

women first bear children and then breast-feed them, so they must stay with them. Anthropologist Margaret Mead explains the dominant concern for achievement in men by the fact that men cannot bear children. She argues that women in every society attain a "sense of irreversible achievement" in giving birth to their children. However, "the recurrent problem of civilization is to define the male role satisfactorily enough—whether it be to build gardens or raise cattle, kill game or kill enemies, build bridges or handle bank-shares—so that the male may in the course of his life reach a solid sense of irreversible achievement" (Mead, 1962a: 158).

The common pattern of male assertiveness and female nurturance leads to male dominance at least in matters of politics and, usually, of economic life; within the household, whether this be a nuclear or an extended family group, different societies show different distributions of power over the sexes.

Anthropology, psychology, and political science confirm the male assertiveness-female nurturance pattern. For example, Barry et al. (1957) found in a secondary analysis of anthropological reports of 110 mostly nonliterate societies that, in the vast majority of cases, girls are socialized toward nurturance and responsibility and sometimes obedience; boys are socialized toward achievement and self-reliance. McClelland (1975: chap. 3) reviewed the U.S. psychological literature for evidence of psychological differences between the sexes. Universally in the U.S. data, boys and men tend to be more assertive; girls and women are more sensitive to social interdependence. Spenner and Featherman (1978: 395ff.) reviewed the U.S. sociological literature, which invariably shows a strong relationship between sex and achievement ambitions, in the sense of lower ambitions for women. Williams et al. (1977) report on a comparative study of sex-role stereotypes in Great Britain, Ireland, and the United States; they show close agreement between male and female judges and among the three countries. Male behavior is associated with autonomy, aggression, exhibition, and dominance; female behavior with nurturance, affiliation, helpfulness, and humility. The pervasiveness of the common sex role pattern is shown in cases where deliberate attempts were made to abolish it, as in Israeli kibbutzim; even here, quite a bit of it has survived—kibbutz women prefer maternal activities to participating as fully as men in the general assembly and kibbutz committees (Quinn, 1977: 191-192).

On the other hand, there is evidence of variations on the common sex role pattern. Mead gives the example of the *Iatmul* and the *Tchambuli*, two New Guinea tribes living close to one another, of which the first shows the usual pattern of male aggressiveness and female nurturance, while the second presents a reverse pattern of female initiative in practical matters while the nonaggressive males concentrate on art and theater (Mead, 1962a: 102-107).

Le Vine (1966), when discussing the influence of male labor migration on African family relationships, show how in East and South African families the absent husbands still tend to control the larger share of family income while placing an increased burden of work on the wives; the traditional dominance of the males has not been challenged. In parts of West Africa, however, there always was a tradition of an independent role of the women in trading products; on the basis of this, male labor migration allowed wives to attain independent incomes and seriously challenged the ideal of male dominance in marital relations. In these societies we find expressions of

male fears of female witchcraft, antifeminism, envy of women, and feelings of sexual inadequacy among men (1966: 192).

Bem (1974) has developed a Sex Role Inventory of adjectives which a sample of male and female U.S. students judged to be more socially desirable in American society for one sex than for the other. Bem's Inventory contains both a "feminine" and a "masculine" scale. In later studies (Bem, 1975; Bem et al., 1976), self-descriptions of U.S. students on these scales were collected and validated in laboratory experiments. On the basis of their self-descriptions, students are divided into four types: "masculine," "feminine," "androgynous" (scoring both types of characteristics) and "undifferentiated" (scoring neither). From 444 male students, 55 percent scored masculine only and 11 percent feminine only; from 279 female students, 54 percent scored feminine only and 20 percent masculine only; the others were androgynous or undifferentiated. Thus, only just over half of these respondents correspond in their own eyes to the sex trait stereotype (Bem, 1975: 636). Typical items from the masculine scale are "aggressive," "ambitious," and "competitive"; typical items from the feminine scale are "affectionate," "compassionate," and "understanding." Masculine and androgynous persons yielded less to pressure to conform than did females; feminine and androgynous persons showed more supportive behavior toward a lonely fellow student than did masculines. Bem's studies show that actual behavior need not correspond to the stereotype, and that differences, here too, are statistical rather than absolute. It may be that the U.S. student population of the mid-1970s is more tolerant of non-sex-typical behavior than are many others; Newson et al. (1978: 47), citing their experiences in Nottingham, England, state that "experimentation with novel sex-role relationships is . . . likely to be taken seriously only by a minority in the highly educated middle class."

However, the fact that an active feminist movement exists in a number of countries (albeit predominantly the wealthy ones) shows that some women, at least (and some men, too) no longer take the traditional pattern of male dominance for granted, and try to develop alternative role distributions.

In human thinking, the issue of the equality or inequality between the sexes is as old as religion, ethics, and philosophy themselves. In Genesis, the first book of the Judao-Christian Old Testament which contains the myths of creation (and which was codified in the fifth century B.C.), we find *two* conflicting versions of the creation of the sexes. The first, Genesis 1: 27-28, states:

So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them, and God said to them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it.

This text suggests equal partnership between the sexes. In the second version, Genesis 2: 8ff (which is supposed to have derived from a different source document), we find the story of the garden in Eden, in which God first put "the man" alone. Then, in Genesis 2: 18, it states:

And the Lord God said, It is not good that the man should be alone: I will make him a help meet for him.

Then follows the story of the Woman being made from one of Adam's ribs. This text

gives clear priority to the male partner and defines the woman as "a help meet" (that is, appropriate) for him; it justifies a society in which there is a male dominance.

In *The Republic*, Plato in the fourth century B.C. offers a design for an ideal state. In this state there is an elite class, the Guardians, who are the best warriors. In selecting Guardians, Plato does not want to discriminate between men and women. He lets Socrates (to whom the dialogue is ascribed) argue at length that of course there is a great natural difference between men and women, but that this difference is irrelevant to the criteria that should be applied to Guardians:

We never meant that natures are the same or different in an unqualified sense, but only with reference to the kind of sameness or difference which is relevant to various employments Then if men or women as a sex appear to be qualified for different skills or occupations . . . we shall assign these to each accordingly; but if the only difference apparent between them is that the female bears and the male begets, we shall not admit that it is a difference relevant for our purpose, but shall still maintain that our male and female Guardians ought to follow the same occupations [Lee, 1974: 232-233].

It must be admitted that the actors in Plato's dialogues are all men. Also, Plato argues later that

In general the one sex [he means the male] is much better at everything than the other. A good many women, it is true, are better than a good many men at a good many things. But the general rule is as you stated it [he means that men do things better; 1974: 234].

But at least Plato sees the social role of the sexes as equal in principle, and he reduces inequality to a statistical issue.¹ In this respect he comes closer to modern feminist positions than, for example, the Roman Catholic church even today.

Sex-Role Socialization

Socialization is the process by which culture patterns are transferred from one generation to the next (Figure 1.4). As only such a small part of sex role differentiation is biologically determined, the stability of sex role patterns is almost entirely a matter of socialization. Socialization means that both men and women learn their place in society and, once they have learned it, the majority of them *want it that way*. We find the same process here as we found in Chapter 3 for the relationship between superiors and subordinates (de La Boétie's "voluntary servitude"); in male-dominated societies, most women are necessary to the male dominance.

A very important part of sex role socialization takes place in the family, whether this be the nuclear family of the modern industrial society, the extended family of more traditional societies, the one-parent family more and more common in "post-industrial" society, the commune, or even the day nursery which partly replaces the family. In all these institutions, children see adults of different sexes (but mostly females) fulfill certain roles; they more or less quickly become aware of their own sex category, and look for adults to identify with. Parsons and Bales (1955) describe the American nuclear family as the functional socialization center of American middle-class society in which boys are socialized to perform "instrumental" tasks and girls to do "expressive" tasks. Feminists who want to change sex roles criticize the family (and Parsons) for this supposed built-in traditionalism (Rapoport, 1978: 66ff). The problem is, however, that traditional patterns in a society are transmitted in alterna-

tive institutions as well; it is not the family as such that transfers a certain role pattern but the specific kind of values and behaviors of each of the adult members—and this holds equally in nonfamily socializing institutions which do not automatically work out differently. Weinreich (1978: 26-27) quotes studies about the backgrounds of women who came to adopt nontraditional roles (feminists and professional women): "The single most consistent feature of the backgrounds of both groups of women is having a mother who worked or who was at least orientated to a life beyond the wife and mother role." But just the fact that a woman has a job does not necessarily change a traditional sex role pattern; and a "housewife" role does not necessarily mean socializing the children toward male dominance.

McClelland (1975) illustrates the importance of the total set of values of the adult family members, women and men alike, on the sex role socialization in the following quote about his own experiences when as a young man he came into contact with the American Quaker subculture:

[T]he women seemed to be so much more self-assured and important in the community than even the career-oriented feminists I had known at Illinois Woman's College. They were vigorous, self-confident, and obviously influential. They were wives and mothers, for the most part, and not career women, but many had strong intellectual and artistic interests, even though few of them had gone to college. I realized that my feminist upbringing had led me to take it for granted that the "housewife" role would be weak or passive, a second best that many women had to choose. But here were women who gloried in their role, regarding it in no way as a hindrance; yet I could not dismiss them as simple homebodies. As I wondered how this could be, I realized that Quakerism as a religion gives strong support to the sharing rather than the assertive life style . . . I found the emphasis on career muted among both men and women The life goal was to develop a certain character and to live in a simple, harmonious way rather than to achieve a career of great significance. It is the only society I have ever entered in America in which the first question asked of a man is not "What do you do?", but "Who are you?". In fact I discovered that many of the women seemed to have only a very vague idea of what their men did. Though they realized of course that it was necessary to have an occupation and to earn money, that was not the most salient or valued feature of a person's life, as it is nearly everywhere else in contemporary America [McClelland, 1975: 108-109].

In this case the entire subculture, women and men alike, endorses values that elsewhere in United States would be seen as more "feminine." Greater sex role equality cannot be attained only when women are more assertive or instrumentally oriented, but also when men are more nurturing or expressive oriented.

Sex-role socialization of course continues in peer groups and in schools. The latter have received a lot of attention as socializing agencies (Lobban, 1978), because school results show so clearly the effect of sex role socialization: Girls and boys enter primary schools with equal intellectual endowment, but at the end of secondary schools girls stay behind or drop out; which appears to be a matter of lower ambition, not lesser abilities. A recurrent theme in U.S. research is the fear of success in academic achievement which is frequent among girls and almost absent among boys; it seems to develop between ages 13 and 16 (1978: 51). From Norway, Gjessme (1973) reports among seventh-grade girls a tendency to collectively underestimate their abilities. Again in the United States, Deaux and Emswiller (1974) did a laboratory

study with undergraduate students who were observing male and female actors perform a traditionally masculine task. Both male and female observers tended to attribute success to skill for the male actors and to luck for the females. This asymmetry of sex roles in the later part of the school education is partly attributed to a "hidden curriculum" (Lobban, 1978: 52) which represents the unofficial and often unintentional aspects of learning, present not so much in the course content as in the behaviors of teachers and, I would add, probably even more of class peers and parents. I tend to believe that the asymmetry at school is to a considerable extent a retarded effect of early socialization in the family. If there are opposing socializing forces in families and school, the family usually wins.

Sex-role socialization, finally, is furthered through the media; starting with a children's literature which usually pictures children and adults in traditional sex roles, and reinforced by TV and the press; Women's journals, in particular, are obvious sex role socializers.

Sex-role socialization is not necessarily consistent. A study by Komarovsky (1976) among male U.S. students shows considerable strain between new egalitarian sex-role norms on the one side and a deeper need for adhering to a traditional male role on the other: Men want women to be intellectual companions, but at the same time some feel threatened by women if they are really intelligent and assertive; many men want wives who are intellectually inferior to them. It is likely that these more traditional role concepts are the residues of early life socialization.

Sex Roles in Organizations

All organizations have a division of labor, and most have members of both sexes. In organizational practice, the division of labor and the division of sex roles tend to be linked in ways which Plato would have considered irrelevant (see the earlier quote); the "proper" division of labor over the sexes is largely a matter of convention. Jobs are given stereotypes of being "masculine" or "feminine" but these may differ from one country or even organization to another and over time; examples are policeman, soldier, dentist, pharmacist, nurse.

The goals of organizations affect the distribution of labor over the sexes. Business organizations have goals of achievement which concur with the achieving role of the male. It is not surprising that they are almost always led by men, and that their climate is set by men.

The model of the successful manager in our culture is a masculine one. The good manager is aggressive, competitive, firm, just. He is not feminine; he is not soft or yielding or dependent or intuitive in the womanly sense. The very expression of emotion is widely viewed as a feminine weakness that would interfere with effective business processes [McGregor, 1967: 23].

This implies a bias against female managers; and it also fits with the general pattern of male dominance in most societies that males are higher than females and are not expected to take orders from females. Perceptions and evaluations of manager behavior by observers are affected by the manager's sex: Bartol and Butterfield (1976) showed two versions of descriptions of manager behavior to (male and female) American business students, in which the managers' names indicated males or fe-

males, but no other differences were present. Students (regardless of their sex) evaluated managers with men's names more positively on "initiating structure" and managers with women's names more positively on "consideration."

In contrast to business organizations, hospitals have a quite different set of goals, which concurs more with the traditional, nurturing female role. Women do take, and always have taken, management positions in hospitals, at least on the nursing side. A study in the Netherlands by Philipsen and Cassee (1965) compares scores of leadership styles as rated by subordinates for matrons in hospitals, middle managers in industrial companies, and section heads in government offices. Hospital matrons receive the highest scores on "initiating structure" and the lowest on "consideration" from their subordinates (of course, "initiating structure" for nurses may be seen as "considerate" toward patients). The data from Philipsen and Cassee show the context-dependence of the association of "masculine" with "initiating structure" and "feminine" with "consideration." Similar resistance as can be found against female managers in business organizations sometimes exists against male "matrons" in hospitals (although in the Netherlands the prejudice against male *nurses* has in recent years disappeared).

The management literature of the 1950s and 1960s stresses the importance of a manager's "consideration" toward subordinates in certain types of jobs. In such jobs, female managers statistically should be more effective than men, if they ever get the chance to prove it. Sex bias which bars women (or men) from certain jobs because of tradition obviously affects the functioning of the organization.

Organization Development (O.D.) where it stresses openness and expression of emotion represents a counter-culture in the modern business world which fits traditional feminine values better than masculine ones.

The effect of the mixing up of the division of labor and of sex roles is an uneven distribution of men and women over the different levels of the work force and pay scales. Hartnett (1978: 83) criticizes the "gatekeeper" activity of males in personnel departments in selection and promotion (in Great Britain), but this looks like an oversimplification, making one group the scapegoat for an almost worldwide cultural phenomenon to which even the victims are accessory. The economic systems of many countries are kept in balance only by women doing menial jobs and being paid less than men even if they do the same jobs. In wealthier countries, they are often considered "cake-winners" rather than breadwinners (1978: 82). As stated earlier, the fact that women have jobs rather than stay at home in itself means no reversal of a traditional sex role distribution pattern; it may even reinforce it.

SEX DIFFERENCES IN WORK GOALS

Data from the Literature

Earlier in this book I referred several times to the measurements of "work goal importance" which are part of the HERMES research but are also found in the literature. When the answers of men and women on "work goal importance" scores are compared, significant differences tend to appear. A review of research in the area of job attitudes by Herzberg et al. (1957) summarizes the results of nine U.S. studies about sex differences in work goals (1957: 52):

More important for men
 Advancement
 Earnings

More important for women
 Supervision
 Social aspects of the job
 Working conditions
 Working hours
 Ease of work

Crowley et al. (1973) quote Herzberg et al. plus four U.S. studies from the 1960s, and conclude the following:

1. Women are more concerned than men with the social aspects of their jobs, particularly with having good relationships with co-workers.
2. It is often said that women are less intrinsically oriented than men [the authors mean that they attach less importance to such things as job content] but the empirical support for this is slight and inconsistent.
3. Sex differences in work goal importance are small and tend to disappear when the confounding effects of educational and/or occupational level are removed [Crowley et al., 1973: 446].

Crowley et al. then analyze the data from the 1969-1970 U.S. Survey of Working Conditions on sex differences in work goal importance. They find for this representative sample of the U.S. working population the following significant differences:

More important for men
 Freedom

More important for women
 Co-workers
 Clearly defined responsibilities
 Working hours
 Working conditions
 Convenient travel to and from work

For the question "my co-workers are friendly and helpful" a control was tried on whether the job demanded significant interaction (which was more the case for women than for men); but even after this control, the observed sex difference in the desire for friendly and helpful co-workers remained (1973: 454).

The analysis by Crowley et al. does not include a work goal question on "promotion" which was eliminated from the report on the 1969-1970 Survey of Working Conditions because it did not load on any of the five major "work goals" factors. However, on another question (not in the work goal importance format) Crowley et al. found that significantly more women than men answered that they never wanted to be promoted.

Manhardt (1972) surveyed 365 male and 301 female college graduates who were hired by the Prudential Insurance Company of America between 1966 and 1970—a group well matched by educational level. He found the following differences:

More important for men
 Advancement
 Supervising others
 Responsibility
 Working on problems central to the organization
 Earnings
 Creativeness

More important for women
 Congenial associates
 Ample leisure time
 Relationship with superiors
 Physical conditions
 Variety

Through a factor analysis of total data, Manhardt divided his 25 goals into three factors: (1) careers, which included the first five goals of the above list of "more important for men"; (2) working environment and relationships, which included the first four goals of the above list of "more important for women"; and (3) autonomy and self-actualization, which included mostly items which did not differentiate between women and men, plus "creativity" and "variety" which differentiate in opposite directions. Manhardt also found that "when the female sample was restricted to only those who rated a career first among their major life satisfactions, the sex differences, including those in job characteristics not directly related to career orientation, were almost completely eliminated" (1972: 367).

Bartol (1976) collected work goal importance scores on 25 goals from 175 male and female U.S. business students and female psychology students. Again, females scored interpersonal relationship and a comfortable environment as more important than did men, but differences between female business and female psychology students were larger than between business males and business females.

A random survey of 329 Dutch youths between age 14 and 24 in November 1976 conducted by McCann-Erickson (1977) asked, among other things, about the most important factors in choosing a job. Girls and boys did not differ in the frequency of their first choice: interesting work. Girls more than boys chose "helping others" and "able to make friends"; boys more than girls chose "exciting, challenging work"; "advancement opportunities"; "money"; and "long-term security."

In a survey of a representative sample of 1450 French youths between age 14 and 24 in the summer of 1977 conducted by IFOP (1977: 47-48) a question was included about work goals. Girls and boys again did not differ in the frequency of their first choice: interesting work. Girls more than boys chose a congenial working atmosphere and rendering service to others; boys more than girls chose high earnings and responsibility.

So far, the literature suggests the following:

- (1) Sex differences in work goal importance may easily be confounded with educational and/or occupational differences.
- (2) In samples from the United States, the Netherlands, and France we find that women compared with men tend to score the interpersonal aspects, rendering service, and sometimes the physical environment as more important, and advancement, sometimes independence, responsibility, and earnings as less important; as far as job content is concerned, women score no different from men, although they may value different detail aspects.

There is no indication that it makes sense to translate the sex differences in work goal importance in Herzbergian terms (one sex is not more "intrinsic-oriented" than the other) or in Maslowian terms (one sex is not further advanced in a hierarchy of human needs, although there may be differences at the intermediate levels of "social" and "esteem" needs)—this in case anyone would like to apply these popular categories of need classification. They simply do not apply to sex differences (as little as they apply to national cultures, see Chapter 2).

All the literature quoted deals with cross-sections of the population or with women in nonmanagerial roles. Herrick (1973) compared two samples of male and female U.S. government executives on 13 work goals (mostly taken from Haire et al., 1966). His results are reported by clusters of one to four goals at a time, and in nonstandardized form. His samples of female executives are small (40 and 13, re-

spectively) and the differences between men and women which he finds are significant only in one out of 10 cases. However, it is interesting that in both cases, after a rough standardization carried out by me, women executives score self-actualization goals as more and *social goals as less important* than do men. This suggests that the selection mechanism is for those women to be promoted who are more "masculine" in their goals than the average male executive; those who beat the men at their own game.

Sex Differences in Work Goals: HERMES Data

In HERMES, work goal importance was measured in all surveys, first with 22 and later with 14 questions. If we want to analyze the scores obtained with these questions for sex differences, we should avoid confusing the latter with occupational differences. We should therefore only compare men and women in the same occupations. Among the 38 occupations in HERMES for which data are available, only a few are (1) performed by both men and women in sufficient numbers to allow statistical treatment of data, and (2) not subject to an internal division of labor in which the women still perform tasks different from men. Altogether, I found seven occupations surveyed with the 22 goals set and two with the 14 goals set which more or less satisfy these conditions. Work goal importance scores for men and women in these occupations (taking a number of countries together) were standardized as usual, and the differences between standardized scores for women and men compared.

We find across the occupations the following significant sex difference trends:

<i>More important for men</i>	<i>More important for women</i>
Advancement	Friendly atmosphere
Earnings	Position security
Training	Physical conditions
Up-to-dateness	Manager
	Cooperation

No significant sex differences are found for job content goals (challenge, use of skills) and for private life goals (personal time, desirable area). However, the analysis suggests that there may be an interaction between sex and education, in that in the higher educated occupations the women would be relatively more job-content-oriented than the men, while in the lower educated occupations the opposite would be the case.

The international HERMES data largely confirm the results of the national studies reported in the previous section. The sex differences for advancement, earnings, atmosphere plus cooperation, physical conditions, and manager were already reported in the 1957 review of Herzberg et al. It seems that the differences in sex roles which determine the reference groups of these women and men when they score their goal importances are pervasive in our modern industrialized world.

Among the "interpersonal relations" goals we have used two formulations with closely related meanings: "cooperation" and "friendly atmosphere" (the latter was dropped after 1971). It appears that "friendly atmosphere" leads to greater score differences between the sexes than "cooperation." Among head office managers, "cooperation" is even scored marginally *less* important by women than by men (com-

pare the finding by Herrick that female executives scored lower on social needs than men). It seems that "atmosphere" has more a nurturing and "cooperation" more an assertive flavor.²

We saw earlier that the "component structures" in the HERMES work goal data depend on whether we compare individuals, occupations, or countries. On the previous page, we found a "clustering" of goals based on the comparison of sexes. To what extent does this clustering on the basis of sex differences agree with or differ from the clustering on the basis of individual, occupational, or country differences?

When we cluster goals on the basis of differences among *individuals* within in more or less homogeneous subsets of the data (one occupation, one country) we generally find, according to Chapter 2, six clusters or factors. There is a trend (but not a perfect one) in the HERMES data for the "Job content and learning" and the "Reward" clusters to be scored more important by men, the "Interpersonal relations," "Security," "Comfort," and "Company" Clusters more important by women.

When we cluster goals on the basis of differences between *occupations* (taking total Europe data), we find two factors, each with some goals on the positive and some on the negative side. I called these "intrinsic-extrinsic" (see chapter 5) and "social-ego." The goals related to the intrinsic-extrinsic factor do not differ significantly in importance for the sexes. However, the social-ego factor contains four goals significantly more important to women on the "social" side (manager, cooperation, friendly atmosphere, physical conditions) and four goals significantly more important to men on the "ego" side (up-to-dateness, advancement, training, earnings). It is virtually identical with a female preference-male preference factor.

One reason for a female-male factor to appear across occupations could be that some occupations are filled mainly by women, others mainly by men. It is true that when the HERMES occupations are distinguished according to their social-ego factor scores, the most "social" occupations are the clerks and unskilled workers; that is the groups employing sizable percentages of women (from 18 percent women for unskilled plant workers A to 99 percent women for office typists and secretaries). The "ego" occupations generally employ less than 10 percent women, or no women at all. However, this does not yet mean that it is the *women* in the "social" occupations who are solely responsible for the occupation's high "social" score. In order to test this, I have compared the "social-ego" factor scores for two occupations, head office clerks and branch office technical experts, separately for the women and the men in these occupations.

Head office clerks are a typical "social" occupation; branch office technical experts a typical "ego" occupation. Within both occupations, women score considerably more to the "social" side than men; and the sex difference in scores is larger for the less educated group (clerks) than for the more educated (experts). Still, between male clerks and male experts, and between female clerks and female experts, there are also large differences. Female experts have lower social scores than male clerks. This confirms the findings of Bartol that goals differ by sex and occupation, but that occupation differences outweigh sex differences.

When we cluster goals on the basis of differences between *countries* (taking our standard sample of seven occupational groups) we find again two factors. When we use the data for 40 countries and 14 goals, the two factors can be labeled "individual-collective" and "social-ego." The goals related to the individual-collective factor do

not differ systematically in importance for the sexes (goals belonging to this factor with significant sex differences are "training" and "physical conditions," but both appear on the "collective" side, while the first is more important to men, the second to women). However, the social-ego factor contains two goals significantly more important to women on the "social" side (manager, cooperation) and two goals significantly more important to men on the "ego" side (earnings, advancement). If we look at the factor analysis across countries for 22 goals (which, however, is only available for 19 countries) we find that also "friendly atmosphere" belongs to the "social" side of the "social-ego" factor. Again, the "social-ego" factor closely resembles a female preference-male preference factor.³

In the same way as the social-ego factor across occupations has something to do with the percentage of women in these occupations, the social-ego factor across countries is related to the percentage of women in the seven standard occupational groups in each country. In fact, the "social" factor score and the percentage of women per country (across the 40 countries) are correlated with $r = .43$. However, the percentage of women in the country samples does not account for the "social" factor score; in all countries women form only a minor fraction of the respondents in the seven occupational groups (between 4.0 percent in Pakistan and 16.2 percent in Finland; see also the second column in Figure 6.1 in which percentage of women has been controlled for). The "social" factor score of a country rather expresses a value complex which makes it more likely that women will be hired for some occupations; we shall come back to this below.

MEASURING NATIONAL DIFFERENCES IN MASCULINITY / FEMININITY IN HERMES

A Masculinity Index: Country Scores

In the previous chapter I explained how I used the factor scores of countries on the first main factor ("individual-collective") in the 14-goals, 40-country factor analysis, to arrive at an Individualism Index (IDV).

The second main factor in this case, as we saw above, was labeled "social-ego." It accounts for 22 percent of the variance in the country mean "work goals" scores. The work goals which together compose this factor are the following:

Loading	Work goal (see Figure 5.1)
.69	manager
.69	cooperation
.59	desirable area
.48	employment security
-.54	challenge
-.56	advancement
-.59	recognition
-.70	earnings

As the (zero-order) contribution of each work goal to the variance in the factor is determined by the square of the loading, the "social-ego" factor is mainly characterized by *high importance of manager and cooperation and low importance of earn-*

FIGURE 6.1 Country Masculinity Index (MAS)

Country	MAS		Country	MAS	
	Actual	Control- ling for % Women		Actual	Control- ling for % Women
Japan	95	87	Brazil	49	44
Austria	79	75	Singapore	48	52
Venezuela	73	70	Israel	47	41
Italy	70	72	Turkey	45	53
Switzerland	70	67	Taiwan	45	38
Mexico	69	64	Iran	43	52
Ireland	68	74	France	43	41
Great Britain	66	66	Spain	42	35
Germany (F.R.)	66	59	Peru	42	32
Philippines	64	58	Thailand	34	45
Colombia	64	56	Portugal	31	32
South Africa	63	60	Chile	28	26
U.S.A.	62	— ^a	Finland	26	51
Australia	61	59	Denmark	16	22
New Zealand	58	55	Netherlands	14	— ^b
Greece	57	73	Norway	8	10
Hong Kong	57	61	Sweden	5	6
Argentina	56	50	Mean of 39 countries		
India	56	47	(HERMES)	51	51
Belgium	54	53			
Canada	52	53	Yugoslavia (same		
Pakistan	50	40	industry)	21	42

a. Only data for occupations filled by men available.

b. Sex identification not asked in surveys.

Values based on the factor scores of the second factor found in a 14-work goals, 40-country matrix. Work goals scores were computed for a stratified sample of seven occupations at two points in time. Actual values and values obtained after controlling for % women in the country sample.

ings. Essentially the same factor was found in the factor analysis of the 22 goals, 19 country matrix (the two factors are rank correlated with $\rho = .92$); the 22 goals analysis adds "friendly atmosphere" on the positive side of the factor. We saw in the previous section that for these goals there is a significant difference in the preference of men and women in the same occupations, in the sense of women scoring more "social" and men more "ego."

In the same way as I measured the individualism dimension of national cultures with an index based on "individual-collective" factor scores, I shall measure the fourth and last dimension with an index based on "social-ego" factor scores. Reversing the sign of the scores, I have called this dimension "Masculinity." This label needs some explanation.

The English language (unlike, for example, Dutch) distinguishes between male/female and masculine/feminine. The first pair of words usually refers to what is

biologically determined and I shall use it in this sense. The second pair usually refers to what, in a given environment, is deemed suitable for members of one sex rather than the other:

[T]he words *masculine* and *feminine* do not refer in any simple way to fundamental traits of personality, but to the learned styles of interpersonal interactions which are deemed to be socially appropriate to specific social contexts, and which are imposed upon, and sustain and extend, the sexual dichotomy [Newson et al., 1978: 28].

"Masculinity" and "femininity," in the sense in which I shall use these terms, refer to the dominant sex role pattern in the vast majority of both traditional and modern societies as described in the early part of this chapter: that of male assertiveness and female nurturance. It is by no means necessary that men always actually behave more "masculine" than women and women more "feminine" than men, as Bem's experiments have shown; statistically, however, men as a rule will be more on the "masculine" side and women more on the "feminine."

As demonstrated above, I found both occupations and countries in the "HERMES" data to differ along a "social-ego" dimension of work goals, opposing the interpersonal relations goals "(relationship with) manager," "cooperation," and "friendly atmosphere" to "earnings" and "advancement." This dimension is related to the percentage of women within the occupation or country sample, but not *due to* the presence of women only; we find it also in the responses by men in these occupations or countries. The fact that the social-ego difference appears on a worldwide ecological level means that it must be associated with a fundamental dilemma of mankind. This dilemma is the relative strength of nurturance interests (relation with manager, cooperation, atmosphere) versus assertiveness interests (earnings, advancement): of interests which in nearly all traditional and modern societies are traditionally more "feminine" versus those that are traditionally more "masculine." The ecological dimension we are dealing with measures to what extent the HERMES respondents in a country (mainly men) show less or more a traditionally "masculine" interest pattern. The fundamental dilemma behind this dimension then, can be no other than the distribution of roles over the sexes: and this sex role distribution differs among the 40 nations. I have therefore interpreted it as a femininity-masculinity dimension (using the words in the sense described earlier, of learned styles of interpersonal interaction). Because the respondents were mainly men, I have called the dimension *Masculinity*, thereby reversing its sign.

Like the Individualism Index (IDV), the Masculinity Index (MAS) has been brought in a range between zero and 100. The values of the Masculinity Index found for the 40 countries are listed in Figure 6.1.

The second column of figures in Figure 6.1 shows the effect on MAS scores of controlling for the percentage of women in the HERMES sample: the scores that would have been obtained if all country samples included the same percentage of female respondents. We see that the basic ordering of the countries is hardly affected. The biggest differences occur for Finland and Yugoslavia, which both have relatively high percentages of women; but the percentage of women in these occupations in the country is not only a cause but can also be seen as partly an *effect* of the country's relatively low masculinity norm.

The list of countries in order of Masculinity Index shows Japan at the top. German-speaking countries (Austria, Switzerland, and Germany) tend to score high; so do the Caribbean Latin American countries Venezuela, Mexico, and Colombia, and Italy. The Anglo-American countries (Ireland, Great Britain, South Africa, the United States, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada) all score above average. Asian countries, other than Japan, are rather in the middle. On the lower side we find other Latin countries (France, Spain, Peru, Portugal, and Chile) and Yugoslavia; at the lowest end are the four Nordic countries Finland, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, and the Netherlands.

The Individualism Index (IDV) could only be used to compare countries, not occupations, because in the factor analysis of work goals by occupations (Chapter 5) there is no such thing as an individual-collective factor. However, across occupations we *do* find a social-ego factor which is largely similar to the social-ego factor that we find across countries. Thus, we can identify occupations as more "masculine" (ego) or more "feminine" (social); the MAS index can be used to describe occupations.

As for other demographic criteria, the MAS index can, of course, be used for discriminating between the sexes; this is why it was given its name. Age group differences in work goals will be described in Chapter 8.

Masculinity and Sex Role Differentiation

Most HERMES respondents were men, and the differences in Masculinity Index values listed in Figure 6.1 reflect therefore mainly the values of *men* in these countries. What about the "masculinity" or "femininity" of women's values in these countries? Two of the occupational categories used for the 40-country comparison contain minorities of women (doing the same work as the men) of a size that permits statistical treatment: head office clerks (35 percent women in 1971-1973) and branch office technical experts (6 percent women). The first is a group which usually has secondary school education, the second usually has a higher (college) education. In Figure 6.2 I have computed separate MAS scores for men and women in these occupations for those countries in which there are at least 20 female respondents in either occupation. I used 1971-1973 survey data (which generally show larger numbers of respondents than the earlier survey round).⁴

In order to widen the range of social class and educational level within the data, I have also entered in Figure 6.2 the MAS scores for male and female unskilled workers B in HERMES manufacturing plants, which are available for six countries.

Several conclusions can be drawn from Figure 6.2. If we look first to the rank correlations with country MAS scores, we see that country differences in "masculinity" are present in the scores of men and women separately and in all three occupations. The men's scores follow the MAS ranking somewhat more closely than the women's scores, not surprisingly, as the MAS scores are mainly based on men's answers. However, we also see from the bottom line of Figure 6.2 that the score differences between men and women (a measure of sex role differentiation) are themselves positively correlated with MAS. For experts and clerks, the correlations of "Δ men-women" with MAS are significant. For unskilled workers, the data for Japan are out of line; but the sample of women in Japan is just 20, the lowest limit of what is acceptable. Without Japan, the rank correlation of "Δ men-women" with MAS for the unskilled would be .83. This means that in the more "masculine" countries, the

FIGURE 6.2 Masculinity Index (MAS) Scores for Men and Women Separately, in 3 Occupations and 15 Countries										
Country	MAS score	Unskilled plant workers B			Head office clerks			Branch office technical experts		
		men	women	Δ	men	women	Δ	men	women	Δ
Japan	95	89	92 ^a	(- 3)	99	77	22	102	73	29
Austria	79	66	63	13	50	80	34	35	69	11
Great Britain	66	66	45	18	27	47	16	31	79	4
Germany (F.R.)	66	66	45	18	27	47	16	31	79	4
South Africa	63	63	52	11	33	52	19	33	74	22
Australia	61	61	56	5	35	52	19	33	74	22
Argentina	56	56	75	19	37	38	16	38	52	22
Belgium	54	49	35	18	61	33	28	59	39	20
Brazil	49	49	35	18	61	33	28	59	39	20
France	43	28	0	28	71	- 6	77	55	51	4
Sweden	5	-14	3	-17	-30	-28	- 2	7	19	-12
Norway	8	- 8	-21	13	-12	- 9	- 3	7	19	-12
Netherlands	14	- 8	-21	13	4	-10	14	7	19	-12
Denmark	16	- 8	-21	13	4	-10	14	7	19	-12
Spain	42	43	38	5	43	38	5	43	38	5
Mean of 5 countries (JAP, GBR, GER, FRA, SWE)	55	42	25	17	53	17	36	65	58	7
Mean of all available country scores	48	34	18	16	45	19	26	66	55	11
Spearman rank correlation with MAS	.99**	.81	.33	.73***	.63**	.61**	.99***	.90***	.71*	.11
Number of respondents: 10,722 men, 3,236 women, 13,958 total.										
^a Based on answers of 20 women only.										

values of men and women in the same occupations tend to be more different than in the more "feminine" ones. Our measure of masculinity in a country is also a measure of sex role differentiation. The two most "feminine" countries, Sweden and Norway, even show a reversal of sex role values: in these countries, the women score more "masculine" than the men in the same occupations. In the righthand part of Figure 6.2 I show the occupational differences in MAS, taking men and women together. Experts distinguish themselves considerably from the two other groups: They are more "masculine." The average female expert scores more "masculine" than the average male clerk or unskilled worker. Occupation stands also for education plus social class: in all countries for which I have data, except Japan, the higher educated, upper-middle-class experts score more masculine, assertive values than the others. In Japan there is no systematic occupation/education difference (or at least it goes one way for men, the other way for women). The largest occupation/education differences are visible for Germany, Sweden, and Australia.

Occupation/education and sex difference interact, as we can see by comparing the Δ scores between women and men for unskilled, clerks, and experts. In France, Great Britain, and Germany, female experts score almost as "masculine" as their male colleagues. Swedish female experts and female unskilled score even more "masculine" than their male colleagues. The women experts pursue a career in an essentially male world. Whereas this career is primarily technical, not managerial, the following quote from a British female executive may still apply:

Underlying most of the controversy about women's suitability for management is the narrow and single minded conception of the ideal manager. This is almost entirely male in character: aggressive, competitive, firm, rational and vigorous. And against this women are seen to fall short by being characterized as not competitive: valuing social skills; intuitive, dependent and person orientated, rather than objective; cooperative; creative but in a small domestic way rather than visionary. To the extent that one is talking about the population as a whole, these sex defined characteristics are no doubt valid; they have been demonstrated in studies at a very general level and accord with observations of Western societies as they exist. However, these are largely irrelevant when dealing with a self-selected universe: women sufficiently motivated to pursue a career [Lannon, 1977: 10].

The female experts belong to this self-selected universe. However, not in all countries do their values approach those of their male colleagues: In Japan, Australia, and Brazil the female experts differ even more from their male colleagues than do the female clerks from theirs. Most likely, in these countries they do not feel themselves as seriously competing with the men.

The French pattern is extreme in that sex value differences are virtually zero for the experts: Both men and women "cadres" score average on the masculinity-femininity scale. For the "non-cadre" clerks however, the men and women score wide apart and show the widest gap for any of the 14 countries between male assertiveness and female nurturance. This latter gap concurs with the results of a study on broad samples of the populations in 12 countries dealing with family time budgets for child care (Stone, 1972). As "non-cadres" are much more numerous than "cadres," this study reflects primarily the non-cadre situation. It concludes:

The French pattern of child rearing is particularly different from all others. French housewives give the most time to young children, yet do not show a large reduction in

time spent with the child as he grows older. French men spend very little time with children apart from time spent also with the spouse . . . In France, periods of child time and adult time appear to be strictly identified [Stone, 1972: 263].

This suggests that the French (non-cadre) child is socialized to sharply differentiated sex roles.

The German female experts score the most "masculine" of any of the samples of women except the Japanese unskilled. These German college-graduate women show an assertiveness which bypasses many groups of men in other countries.

Country Masculinity Index Scores and Other HERMES Survey Questions

HERMES respondents in more masculine countries, compared with those in more feminine countries, tend to endorse significantly more frequently the following items in the questionnaire:

- (1) High stress (A37).
- (2) Decisions made by individuals are usually of higher quality than decisions made by groups (B57).
- (3) A large corporation is generally a more desirable place to work than a small company (C17); a corporation is responsible for its employees (B52) and for society (B58); and the private life of an employee is properly a matter of direct concern to the company (C19).
- (4) Most employees have an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it if they can (C3); and for getting ahead in industry, knowing influential people is usually more important than ability (C15).

The association of masculinity with higher stress is interesting because in Chapter 4 we saw that there is no evidence of systematic differences in stress between men and women in the same jobs. The conclusion is that stress is not in the sex but in the sex role. Le Vine (1966: 255) quotes data from Africa showing that "separated and widowed women, who have become family heads involuntarily, have a significantly higher frequency of high blood pressure than married women". Their more masculine new role is associated with more stress symptoms. In all developed countries, women on the average live four to eight years longer than men; differences in stress during life are a likely contributor to this. The higher ambition of the men is paid for in years of life.⁵ One aspect of the sex role patterns is that usually "masculinity" is associated with being tough and not showing emotions, while "femininity" means that emotions may be shown. Showing emotions is an excellent way of reducing the negative effect of stress on long-term health (see Chapter 4).

The association of masculinity with "individual decisions better than group decisions" confirms the picture of the masculine decision maker who is *not* socially oriented.

Masculinity in a country is also (weakly) associated with support for the large, responsible corporation which has a right to interfere in its employees' lives; while the "feminine" pattern is more to prefer the smaller company (small is beautiful), to leave social responsibility to other institutions, and to reject company interference with their private lives. The corporation belongs to the masculine world.

Finally, in more "masculine" countries, people tend to show a more skeptical

view of others, which is demonstrated by their lesser rejection of Theory X ("most employees dislike work") and their agreement that knowing people is more important for getting ahead than ability.

Masculinity and Work Centrality in HERMES

Earlier studies of the HERMES survey data (Hofstede, 1976b, 1979a) have compared two measures of the importance of work goals. One is the set of direct questions ("how important is it to you . . .") used for computing the Country Individualism and Masculinity Indices. I have called this measure a "sociological" measure because the answers reflect the respondents' social frame of reference and feelings of social desirability. The other measure is the strength of the correlation between the satisfaction with each individual work goal and a score of the respondents' "overall satisfaction in the company." I have called this a "psychological" measure because it is unconscious and unaffected by social desirability.

It can be shown (Hofstede, 1976b: 28) that the psychological measure always leads to about the same ordering of work facets. Regardless of country or occupation, "challenge" and "earnings" tend to be the two work facets whose satisfaction is most strongly correlated with overall satisfaction. That is, within any category of HERMES employees, those scoring more satisfaction with their "challenge" and their "earnings" are also usually the ones scoring more satisfaction with their job in general.

The sociological measure, as we saw in Chapter 5 and in this chapter, is strongly affected by the occupation and the country of the respondents. It appears (in a comparison of five countries) that in three high MAS countries the sociological measure is much more similar to the psychological, unconscious measure than in two low MAS countries. In these high MAS countries (Japan, Germany, and Great Britain) HERMES employees rate as personally and socially desirable in their job mainly those facets that go together with high overall job satisfaction. In the lower MAS countries (France and the Netherlands) they rate other job facets as personally and socially desirable (important). In rating work goal "importance" respondents choose their own reference frame. They are not told in the questionnaire that their ultimate criterion should be maximal *job* satisfaction. It is obvious that in the lower MAS countries, the ultimate criterion is *not* maximal job satisfaction. If we accept the hedonistic principle that people always try to maximize some kind of satisfaction, this leads to the conclusion that respondents in the lower MAS countries try to maximize a "life satisfaction," which is seen as socially desirable but does not overlap with "job satisfaction." That is, in the high MAS countries, the job takes a more central position in the respondents' total life space than in the lower MAS countries. This same reasoning can be applied to occupational differences: We also find that only the higher educated occupations (managers and professionals) rate as personally and socially desirable those facets that go together with high overall job satisfaction; the job *does* occupy a more central position in the life space of managers and professionals than in that of lower status employees.

If this analysis is correct, it means that there is a relationship between MAS and national levels of "work centrality." This is a concept that has been used in sociology

since Dubin's (1956) study of "Central Life Interests" of U.S. workers. Another related concept in the literature is "Job Involvement" (Lodahl and Kejner, 1965). Unfortunately, so far I have not been able to trace any systematic cross-national studies of work centrality.

Vroom (1964: 43) quotes U.S. research findings pertaining to a difference in work centrality by sex: "Job satisfaction is more highly correlated with general satisfaction among employed men than among employed women." This, of course, supports a positive association between work centrality and masculinity. Whyte (1969: 31) uses a quote from American businessman Charles F. Kettering to illustrate the cultural boundedness of the meaning of work.

I often tell my people that I don't want any fellow who has a job working for me: What I want is a fellow whom a job has. I want the job to get the fellow and not the fellow to get the job. And I want that job to get hold of this young man so hard that no matter where he is the job has got him for keeps. I want that job to have him in its clutches when he goes to bed at night, and in the morning I want that same job to be sitting on the foot of his bed telling him it's time to get up and go to work. And when a job gets a fellow that way, he's sure to amount to something.

It is no accident that Kettering refers to a "young man" only—his is a masculine ideal. If we also take into account the correlation referred to on page 195 between the Masculinity Index and "the private life of an employee is properly a matter of direct concern to his company," we can postulate that people in more "masculine" countries, other factors being equal, "live to work," while people in more feminine countries "work to live." I am waiting for more extensive cross-national studies of work centrality to confirm this distinction, which at present has the status of a hypothesis.

COMPARING THE HERMES MASCULINITY INDEX VALUES WITH OTHER DATA

Sample Survey Studies

(1) *Samples of students from 17 countries answering L. V. Gordon's Survey of Interpersonal values* (see Chapter 3). Higher masculinity in a country is associated with higher recognition (importance of being looked up to and admired, being considered important, attracting favorable notice, achieving recognition: $r = .50$). Higher masculinity is associated with lower benevolence (importance of doing things for other people, sharing with others, helping the unfortunate, being generous: $r = -.59$). This clearly shows the association of masculinity with assertiveness and of femininity with nurturance.

(2) *Samples of managers in 12 countries answering Bass' IRGOM Life Goals Exercise* (see Chapter 5). An ecological factor analysis of the "Life Goals" scores showed the existence of two factors. The first ("hedonism-skill") was related to individualism. The second factor (labeled "assertiveness-service") is correlated with masculinity: $\rho = .84$. This factor opposes leadership, independence, and self-realization to service. These goals are defined in the exercise as follows: