- Moliner, P., Lorenzi-Cioldi, F., & Vinet, E. (2009). Utilité sociale des représentations intergroupes de sexe. Domination masculine, contexte professionnel et discrimination positive. *Cahiers Internationaux de Psychologie Sociale*, 3(83), 25-44. doi : 10.3917/cips.083.0025
- Morchain, P. & Kerneis-Pinelli, M. (2011). (Moins) Utile et (Moins) Désirable ? Quand le surpoids féminin est un potentiel facteur de discrimination à l'embauche. *Psychologie du Travail et des Organisations*, ePTO-17, 465-476. Can be found at [http://revue-pt0.com/art\\_ep0/ep027.pdf](http://revue-pt0.com/art_ep0/ep027.pdf)
- Reinhard, M.A., Schindler, S., Stahlberg, D., Messner M., & Mucha, N. (2011). "I don't know anything about soccer" : How personal weaknesses and strengths guide inferences about women's qualification in sex-typed jobs. *Swiss Journal of Psychology*, 70(3), 149-154. doi : 10.1024/1421-0185/a000050
- Rudman, L.A., Moss-Racusin, C.A., Phelan, J.E., & Nauts, S. (2012). Status incongruity and backlash effects : Defending the gender hierarchy motivates prejudice against female leaders. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48, 165-179. doi : 10.1016/j.jesp.2011.10.008
- Rudman, L.A. & Phelan, J.E. (2008). Backlash effects for disconfirming gender stereotypes in organizations. In A.P. Brief & B.M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*, Vol. 4. (pp. 61-79). New York : Elsevier.
- Schadron, G. & Yzerbyt, V. (1991). Social judgeability : Another perspective in the study of social inference. *Cahiers de Psychologie Cognitive/European Bulletin of Cognitive Psychology*, 11, 229-258.
- Schadron, G. & Yzerbyt, V.Y. (1993). Les stéréotypes et l'approche de la jugeabilité sociale : un impact des stéréotypes sur le jugement indépendant de leur contenu. In J.L. Beauvois, R.V. Joule & J.M. Monteil (Eds.), *Perspectives cognitives et conduites sociales*, Vol. 4, (pp. 15-35). Delachaux & Niestlé : Neuchâtel-Paris.
- Sczesny, S. & Kühnen, U. (2004). Meta-cognition about biological sex and gender-stereotypic physical appearance : consequences for the assessment of leadership competence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30(1), 13-21. doi : 10.1177/0146167203258831
- Sczesny, S. & Stahlberg, D. (2002). The influence of gender-stereotyped perfumes on leadership attribution. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 32, 815-828. doi : 10.1002/ejsp.123
- Stahlberg, D. & Sczesny, S. (2001). Gender stereotypes and the social perception of leadership. *European Bulletin of Social Psychology*, 13, 15-29.
- Tajfel, H. & Turner, J.C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W.G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-47). Monterey, CA : Brooks/Cole
- Van Keer, E., Bogaert, J., & Trbovic, N. (2008). Could the right man for the job be a woman ? How women differ from man as leaders. *Hudson*. Retrieved May 30<sup>th</sup>, 2012, from <http://hudson.fr/en-gb/knowledgecentre/publications/womenandleadership.aspx>
- Von Stockhausen, L., Koeser, S., & Sczesny, S. (2013). The gender typicality of faces and its impact on visual processing and on hiring decisions. *Experimental Psychology*, 60(6), 444-452. doi : 10.1027/1618-3169/a000217