

MARÍA LAMEIRAS FERNÁNDEZ, YOLANDA RODRÍGUEZ CASTRO,  
MARÍA CALADO OTERO, MARIKA L. FOLTZ and MARÍA VICTORIA  
CARRERA FERNÁNDEZ

## EXPRESSIVE-INSTRUMENTAL TRAITS AND SEXIST ATTITUDES AMONG SPANISH UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

(Accepted 10 February 2006)

**ABSTRACT.** In this study we analyze the link between Instrumental/Expressive traits and sexist attitudes. The sample is made up of 496 male and female Spanish university professors (230 women and 266 men). In addition to collecting sociodemographic information from the participants, the following scales were administered: the Personal Attributes Questionnaire by Spence and Helmreich (PAQ, 1978); the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory [ASI, Glick and Fiske: 1996, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 70, pp. 491–512]; and the Neosexism Scale [Tougas et al.: 1995, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21(8), pp. 842–849]. The data reveal that while the participants in our study subscribe less to sexist attitudes than the general population, the men continue to hold more hostile and benevolent sexist attitudes than do the women in our study. Surprisingly, however, we find that both female and male professors are less favorable toward affirmative action aimed at increasing women's presence in the public sphere than the general population. As expected, women and men are equally instrumental, although women continue to show a greater number of expressive traits than men. Conversely, men score higher on instrumentality/expressiveness, which correlates positively with instrumentality and negatively with expressiveness. We also find some significant differences in levels of instrumentality and expressiveness when comparing the male and female professors and taking field of study into account. Lastly, we find negative correlations between expressiveness and Hostile Sexism (HS) and between masculinity and HS among women, and between expressiveness and Benevolent Sexism (BS) among men. To conclude, we offer some insight into the potential implications of these results.

**KEY WORDS:** ambivalent sexism, gender stereotypes, instrumental and expressive traits, neosexism

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The terms *instrumental* and *expressive*, first proposed by Parsons and Bales in 1955, refer to psychological traits associated differentially with each sex in a specific cultural group (Eagly, 1995), and are often found to be stable cross-culturally, thereby representing pan-cultural traits (Williams et al., 1999). Under the heading of instrumentality, we have characteristics such as

assertiveness, activity, competitiveness, and aggressiveness, which have prototypically been associated with men, while the concept of expressiveness represents such traits as sensitivity, tenderness, anxiety, and sociability, which have all typically characterized women. Instrumental and expressive traits have been widely seen as equivalent to or representative of the traits of masculinity–femininity (Bem, 1974), although there is some dissension regarding this supposed connection (Spence, 1993). The way in which these traits have been conceptualized and measured has evolved over time. The scales originally designed to measure masculinity and femininity are now widely considered to measure a more specific set of traits, namely instrumentality and expressiveness.

The first test designed to measure the traits of masculinity and femininity was designed by Terman and Miles in 1936. Known as the Masculinity–Femininity Test. Many years later, Constantinople (1973) questioned the one-dimensional nature of Terman and Miles' test and instead offered a bi-dimensional vision of masculinity–femininity. From this point, a new view of gender identity emerged, one in which femininity and masculinity were considered not necessarily to be opposite sides of one dimension, but rather separate and independent constructs. The most meaningful contribution to take place during the reconceptualization of femininity–masculinity was that of Bem (1974), with his androgynous model. According to this perspective, masculinity and femininity are seen as characteristics that people develop regardless of their sex and undetermined by biological factors; those people who are able to develop both feminine and masculine qualities will be the most adept, psychologically and practically speaking. This theory, however, has had its share of critics (Marsh and Byrne, 1991).

Spence's contribution embodies today's evolving conceptualization of gender identity, and her theoretical model serves as a springboard for our own work. Spence (1993) proposes a Multifactorial Theory of Gender Identity, in which the distinct attitudes, traits, interests, preferences, and behaviors that differentiate men from women in a given culture do not constitute one lone underlying factor, but rather consist of a number of independent factors. She suggests that there are four relevant aspects which must be considered: (1) *gender identity*, which alludes to one's basic sense of masculinity and femininity; (2) *instrumental and expressive personality traits*, which are stereotypically associated with men and women in Western societies; (3) *interests, behavior, and attitudes* regarding gender; and (4) *sexual orientation*. Thus, the multifactorial model considers the possibility that along with expressive-instrumental traits, there may be other elements such as gender-role behaviors, interests, and attitudes, all of which are seen

as being important factors in the construction of gender identity (Aube et al., 1995). In this way, the multifactorial perspective views women and men as being much more heterogeneous and diverse than was previously postulated in both the one-dimensional and bi-directional models of gender identity (Koestner and Aube, 1995).

The Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) (Bem, 1974) and the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) (Spence et al., 1974), published the same year, are currently the two scales most commonly used to measure gender stereotyped personality traits (Twenge, 1997). The items on the Masculinity (M) scale describe traits which are generally considered to be socially desirable in men or typically masculine: "instrumental" traits such as assertiveness and independence. Conversely, the items on the Femininity (F) scale include socially desirable traits in women or typically "feminine" qualities: "expressive" traits such as understanding others and being affectionate. The 10 studies reviewed by Lenney (1991) confirm that there is a significant parallel between the M and F scales of the BSRI and the PAQ. A study by Vergara and Paéz (1993) reveals that both instruments are free of biases due to social desirability and acquiescence, and have moderately high to high degrees of reliability. However, the PAQ is found to have greater internal validity (Vergara and Paéz, 1993), a fact which is confirmed in the study by Lenney (1991).

Since 1978, Spence and Helmreich have abandoned the concepts of masculinity and femininity in favor of more descriptive labels like instrumentality and expressiveness. They have used the terms *masculinity* and *femininity* exclusively to describe a more global concept of gender identity with which each person identifies. As Spence and Buckner (2000) point out, it may be inappropriate to use the terms masculinity and femininity to identify the concepts measured in both the BSRI and the PAQ, due to the fact that there is no correlation between these scales and those that measure attitudes toward the sexes. Even so, they point out that if there were any connection between these two types of scales, the correlation should be predictable based on the theoretical expectations: the more instrumental a man is, and the more expressive a woman is, the more likely it is that he/she will adhere to more sexist attitudes (Spence and Buckner, 2000).

As it appears from what we have discussed thus far, instrumental/expressive traits are neither exclusive to each sex, nor are they broader, more complex representations of masculinity and femininity per se. One could speculate that these traits have evolved within a complex social framework, and have been directly affected by the social changes which have taken place over the past few decades. Among such changes, perhaps the most notable is

the great number of women who have moved into the working world, leaving behind the traditional role of housewife. Twenge (1997) carried out a meta-analysis analyzing the changes which have taken place over the last three decades in the number of women and men reporting instrumental and expressive traits, as measured using the BSRI and the PAQ. The results of this study show that while both women and men report a greater number of instrumental traits than in decades past, women have shown a much greater increase in the number of such traits than men have, reaching levels similar to men in recent years. Thus, women now show a degree of instrumentality similar to men, while at the same time retaining more expressive characteristics (Spence and Buckner, 2000).

In notable contrast to the changes women's lives have undergone in the western world in recent years, men have, for the most part, not experienced a similar transition from a largely public life to a more exclusive dedication to home and family – traditionally a woman's role. Despite small “advances” in this terrain, women continue to be the ones to take most of the responsibility for the housework and child rearing, even when both partners work outside the home, a fact which has been observed in various studies worldwide (Lennon and Rosenfield, 1994; Twenge, 1997; Spence and Buckner, 2000) and corroborated by data obtained in Spain (Instituto de la Mujer, 2004).

To compensate for the added responsibilities that women have taken on outside the home, it seems that rather than their partners sharing the household chores, the tendency is to reduce the load on the home front. This is primarily done by having fewer children, by hiring outside assistance, or both. Spain and Italy are currently the two countries with the lowest birth rates worldwide, with an average of 1.34 and 1.36 children born to each adult woman, respectively. What is more, Spain is one of the developed countries in which the drop in birth rate has been most prominent, since – along with Ireland – it had the highest birth rate in Europe just three decades ago (Cantalapiedra and Panizo, 2002). Housekeepers and nannies (almost exclusively women) are also more often employed in households in which both partners hold down jobs, although it is difficult to determine the exact number of women who do this type of work due to its largely unofficial nature; in fact, it is estimated that as many as 30% of all female workers who work without legally regulated working conditions in Spain are employed as housekeepers or nannies (UGT, 2004).

In addition to reducing family size and thus the workload at home, European women are postponing child rearing until later in life. This is due to the fact that the more time and energy that is spent receiving education

and being trained in a field, the less likely it is that women will choose to interrupt their professional careers long enough to form a family (Blau et al., 1998). In Spain, the mean age for a woman bearing her first child is over 31, which makes it – along with Great Britain and Ireland – the European country with the highest average age for first-time mothers (EUROSTAT, 2002)

The first objective of this study is to determine the presence of instrumental and expressive traits in a Spanish sample. More specifically, we have chosen to make use of university professors in order to compare male and female participants with an equally high academic and professional status. By doing so, we hope to sidestep any potential effects which could arise owing to differences in social status between the two sexes, a variable which is not always adequately controlled for (cf. Anastasia and Miller, 1998). In addition, we have chosen to employ professors from different fields of study in order to take into account gender stereotypes associated with these; women tend to choose fields which involve helping others, such as health-related fields, while men continue to choose technical and scientific fields. In fact, in Spain women only make up one-third of the college student population in technical and scientific degrees, whereas the reverse is true in health-related fields, in which two-thirds of the student body is comprised of female students (INE, 2004).

Our second main objective is to examine the connection between instrumental and expressive traits, as measured by the PAQ (Spence and Helmreich, 1978), and sexist attitudes, using more recently developed scales designed to measure “modern” forms of sexism. This so-called *modern sexism* refers to a more subtle, covert type of sexism which can be expressed either socially, as measured by the Neosexism Scale (Tougas et al., 1995), or in interpersonal relationships, in which case it can be evaluated using the Ambivalent Sexism Scale (Glick and Fiske, 1996). Tougas et al. (1995) introduced the concept known as *Neosexism*, a new form of sexism conceived of as the manifestation of an internal conflict: simultaneously believing that men and women should be equal, while at some subtle level harboring negative feelings toward women. Ambivalent sexism has two sub-components: hostile sexism and benevolent sexism. Hostile sexism is expressed as hostility and resentment toward women, viewing them as not conforming to typical gender roles and thereby attempting to acquire men’s power. Benevolent sexism is more subtle, as it is characterized by affectionate and protective attitudes toward women, while they are at the same time patronized for conforming to their expected roles (Glick and Fiske, 1996; Glick et al., 2000). Finally, we are interested in determining if any

existing relationship between instrumentality/expressiveness and modern sexism (neosexism and ambivalent sexism) is indeed in line with the theoretical expectations.

## 2. METHOD

### 2.1. *Participants*

The sample was made up of 496 university professors (230 women and 266 men), all of them faculty at one of three public universities in the north-west of Spain. A representative, randomly chosen sample was used for each university, and within each one a further sub-division was carried out using four broad fields of study: Experimental and Health Sciences; Social and Legal Sciences; Humanities; and Technical fields. There was a sampling error of less than 5% and a confidence level of 95%.

### 2.2. *Instruments*

The following questionnaires were administered by means of an interview:

*Socio-demographic variables:* sex, age, field of study, religious affiliation, whether or not participant had a partner and/or children, level of studies reached by partner, participant's state of employment and that of his/her partner.

*Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI)* (Glick and Fiske, 1996): we used the Spanish version adapted by Expósito et al. (1998), which measures ambivalent (hostile and benevolent) attitudes toward women. This instrument uses a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 0 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). Higher scores represent more sexist attitudes. The Hostile Sexism (HS) sub-scale includes the items: 2, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 18, and 21, and the Benevolent Sexism (BS) sub-scale is comprised of the remaining items on this 22-item scale. The reliability for the HS sub-scale was 0.91, and the reliability for the BS sub-scale was 0.87.

*Neosexism scale* (Tougas et al., 1995): We used the Spanish version of this scale, adapted by Moya and Expósito (2001), which is comprised of 11 items requiring responses on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Before summing up the scores for each item, it is necessary to reverse the scoring procedure for items 2 and 11. Higher scores represent greater adherence to modern sexist attitudes (Cronbach's  $\alpha = 0.65$ ).

*Personal Attributes Questionnaire by Spence and Helmreich (PAQ)*: we used the Spanish version by Vergara and Páez (1993), containing 24 items. The objective of this questionnaire is to measure subjects' self-adherence to certain traits, namely assertive-instrumental and expressive-interpersonal traits. Each characteristic measured on the PAQ is represented linearly on a 5-point bipolar scale. Respondents are asked to indicate at what point on the continuum (1–5) they fall (i.e. from 1 “not at all aggressive” to 5 “very aggressive”). Three variables are then extrapolated from this scale:

1. *Instrumental trait scale* – includes the following characteristics: independence, competitiveness, ease-difficulty in making decisions, ease-difficulty in accepting defeat, self-confidence, and feelings of inferiority/superiority. Items: 3, 7, 8, 9, 12, 15, 21, 22 (Cronbach's alpha = 0.77)
2. *Instrumental/expressive trait scale* – measures such traits as aggressiveness, submissiveness-dominance, need for acceptance from others, emotional vulnerability, ease-difficulty in crying, and self-confidence. Items: 2, 6, 10, 16, 17, 19, 20, 24 (Cronbach's alpha = 0.68)
3. *Expressive trait scale* – evaluates aspects such as the ability to dedicate oneself to others, desire to help others, friendliness, awareness of others' feelings, and coldness/warmth in relationships. Items: 1, 4, 5, 11, 13, 14, 18, 23 (Cronbach's alpha = 0.51)

Higher scores on all three sub-scales represent greater levels of instrumentality, instrumentality-expressiveness, and expressiveness, respectively.

### 3. RESULTS

Means and standard deviations for male and female subjects on both the Hostile Sexism (HS) and Benevolent Sexism (BS) scales revealed significant gender differences (Table I). Men scored higher than women on HS ( $t = -5.74$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ) and BS ( $t = -4.63$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ). The Neosexism scale did not reveal significant gender differences. The genders differed as expected on the three PAQ scales: female participants scored higher on the *expressive trait scale* ( $t = 2.60$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ), men scored higher on the *instrumental-expressive trait scale* ( $t = -6.76$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ), and no significant gender differences were found on the *instrumental trait scale*.

Table II shows adherence to sexist attitudes by respondents, taking into account both their sex and field of study. In terms of hostile sexism, results show that male professors in the fields of Social and Legal Sciences ( $t = -2.48$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ), Experimental and Health Sciences ( $t = -4.47$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ), and Technical fields ( $t = -2.03$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ) hold more hostile sexist

TABLE I

Differences between Men and Women on Hostile Sexism, Benevolent Sexism, and Neosexism Scales, and the PAQ

	Women		Men		<i>t</i>
	<i>N</i>	Mean (SD)	<i>N</i>	Mean (SD)	
<i>ASI</i>					
Hostile Sexism	213	1.91 (0.80)	209	2.12 (0.89)	-5.74***
Benevolent Sexism	256	2.12 (0.89)	245	2.52 (0.94)	-4.63***
NEOSEXISM	214	3.11 (0.39)	258	3.12 (0.39)	-0.168
<i>PAQ</i>					
Expressive	222	3.70 (0.54)	266	3.57 (0.53)	2.60**
Instrumental	226	3.41 (0.49)	266	3.48 (0.54)	-1.56
Instrumental-Expressive	221	2.59 (0.42)	263	2.86 (0.44)	-6.76***

Note:  $p < 0.01^{**}$ ;  $p < 0.001^{***}$ .

attitudes toward women than do their female cohorts. And in the case of benevolent sexism, it is the male professors from Experimental and Health Sciences ( $t = -3.24$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ), Technical fields ( $t = -3.86$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ), and Humanities ( $t = -2.72$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ) who adhere more to this type of ambivalent sexist attitude than do the female professors in the same fields.

When analyzing the Neosexism scale by field of study, no significant gender differences were found in terms of sexist attitudes held by female and male professors.

The results obtained from the PAQ when taking field of study into account revealed that the only significant differences found on the *expressive trait scale* were in the Experimental and Health Science field, with female respondents scoring higher than male respondents. The only field in which there was a significant difference between male and female subjects on the *instrumental trait scale* was in Social and Legal Sciences, in which the male professors had higher scores. Lastly, we observed that on the *instrumental-expressive trait scale*, significant differences were found in the fields of Experimental and Health Sciences ( $t = 5.41$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ), Humanities ( $t = 2.94$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ), and Social and Legal Sciences ( $t = 3.39$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ), once again with the male professors scoring higher than their female colleagues.

The results from the univariate analysis of the scales by field of study (Table II) show that there are no significant differences among the female professors in terms of their adherence to hostile and benevolent sexist attitudes. However, there are significant differences among the male professors in terms of their scores on the HS ( $F_{(249,3)} = 5.01$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ) and BS



TABLE II  
Means and Standard Deviations between Men and Women on Hostile Sexism, Benevolent Sexism, and Neosexism Scales, and the PAQ

	Experimental and Health Sciences		Humanities		Social and Legal Sciences		Technical Fields		<i>F</i>					
	Women Mean (SD)	<i>t</i>	Women Mean (SD)	<i>t</i>	Women Mean (SD)	<i>t</i>	Women Mean (SD)	<i>t</i>						
<i>ASI</i>														
Hostile Sexism	1.88 (0.89)	2.69 (1.05)	-4.47***	1.77 (0.54)	2.06 (0.87)	-1.92	1.96 (0.82)	2.28 (0.91)	2.58 (0.92)	-2.03*	0.841	5.01*		
Benevolent Sexism	2.24 (0.98)	2.83 (.93)	-3.24**	1.95 (.82)	2.5 (1.03)	-2.72**	2.13 (0.89)	2.26 (0.89)	2.02 (0.72)	-0.972	-3.86***	0.980	6.25***	
NEOSEXISM	3.09 (0.30)	3.04 (0.35)	.824	3.09 (0.45)	3.21 (0.35)	-1.46	3.15 (.37)	3.14 (0.41)	3.08 (0.54)	0.196	0.074	0.394	1.903	
<i>PAQ</i>														
Expressive	3.84 (0.48)	3.57 (0.47)	3.08**	3.88 (0.49)	3.80 (0.61)	0.655	3.49 (.54)	3.52 (0.50)	3.66 (0.62)	-0.334	1.33	7.85***	4.53**	
Instrumental	3.51 (0.45)	3.51 (0.58)	.071	3.41 (0.46)	3.39 (0.45)	0.210	3.34 (.52)	3.59 (0.55)	3.33 (0.53)	-3.34**	0.760	1.77	5.41**	
Instrumental-Expressive	2.51 (0.45)	2.96 (0.47)	-5.41***	2.54 (0.35)	2.76 (0.37)	2.94**	2.69 (.41)	2.90 (0.45)	2.53 (0.45)	3.39***	2.71 (0.41)	-1.51	2.82*	3.84*

Note: *p* < 0.05\*; *p* < 0.01\*\*; *p* < 0.001\*\*\*.

( $F_{(238,3)} = 6.25$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ) scales depending on the field in which they specialize. Most notably, male professors in the fields of Experimental and Health Sciences, along with those from the Technical fields, appear to hold more sexist attitudes toward women than the male professors in other areas.

Upon carrying out a univariate analysis of the PAQ, we found that female professors in the Humanities fields subscribed to more expressive traits than their female colleagues in the other fields ( $F_{(217,3)} = 7.85$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ). Significant differences were also found on the *instrumental-expressive trait scale*, with the female professors from the Social and Legal Sciences being those with the highest scores ( $F_{(216,3)} = 2.82$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ) (See Table II).

When comparing the male professors from the various fields considered, we found significant differences on the three sub-scales of the PAQ. Male professors from the Humanities fields scored highest on the *expressive trait scale* ( $F_{(259,3)} = 4.53$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ). In contrast, the male professors from the Technical fields, as well as those in the Social and Legal Sciences, scored lowest on the *expressive trait scale*, while scoring highest on the *instrumental trait scale* ( $F_{(259,3)} = 5.41$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ). And it was the male professors from the Experimental and Health Sciences who scored highest on the *instrumental-expressive trait scale* ( $F_{(256,3)} = 3.84$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ) (See Table II). No significant differences were found among the group of male professors or among the female professors on the Neosexism Scale (see Table II).

Table III shows the correlations by gender of all of the scales used. The data referring to the general sample confirm that there was a positive correlation between the sub-scales for instrumental and expressive traits ( $r = 0.12$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ); the instrumental-expressive trait scale correlated positively with that of instrumentality ( $r = 0.31$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ), while its correlation with the expressive trait scale was negative ( $r = -0.36$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ).

TABLE III  
Correlations Among the Scales by Gender

	NS	HS	BS	E	I	I/E
Neosexism (NS)		0.16 <sup>*a</sup>	0.02	-0.01	0.03	0.06
Hostile Sexism (HS)	0.29 <sup>**b</sup>		0.66 <sup>**</sup>	-0.17 <sup>*</sup>	-0.15 <sup>*</sup>	0.05
Benevolent Sexism (BS)	0.14 <sup>*</sup>	0.58 <sup>**</sup>		-0.03	-0.02	0.06
Expressive (E)	0.02	-0.01	0.14 <sup>*</sup>		0.11	-0.37 <sup>**</sup>
Instrumental (I)	-0.08	-0.08	0.01	14 <sup>*</sup>		0.20 <sup>**</sup>
Instrumental-Expressive (I/E)	-0.03	-0.01	0.01	-0.31 <sup>**</sup>	0.37 <sup>**</sup>	

Note:  $p < 0.05^*$ ;  $p < 0.01^{**}$ ; (a: women and b: men).

Contrary to the theoretical expectations, we found that the expressive trait scale correlated negatively with that of hostile sexism ( $r = -0.09$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ), as did the instrumental trait scale ( $r = -0.09$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ). Upon analyzing the data by gender (see Table III), we observe that among the male professors, the expressive trait scale correlated positively with that of benevolent sexism ( $r = 0.14$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ), whereas among female professors hostile sexism correlated negatively both with the expressive trait scale ( $r = -0.17$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ) and with the instrumental trait scale ( $r = -0.15$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ).

In line with findings from previous studies, we observed that hostile and benevolent sexism were positively correlated ( $r = 0.63$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ). Nonetheless, when comparing the Neosexism scale with the ASI, we found that neosexism only correlated with hostile sexism ( $r = 0.23$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ), but not with benevolent sexism. This suggests that what the neosexism scale measures is in fact the more traditional, latent form of sexism rather than a more subtle form with a positive affective tone to disguise it, as in the case of benevolent sexism. When comparing the two sexes, we found that among the male respondents, neosexism correlated with hostile sexism ( $r = 0.29$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ) and with benevolent sexism ( $r = 0.14$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ), whereas among the group of female respondents, neosexism only correlated with hostile sexism ( $r = 0.16$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ). Hostile and benevolent sexism continue to be strongly correlated both among the male professors ( $r = 0.58$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ) and among the female professors ( $r = 0.66$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ).

#### 4. DISCUSSION

##### 4.1. *Sexist Attitudes*

To begin with, when considering sexist attitudes, it is important to bear in mind that the population from which we have formed our sample – namely university professors – is less sexist, both in terms of hostile and benevolent sexism, than other samples studied both in Spain (Lameiras and Rodríguez, 2003) and abroad (Glick et al., 2000). As one would expect, the women in our study are less sexist than the men in their attitudes toward women, regardless of the field of study they pertain to. When comparing male professors as a group, however, we find significant differences depending on their areas of expertise: the most sexist of the male professors are those in the Technical fields and Experimental Sciences, precisely those areas which have traditionally been considered more “masculine” in nature.

Another interesting consideration comes from comparing the present sample of university professors with the general population. On the one hand, the participants in the present study hold fewer sexist attitudes as measured by the ASI (sexist attitudes regarding interpersonal relationships) than participants from previous studies using the general population (Lameiras et al., 2003; Glick et al., 2000). On the other hand, both our male and female respondents score highly on the Neosexism scale (sexist attitudes from a social perspective), a tendency which is supported by findings from previous studies (Moya and Expósito, 2000; Tougas et al., 1995).

At first glance, it may seem contradictory that such an elite and highly educated group should score so highly on the Neosexism scale. One could hypothesize that university professors comprise one of the most egalitarian groups in the workforce, one in which they do not generally experience differential salaries based on sex. For this reason, they may develop the belief that the society in which they live is indeed an egalitarian place for women and men, one in which women can excel based solely on their own capacities and skills. From a social perspective, although someone who holds neo-sexist attitudes is opposed to open discrimination against women, he/she tends to consider that as women have already achieved equality, there is no need to support public policy aimed at helping women reach a more egalitarian status in society. This would explain why female professors tend to reject affirmative action programs designed to aid women in their struggle to obtain better paid jobs which confer greater status.

Objective data reveal, however, that the university is in fact not an ideal model of equality. Whereas 35.23% of all university professors in Spain are women, they only constitute 12% of tenured full professors (INE, 2002). A report published by the European Commission (1999) on the situation of women in the sciences and in institutions of higher learning concluded that while women represent more than 50% of all college students in most European countries, fewer women than men choose to become professors and then continue to rise in the ranks until reaching the highest professional categories within the university system. In addition, the same study found that when comparing the various levels of academia hierarchically, the higher the level, the lower the percentage of women employed. What is more, in the majority of European countries, the number of female professors varies greatly from one field to another, and there is a disproportionately low percentage of women teaching in those fields of study which confer the greatest status and prestige.

These results are indeed disturbing given the great influence that university professors have both in terms of encouraging a critical collective

consciousness and fostering egalitarian attitudes in their students, who represent an elite sector of society with the potential to bring about social change.

#### 4.2. *PAQ*

In regards to instrumental and expressive traits as measured by the PAQ, as expected, the women in our study show a degree of instrumentality similar to the men, although they continue to display a higher level of expressiveness than their male counterparts, a tendency which has been observed in studies by Twenge (1997), and Spence and Buckner (2000). The male respondents in our study score higher on the *instrumental/expressive trait* scale, which combines instrumental and expressive traits. While this could be interpreted as a greater tendency toward “androgyny”, as Bem (1974) postulates, the scale’s high positive correlations with instrumentality and negative correlations with expressiveness indicate that what it primarily measures is instrumentality.

A second observation stemming from the results obtained from the PAQ involves the “egalitarian island” – as Anastasia and Miller (1998, p. 682) call it – on which female and male professors in the Technical fields “reside.” This means that they appear to hold more similar views than do the male and female professors in other fields of study. This convergence seems possible due to the fact that female professors in Technical fields score lower on expressiveness than their female colleagues in other areas, while the male professors in these fields score lower on instrumentality than do men who teach in other areas.

#### 4.3. *PAQ and Sexism*

Lastly let us consider the second objective laid out in this study: to determine the extent to which expressive-instrumental traits are in fact independent of sexist attitudes. If we find the two to be unrelated, this would help to confirm that the traits included in the PAQ (as well as the BSRI) measure concrete traits – instrumentality and expressiveness – rather than broader concepts like masculinity or femininity. Spence and Buckner (2000) postulate that while there is not likely to be any consistent connection between expressive-instrumental traits and sexist attitudes, were there to be any relationship between the two, it should be congruent with gender stereotypes. In the present study we find, as did Spence and Buckner (2000), that said relationship in fact does not follow the expected trend. The results

show that female respondents who score highest on expressiveness, as well as those who score highest on instrumentality, actually subscribe the least to hostile sexist attitudes. This seems to indicate that both extremes – highly expressive and highly instrumental women – reject any sort of overt discrimination toward women.

Spence and Buckner (2000) have also found that the most expressive women subscribe less to hostile sexist attitudes. They explain these seemingly counter-intuitive results by alluding to the expressive nature of these women, who are interpersonally oriented and concerned for the general well-being of others; thereby, they are inclined to deny all negative views about others – in this case, hostile sexist attitudes toward women. However, if we examine what these authors have said repeatedly (Spence, 1993), the PAQ actually measures expressiveness, a trait which is not interchangeable with femininity. As such, the aforementioned findings are “logical,” given that a positive correlation between hostile sexism and femininity would be easily explained, but not necessarily so between hostile sexism and expressiveness. Thus, what the data in fact reveal is in no way startling.

Thus, the findings from the present study appear to reaffirm that the most overtly hostile sexist attitudes toward women are rejected both by women who subscribe to more stereotyped gender traits (expressiveness) and by those who adhere to traits which are typically associated with masculinity but which are now present to a similar extent in both sexes (instrumentality). We also find that there is no clear connection between one’s adherence to sexist attitudes and one’s field of study, even in the case of the fields which are typically considered the least feminine (Technical fields).

In examining the results obtained from the PAQ for the male respondents, we find, as Spence and Buckner (2000) do, that there is a significant positive correlation between expressiveness and benevolent sexism. The men who are more expressive appear to retain sexist and discriminatory attitudes toward women, albeit while maintaining a positive tone in the process. In response to these results, which are once again contrary to the theoretical expectations, Spence and Buckner (2000) offer a merely speculative ad hoc explanation whereby the expressive traits found in these men, which do not follow gender stereotyped lines, allow them to be more positive in their reactions toward women and to show more sympathy with their cause. However, we must bear in mind that benevolent sexism, despite its positive affective tone, continues to be a sexist attitude which “values” the qualities in women which make them good wives and mothers, and by doing so, aims to maintain gender roles. In so doing, benevolent sexist attitudes continue to relegate women to a place in society which is distinct from men’s as well as

serving to perpetuate women's dependency on men (Glick and Fiske, 1996, Glick et al., 2000).

To sum up, there are several key points we would like to emphasize from the findings in this study. As we have attempted to replicate a study by Spence and Buckner using a different group of participants, we must first examine in what ways our studies and findings differ. First of all, it is essential to point out that we have obtained the same results as they did, revealing a clear connection between sexist attitudes and the results from the PAQ. Spence and Buckner initially surmised that any connection between sexist attitudes and expressiveness/instrumentality would be predictable based on gender stereotypes: the more expressive the woman and the more instrumental the man, the more sexist their attitudes would be. As this was not what they found, they offered an alternative explanation. While we believe that Spence and Buckner's interpretation of those results was quite valid, it was the theoretical expectations they proposed which we find to be flawed. Did they perhaps fall into the very same trap they were trying to avoid – namely confusing the concepts of instrumentality and expressiveness with those of masculinity and femininity? If these two constructs are indeed two very separate things, then the results are not so surprising. An expressive man tends to hold more benevolent sexist attitudes toward women, but he is not necessarily more *feminine* than the more instrumental men are. And instrumental women tend to adhere more to sexist attitudes than do expressive women, but they are not necessarily more *masculine* than the more expressive women are. If we continue to remind ourselves that these concepts are in fact distinct, we will avoid such pitfalls and begin to understand the complex factors involved in the formation of men's and women's gender identities as well as their sexist beliefs. We hope future research will continue to shed light on the subtle underlying factors which play a part in forming one's own concept of gender and one's sexist attitudes, as well as the connection between the two.

#### REFERENCES

- Anastasia, I. and M.D. Miller: 1998, 'Sex and gender: A study of University Professors'. *Sex Roles* 38(7/8), pp. 675–683.
- Aube, J., H. Norcliffe and R. Koestner: 1995, 'Physical characteristics and the multifactorial approach to gender characteristics'. *Social Behavior and Personality* 23, pp. 69–82.
- Bem, S.L.: 1974, 'The measurement of psychological androgyny'. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 42, pp. 155–162.

- Blau, F.D., M.A. Ferber and A.E. Winkler: 1998, *The Economics of Women, Men and Work* 3 ed. (Prentice-Hall, Saddle River, NJ).
- Cantalapiedra, M. and E. Panizo: 2002, 'Evolución reciente y perspectivas de fecundidad en España'. *Revista Pediátrica de Atención Primaria* 4(13), pp. 31–56.
- Comisión Europea: 1999, *El empleo en Europa*, 1998. Dirección General de Empleo, Relaciones Industriales y Asuntos Sociales.
- Constantinople, A.: 1973, 'Masculinity–femininity: An exception to a famous dictum?'. *Psychological Bulletin* 80, pp. 389–407.
- Eagly, A.: 1995, 'The science and politics of comparing women and men'. *American Psychologist* 50(3), pp. 145–158.
- EUROSTAT: 2002, *Inquiry on National Collection of Services Produces Prices*. OECD.
- Expósito, F., M. Moya and P. Glick: 1998, 'Sexismo ambivalente: Medición y correlatos'. *Revista de Psicología Social* 13(2), pp. 159–169.
- Glick, P.Y and S.T. Fiske: 1996, 'The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism'. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 70, pp. 491–512.
- Glick, P., S.T. Fiske, A. Mladinic, J.L. Saiz, D. Abrams, B. Masser, B. Adetoun, J.E. Osagie, A. Akande, A. Alao, A. Brunner, T.M. Willemsen, K. Chipeta, B. Dardenne, A. Dijksterhuis, D. Wigboldus, T. Eckes, Y. Six-Materna, F. Expósito, M. Moya, M. Foddy, H.J. Kim, M. Lameiras, M.J. Sotelo, A. Mucchi-Faina, M. Romani, N. Sakalli, B. Udegbe, M. Yamamoto, M. Ui and M.C. Ferreira: 2000, 'Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: Hostile and benevolent sexism across cultures'. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 79, pp. 763–775.
- INE: 2002, Instituto Nacional de Estadística (INE, Madrid).
- INE: 2004, Instituto Nacional de Estadística (INE, Madrid).
- Instituto de la Mujer: 2004, *Indicadores laborales básicos de la situación de la mujer en España y sus regiones* (Instituto de la Mujer, Madrid).
- Koestner, R. and J. y Aube: 1995, 'A multifactorial approach to the study of gender characteristics'. *Journal of Personality* 63, pp. 681–709.
- Lameiras, M. and Y. Rodríguez: 2003, *Evaluación del sexismo ambivalente en estudiantes gallegos/as*. *Revista de Acción Psicológica* 2(2), pp. 131–136.
- Lameiras, M., Y. Rodríguez Castro and M. González Lorenzo: 2004, 'Evolution of hostile sexism and benevolent sexism in a Spanish sample'. *Social Indicators Research* 66, pp. 197–211.
- Lenney, E.: 1991, 'The measurement of masculinity, femininity and androgyny', in J.P. Robinson, P.R. Shaver and L.S. Wrightsman (eds.), *Measures of Personality and Social Psychological Attitudes*, Academic Press, San Diego, CA, pp. 140.
- Lennon, M.C. and S. Rosenfield: 1994, 'Relative fairness and the division of housework'. *The importance of options*. *American Journal of Sociology* 100, pp. 506–531.
- Moya, M. and y Expósito, F.: 2000, *Antecedentes y Consecuencias del Neosexismo en Varones y Mujeres de la misma Organización Laboral*. En D. Caballero, M.T. Méndez, y J. Pastor (eds.), *La Mirada Psicosociológica. Grupos, Procesos, y Lenguajes* (Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva), pp. 619–625.
- Moya, M. and F. Expósito: 2001, *Nuevas formas, viejos intereses: neosexismo en varones españoles*. *Psicothema* 13(4), pp. 643–649.
- Marsh, H.W. and B.M. Byrne: 1991, 'Differentiated additive androgyny model: Relations between masculinity, femininity and multiple dimensions of self-concept'. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 61, pp. 811–828.
- Parsons, T. and R.F. Bales: 1955, *Family, Socialization, and Interaction Process* (Free Press, New York).
- Spence, J.T. and C. Buckner: 2000, 'Instrumental and expressive traits, trait stereotypes, and sexist attitudes. What do they signify?'. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 24, pp. 44–62.



- Spence, J.T.: 1993, 'Gender-related traits and gender ideology: Evidence for a multifactorial theory'. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 64(4), pp. 624–635.
- Spence, J.T. and R.L. Helmreich: 1978, *Masculinity and Femininity: Their Psychological Dimensions, Correlates, and Antecedents* (University of Texas Press, Austin).
- Spence, J.T., R.L. Helmreich and J. Stapp: 1974, 'The Personal Attributes Questionnaire: A measure of sex-role stereotypes and masculinity–femininity'. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology* 4, pp. 43–44.
- Terman, L.M. and C.C. Miles: 1936, *Sex and Personality* (McGraw Hill, New York).
- Tougas, F., R. Brown, A.M. Beaton and S. Joly: 1995, 'Neosexism: Plus ça change, plus c'est pareil'. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 21(8), pp. 842–849.
- Twenge, J.M.: 1997, 'Changes in masculine and feminine traits over time: A meta-analysis'. *Sex Roles* 36(5/6), pp. 305–325.
- UGT: 2004, *Unión General de Trabajadores* (UGT, Madrid).
- Vergara, A.I. and D. y Páez: 1993, 'Revisión teórico-metodológica de los instrumentos para la medición de la identidad de género'. *Revista de Psicología Social* 8(2), pp. 132–152.
- Williams, J.E., R.C. Satterwhite and D.L. Best: 1999, 'Pancultural gender stereotypes revisited: The five factor model'. *Sex Roles* 40(7/8), pp. 513–525.

*Faculty of Education*  
*University of Vigo*  
*Campus Ourense, Avda. Castela s/n*  
*32004, Ourense*  
*Spain*  
*E-mail: lameiras@uvigo.es*

M. L. Fernández