

Double Standards and Perceptions of Double Standards in Attitudes Toward  
the Roles of Men and Women

By

Kathleen A. Fortune

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of the University of  
Manitoba in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Psychology

University of Manitoba

Winnipeg, Manitoba

© Copyright by Kathleen A. Fortune, July 2006

**THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA**  
**FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES**  
\*\*\*\*\*  
**COPYRIGHT PERMISSION**

**Double Standards and Perceptions of Double Standards in Attitudes Toward  
the Roles of Men and Women**

**BY**

**Kathleen A. Fortune**

**A Thesis/Practicum submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of The University of  
Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirement of the degree**

**OF**

**MASTER OF ARTS**

**Kathleen A. Fortune © 2006**

**Permission has been granted to the Library of the University of Manitoba to lend or sell copies of this thesis/practicum, to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and to University Microfilms Inc. to publish an abstract of this thesis/practicum.**

**This reproduction or copy of this thesis has been made available by authority of the copyright owner solely for the purpose of private study and research, and may only be reproduced and copied as permitted by copyright laws or with express written authorization from the copyright owner.**

## Abstract

Two studies examined double standards in attitudes toward appropriate roles and behaviors for women and men. A double standard is an attitude that more strongly supports rights, freedoms, and opportunities for one sex more than the other. Double standards were measured using a “mirror-image” time-delay method that minimizes social desirability concerns and a “mirror-image” simultaneous method that increases social desirability concerns. In addition, participants’ beliefs about the attitudes of the “typical male” and “typical female” were measured. Results indicated that overall participants endorsed a pro-female bias. Female participants endorsed pro-female double standards in five domains; male participants endorsed pro-female double standards in three domains, and no double standards in two domains. Participants believed that overall, the “typical female” endorsed pro-female double standards and the “typical male” endorsed pro-male double standards.

### Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to the members of my examining committee, not only for their invaluable input, but also for their unfailing support of the importance of this type of research. Thank you Dr. Stephen Brickey, Dr. Jacquie Vorauer, and Dr. Gerry Sande, for sharing your insights and expertise with me. You are each an example of the kind of researcher and human being that I aspire to be. It has been a pleasure and an honour to complete this project under your guidance.

Dr. Gerry Sande, your wisdom is matched only by the size of your heart and your steadfast belief in my ability to achieve everything I set out to has been the foundation on which I have based my success. You have seen me through every conceivable challenge with kindness, empathy, and endless amounts of patience. If it is possible to repay you, I hope to do so by becoming all that you have always believed that I could.

Graduate school is about more than coursework and a thesis; it is about surrounding oneself with an intellectual community that helps to shape you as a human being. I want to take this opportunity to thank the community of friends that have urged, pushed, and sometimes carried me along this academic journey. None of this would have been possible without you. Thank you to my family for encouraging me to pursue my dreams despite every obstacle and for listening at the other end of the phone line every time I needed to vent.

Thank you Kristin for being my best friend and partner. Thank you for your love and support. You give my life meaning and understand implicitly how important this achievement is to me.

Table of Contents

Abstract ..... ii

Acknowledgements ..... iii

Table of Contents ..... iv

List of Tables ..... vii

Defining Double Standards ..... 1

Measurement of Double Standards ..... 6

    Double Standards Domains ..... 10

        Education and Career ..... 10

        Sexual Behavior ..... 12

        Violent Behavior ..... 14

        Public Behavior ..... 16

        Parenting Responsibilities ..... 17

    Theoretical Explanations ..... 19

        Self-interest and perceived self-interest ..... 20

        Automatic In-group Bias ..... 21

        Stereotype Inaccuracy ..... 23

Hypotheses ..... 28

Method ..... 29

    Mirror-Image Double Standards Questionnaire ..... 29

    Study 1 Participants ..... 30

    Study 1 Procedure ..... 30

    Study 2 Participants ..... 31

Study 2 Procedure ..... 31

Analyses ..... 32

    Calculating a Double Standard ..... 32

    Item Sorting ..... 33

Results ..... 35

    Personal Endorsement of Double Standards: Time-Delay ..... 35

    Personal Endorsement of Double Standards: Simultaneous ..... 36

    Perceptions of the Typical Female ..... 38

    Perceptions of the Typical Male ..... 41

    Personal Endorsement versus Perceptions of Typical Female s ..... 44

    Personal Endorsement versus Perceptions of Typical Male..... 45

    Correlation between personal endorsement and perceptions..... 46

    Distribution and Analyses of Quartile Groups ..... 47

General Discussion ..... 48

    Domain Discussion ..... 50

    Simultaneous Sample ..... 55

    Typical Female and Typical Male ..... 58

    Correlational Analyses ..... 61

    Future Directions ..... 62

References ..... 65

Appendix A

    Mirror-Image Double Standards Questionnaire Version 1..... 70

Appendix B

Mirror-Image Double Standards Questionnaire Version 2 .....	73
Appendix C	
Domains, Index of Priorities, and Individual Item Breakdown .....	76
Appendix D	
Informed Consent .....	77

## List of Tables

Table 1 – Analysis of Variance Results for Domain, Sex of Participants, Sex of Target, and Order Variables for the “Mirror-Image” Time-Delay Sample .....	78
Table 2 – Domain Means and Standards Deviations for the “Mirror-Image” Time-Delay Sample .....	79
Table 3 – Domain Means and Standard Deviations for the “Mirror-Image” Simultaneous Sample .....	80
Table 4 – Domain Means and Standard Deviations for Perceptions of the “Typical Female” in the “Mirror-Image” Time-Delay Sample.....	81
Table 5 – Domain Means and Standard Deviations for Perceptions of the “Typical Female” in the “Mirror-Image” Simultaneous Sample.....	82
Table 6 – Domain Means and Standard Deviations for Perceptions of the “Typical Male” in the “Mirror-Image” Time-Delay Sample.....	83
Table 7 – Domain Means and Standard Deviations for Perceptions of the “Typical Male” in the “Mirror-Image” Simultaneous Sample.....	84
Table 8 – Analysis of Variance for Sexual Behavior for the “Mirror-Image” Time Delay and “Mirror-Image” Simultaneous Samples.....	85
Table 9 – Analysis of Variance for Parenting Responsibilities for the “Mirror-Image” Time Delay and “Mirror-Image” Simultaneous Samples.....	86
Table 10 – Analysis of Variance for Public Behavior for the “Mirror-Image” Time Delay and “Mirror-Image” Simultaneous Samples.....	87
Table 11 – Analysis of Variance for Career Opportunities for the “Mirror-Image” Time Delay and Simultaneous Samples.....	88



Table 12 – Analysis of Variance for Violent Behavior for the “Mirror-Image” Time Delay and Simultaneous Samples.....	89
Table 13 – Analysis of Variance for Sexual Behavior for Perceptions of the “Typical Female” in the “Mirror-Image” Time-Delay and Simultaneous Samples.....	90
Table 14 – Analysis of Variance for Parenting for Perceptions of the “Typical Female” in the “Mirror-Image” Time-Delay and Simultaneous Samples.....	91
Table 15 – Analysis of Variance for Public Behavior for Perceptions of the “Typical Female” in the “Mirror-Image” Time-Delay and Simultaneous Samples.....	92
Table 16 – Analysis of Variance for Career Opportunities for Perceptions of the “Typical Female” in the “Mirror-Image” Time-Delay and Simultaneous Samples.....	93
Table 17 – Analysis of Variance for Violent Behavior for Perceptions of the “Typical Female” in the “Mirror-Image” Time-Delay and Simultaneous Samples.....	94
Table 18 – Analysis of Variance for Sexual Behavior for Perceptions of the “Typical Male” in the “Mirror-Image” Time-Delay and Simultaneous Samples.....	95
Table 19 - Analysis of Variance for Parenting for Perceptions of the “Typical Male” in the “Mirror-Image” Time-Delay and Simultaneous Samples.....	96
Table 20 – Analysis of Variance for Public Behavior for Perceptions of the “Typical Male” in the “Mirror-Image” Time-Delay and Simultaneous Samples.....	97
Table 21 – Analysis of Variance for Career Opportunities for Perceptions of the “Typical Male” in the “Mirror-Image” Time-Delay and Simultaneous Samples.....	98
Table 22 – Analysis of Variance for Violent Behavior for Perceptions of the “Typical Male” in the “Mirror-Image” Time-Delay and Simultaneous Samples.....	99

Table 23 – Correlations between Personal Endorsement of Double Standards and Perceptions of Others’ endorsement of Double Standards..... 100

Table 24 – Correlations between Personal Endorsement of Double Standards and Perceptions of “Typical Male” and “Typical Female” Double Standards in Parenting. .... 101

Table 25 – Correlations between Personal Endorsement of Double Standards and Perceptions of “Typical Male” and “Typical Female” Double Standards in Public Behavior..... 102

Table 26 – Correlations between Personal Endorsement of Double Standards and Perceptions of “Typical Male” and “Typical Female” Double Standards in Career Opportunities..... 103

Table 27 – Correlations between Personal Endorsement of Double Standards and Perceptions of “Typical Male” and “Typical Female” Double Standards in Violent Behavior..... 104

Table 28 – Analysis of Variance for Participants Double Standards (Self) and Perceptions of the “Typical Female” Double Standards (Typical Female)..... 105

Table 29 – Analysis of Variance for Participants Double Standards (Self) and Perceptions of the “Typical Male” Double Standards (Typical Male)..... 106

Table 30 – Means and Standard Deviations for Individual MIDSQ Items..... 107

Table 31 – Difference Scores by Quartile Group for each domain. .... 108

## Double Standards and Perceptions of Double Standards in Attitudes Toward the Roles of Men and Women.

This research examined double standards in attitudes held by men and women. In the context of gender roles, double standards are beliefs that afford different rights, freedoms, and opportunities to one gender than to another. The Attitudes Toward Women Scale (ATWS) provides several examples of traditional double standards. One item from the ATWS states, "Sons in a family should be given more encouragement to go to college than daughters." Another item states, "Swearing and obscenity are more repulsive in the speech of a woman than a man." A third item states, "The intellectual leadership of a community should be largely in the hands of men." (Spence & Helmreich, 1972).

Traditional double standards favor men by affording them more freedom and power, thereby limiting possibilities for women with respect to the roles they are free to occupy within society. In the occupational setting for example, traditional double standards resulted in barriers to entry into professions such as engineering, or gender segregation, such that more women were given more encouragement to become elementary school teachers than they were to become surgeons.

Traditional double standards are rooted in beliefs about the traits that characterize men and women. For example, women may be perceived as passive, nurturing, and emotional whereas men are perceived as strong, stoic, and assertive. Furthermore, Rosenkrantz et al. reported that these traits were evaluated differently and that "regardless of their gender, students attributed more socially desirable traits to men than to women" (as cited in Nesbitt and Penn, 2000, p. 493).

Beliefs about the traits that characterize men and women constitute stereotypes, or “beliefs about the personal attributes of a group of people” (Myers and Spencer, 2004, p. 558). Group membership takes on many forms, including, but not limited to: religious, ethnic, political, or gender. Stereotypes also form the basis for social roles. Roles are sets of norms or tacit rules that prescribe appropriate social behaviour for a group of people. For example, if one believes that men possess inherent leadership ability, it follows that one would believe that leadership roles are more appropriate for men. If one believes that women are inherently nurturing, it follows that one would believe that care giving roles like parenting and teaching are more appropriate for women. When an individual believes that a certain role or behaviour is appropriate for one gender but not for another, they are endorsing a double standard. Double standards need not be black and white but rather, can be evidenced in the degree of acceptability one endorses for certain roles for men and for women. For example, an individual may believe it is acceptable for both genders to be teachers but that it is significantly more appropriate for a woman than a man. Alternatively, an individual might believe it is acceptable for both men and women to be doctors but that it is significantly more acceptable for men than it is for women.

The result of traditional double standards was evidenced not only in the exclusion of women from certain roles but also in beliefs about the importance of higher education for women. If one believes that a woman’s role is more appropriately in the home than it is in the workplace, this may lead to a devaluing of the importance of higher education for women. It is important to note that although traditional double standards favour men, they also limit the opportunities and roles open to men. For example, if men are viewed

as less nurturing, it follows that they are also viewed as less capable parents, which profoundly influences custody decisions following divorce.

Essentially, beliefs about traits lead to gendered behaviour on the part of men and women and this behaviour reinforces beliefs about the inherent traits of men and women. Thus, if you were never witness to a woman in a political leadership role or a man bathing and clothing children, you might never be forced to question your beliefs.

Even when you encounter evidence that contradicts your gender stereotypes, it may be difficult to change your beliefs. People have so much invested in these beliefs that they will engage in dissonance reducing behaviour rather than dealing with the potential that their beliefs are indeed wrong. For example, different attributions are made to explain violence perpetrated by a woman as opposed to violence perpetrated by a man. When a man is violent, people cite men's natural aggression but when a woman is violent, it may be explained away as being defensive or self-protective in nature. Moreover, the punishment for violence is different for men than it is for women. The sentences imposed for violent crimes are, with the exception of extreme cases, considerably more lenient for female perpetrators than they are for male perpetrators. According to Plaks, Stroessner, Dweck, and Sherman (2001), "Selectively seizing stereotype-confirming information and deflecting stereotype-disconfirming information may be a key mechanism that serves to accumulate mostly stereotype-confirming information in memory, thereby supporting the validity of the stereotype" (p. 890).

The stereotype of men as less nurturing may result in men being excluded from jobs that involve working with children, thus preventing them from engaging in behaviour that would contradict the stereotype. Alternatively, if men are hired for these

kinds of positions, they may be labelled as effeminate, homosexual, or predatory, in an attempt to avoid acknowledging the reality that some men are nurturing. In other words, some individuals may be more likely to “preserve a stereotype by “fencing off” the inconsistent target as a subtype of the larger group” (Plaks et al., 2001, p. 890). This may contribute to the development and maintenance of double standards such that despite significant changes in the behaviours and roles of men and women certain contradictory evidence is overlooked in order that the gender stereotypes are maintained.

However, social change has led to the introduction of new laws preventing discrimination in hiring and promotion decisions. In addition, institutional policies such as affirmative action encourage applications from women into predominantly male occupational fields. Nesbitt and Penn (2000) noted the fact that economic change had brought many more women into the workforce, particularly into previously male-dominated professions. Moreover, discrimination against women in the form of sexism and sexual harassment were openly discussed and were frequently prosecuted under the law. This substantive change can be largely attributed to the work of early feminists who sought to eliminate barriers for women into male-dominated professions and to expand on the social roles women were free to occupy.

These changes are evident with respect to levels of higher education. Presently there are more women than men graduating from Canadian universities. According to Statistics Canada (2005), approximately 102,790 females graduated from Canadian universities in the 1999-2000 academic year as compared to approximately 72,765 males. Although there is still considerable gender segregation, women have infiltrated even the most male-dominated areas of study and are working in increasing numbers in all fields.

Harris and Firestone (1998) suggested that increasing participation in the workforce is associated with more non-traditional gender role attitudes on the part of women. It appears that no such research has been done with respect to change in men's attitudes because of participation in female-dominated professions.

Citing this social change, Nesbitt and Penn (2000) sought to replicate Rosenkrantz et al.'s findings regarding the social desirability of traits attribute to males and females. They referenced a study by Der Karabetian and Smith (1977) that suggested a shift was occurring in the way that men and women were viewed by one another. Der Karabetian and Smith found that women "assigned higher social desirability to traits associated with their own sex, whereas men valued traits associated with men and women equally" (p.195). Nesbitt and Penn (2000) asked 240 male and female university students to complete the Sex Role Stereotypes Questionnaire and then selected 103 of those students to complete the Social Desirability Questionnaire. As they had in Rosenkrantz et al.'s study, men and women agreed on the traits characteristic of men and women. When asked to rate the social desirability of the traits, male and female participants assigned greater social desirability to the traits characteristic of the typical woman. This difference was particularly significant when women rated social desirability. In other words, female participants assigned significantly more social desirability to traits associated with women than did male participants.

This shift in the social desirability of male and female traits and the increasing numbers of women employed in the workforce raise the question of whether beliefs about the nature of men and women have also changed and thus diminished traditional double standards. If we measure double standards today, would we still find traditional attitudes

about the appropriate behaviours, roles, and aspirations of men and women? Have traditional double standards persisted in some domains and disappeared in others?

#### Measurement of Double Standards

In order to explore these possibilities we can assess traditional double standards using attitude measures. Previous research examining double standards relied heavily on scales that were originally developed to measure gender role attitudes and sexist attitudes. Two widely used measures include Benson and Vincent's (1980) Sexist Attitudes Toward Women Scale (SATWS) that measures several aspects of sexism toward women and Spence and Helmreich's (1972) Attitudes Toward Women scale (AWS) which measures beliefs about women in various domains.

These scales are fundamentally limited by the degree of transparency and the social desirability bias built into the statements. For example, the SATWS asked participants to agree or disagree with statements such as "*men will always be the dominant sex*" (Benson & Vincent, 1980). Current social norms strongly prohibit the endorsement of such blatantly sexist beliefs, so participants have strong motives to answer in a manner consistent with the norm. An even greater limitation of scales like the SATWS is that they require participants to judge the roles of men and women within the same item. For example, in judging the roles appropriate for men and women, one example item stated, "*A working wife should not be hired for a job if there is a family man who needs it*" (Benson & Vincent, 1980).

The "Mirror-Image" Double Standards Questionnaire (MIDSQ), developed by Sande (1990), addresses these limitations in two ways (see Appendices A & B). First, the MIDSQ measures double standard attitudes across five domains (sexual behaviour,



violent behaviour, public behaviour, parenting responsibilities, career opportunities). To the researcher's knowledge, no other scale has measured double standards across multiple domains. Additionally, unlike the previous scales, the participants respond to the roles of men in one version and the roles of women in the other version. For example, one version stated, "*In today's technological society, one of the parents' first priorities should be to ensure that their sons go to college or university,*" while the other version states, "*In today's technological society, one of the parents' first priorities should be to ensure that their daughters go to college or university.*" A time lag of approximately eight weeks between completing each version reduces the potential for any suspicion on the part of the participants. In presenting the items this way, judgements about the appropriate roles for men and women can be made separately and this reduces the level of transparency as well as socially desirable responding.

Research examining double standards may be heavily influenced by methodology. Within their review of the literature, Crawford and Popp (2000) found experimental designs, ethnographies, interviews, focus groups, and linguistic analyses all being used to measure sexual double standards. For example, Milhausen and Herold (1999) used only two items to measure perceptions of societal double standards and one indirect item to measure personal endorsement of double standards. In contrast, Sprecher, Regan, McKinney, Maxwell, and Wazienski (1997) utilised three versions of a mate selection preference list containing 18 partner traits to assess sexual double standards. Such a variety of methodologies makes comparing their results nearly impossible and may account for a large amount of the variability. Crawford and Popp (2003) suggested that within-subjects designs like that employed by the MIDSQ provide the purest test of

double standards, but few studies in this field employ such an approach. In over two decades of research, Crawford and Popp found only five studies evidencing double standards. However, they noted that the two studies utilizing the within-subjects design both found double standards.

The MIDSQ employs a within-subjects design and double standards are calculated by comparing the mean score for female behavior with the mean score for male behavior. For example, if an individual strongly agreed with the item stating, "I do not think men should hug their male friends in public," but only slightly agreed with the "mirror-image" item stating, "I do not think that women should hug their female friends in public," a double standard was recorded. However, if an individual strongly agreed or disagreed with both statements for example, no double standard was recorded.

Sande (1993) asked University of Manitoba undergraduate students to complete both versions of the 37-item double standards scale, with a time lag of one month. Sande anticipated finding some traditional or pro-male double standards on a significant number of the 37 items and no double standards on a few items. Analysis of the 37-items indicated that female participants endorsed pro-female double standards on 31 items, pro-male double standards on two items, and no double standards on the remaining four items. In contrast, male participants endorsed pro-female double standards on 12 items, pro-male double standards on 10 items, and no double standard on the remaining 15 items.

Fortune, Sande, and Kohut (2005) replicated the design of Sande's (1993) study with 200 University of Manitoba undergraduate students completing both versions of the double standards questionnaire approximately one month apart. Taking into consideration

the results of Sande (1993), the researchers made significantly different predictions than had been made in the former study. They expected to find several pro-female double standards and a few items on which no double standards were endorsed. The results were in the predicted direction.

Unlike Sande (1993), Fortune, Sande, Kohut (2005) grouped the 37 items into six domains using a qualitative sorting technique. Sorters were asked to place the items into one of the six domains as they believed was most appropriate and they were told to leave out the items that they did not see as fitting into any of the domains. For 31 of the items, consensus ranged between 75 and 90 percent and six items that did not reach minimum consensus were excluded from analyses. The six domains; sexual behaviour, public behaviour, violent behaviour, parenting, relationship with partner, and education/career were analysed individually.

Female participants endorsed pro-female double standards in five of the six domains. In the domain of education and career, they endorsed pro-female responses, but they did not reach significance. Males endorsed pro-female double standards in four of the six domains. In the domains of education and career, as well as in parenting, males endorsed pro-female double standards that did not reach significance. A number of potential predictors were analysed, including college major, religious affiliation, personal values, and parental education. Of these predictors, only parental education appeared to influence the pervasive pro-female endorsements. The only group to endorse pro-male double standards was a small number of males whose parents did not have a university education. Even this small result was limited to the domain of parenting. In addition,

females whose parents did not have a university education held the most extreme pro-female double standards in the domain of sexual behaviour.

Although research examining double standards is not new, a search of the literature reveals a paucity in certain domains. For example, there has been considerable research in the domains of sexual behaviour, violence, and education, but very little in the domains of parenting and public behavior. The following is a brief summary of the literature available on several of these domains.

### Double Standards Domains

#### *Education and Career*

According to 1995 statistics released by the U.S Department of Labour, "The number of women between the ages of 20 and 54 employed in the American labour force has increased from about 30% in 1945 to nearly 70% in 1995" (as cited in Rider, 2000, p. 247). Although women are employed in all areas of the work force, considerable gender segregation still exists in the workplace, with men and women concentrated in different occupations. Phillips & Imhoff (1997) conducted a review of a decade of research on women and career development and concluded that there was strong evidence that occupational stereotypes are not only formed early but continue to be manifest in secondary school and college, and are further reinforced by the media.

One division of gender stereotypes includes occupational stereotypes. These are cultural expectations that prescribe what occupations are appropriate for men and women to persist. Judd and Oswald (as cited in Rider, 2000) asked college students about the gender-typed occupations of secretary and firefighter. Both women and men gave the most positive ratings to men with masculine traits applying for the firefighter position

and to women with feminine traits applying for the secretarial position. Men with feminine traits applying for the secretarial position were rated most negatively. Yoder and Schleicher (1996) found that college students rated female electricians and electrical engineers – two stereotypically masculine professions, as less likeable, less attractive, and less feminine.

According to Frehill (as cited in Benokraitis, 1997), “women continue to represent less than 20% of all engineering college graduates, so they are likely to continue to face the pressures associated with token status” (p. 133). Fassinger (as cited in Diamont and Lee, 2002) suggests that the “pervasive beliefs about the appropriateness of particular jobs for men and women that are based on widely held societal and individual gender roles limit choices for both sexes.” (p. 22).

Fassinger and O’Brien cite chemistry as one example of a field that has been resistant to change despite a widely publicized influx of women in the 1980’s. According to Fassinger and O’Brien, preceding this influx many of the top chemistry departments in the United States had no female faculty and 20 years later, had one female faculty member at most.

However, Murray (as cited in Benokraitis, 1997) noted that “men make up only 3-5% of all child care workers in the U.S.”(p.139). She suggests that just the mere presence of male workers in the childcare field violates normative conceptions regarding what work men should be doing. Murray states that when men do cross this boundary, they face challenges to their heterosexuality and masculinity. Male childcare workers are restricted in touching, cuddling, and napping the children to avoid any potential accusations of abuse, while no such restrictions are placed on female workers.

Kimmel (as cited in Benokraitis, 2004) cited several examples of occupational discrimination faced by males entering primarily female professions. "It is popularly assumed that male nurses are gay. Male librarians encounter images of themselves as wimpy and asexual. Male social workers are typecast as feminine and passive. Elementary school teachers and daycare workers are confronted by suspicions of being pedophiles" (p.302).

### *Sexual Behaviour*

As defined by Gentry (1998), a sexual double standard exists when society accepts and tolerates certain sexual behaviours, such as premarital sex, for men, but not for women. The double standard prescribed that boys had to "sow their wild oats," while girls were warned that a future husband "won't buy the cow if he can get the milk for free" (Crawford & Unger, 2000, p. 288).

Previous research in this area has supported the existence of these double standards. Reiss (as cited in Crawford and Popp, 2003) conducted a significant foray into the field of sexual double standards in the early 1960's. He believed that societal norms had moved beyond this dichotomous double standard for the sexual behaviour of boys and girls and into more transitory categories of acceptability. Reiss classified attitudes toward premarital sex into four categories: abstinence (wrong for both sexes), double standard (acceptable for men but not for women), permissiveness with affection (acceptable for both), and permissiveness without affection (acceptable for both). Within these categories, subtypes were delineated. For example, within the double standard category Reiss distinguished between an orthodox view that permitted premarital sex for

males but not for female under any circumstances, and a transitional view that permitted intercourse for females only if they were in love or engaged.

It is important to note that although Reiss predicted a trend toward increased sex-role equality, he did not include a fifth category that permitted certain sexual behaviour for women but not for men. It is likely that at the time of his work in the late 1960's, no such standard was espoused, but the fact that he did not even attempt to measure such a view, suggests a biased study. Without such a category, the study is not a complete design and makes assumptions about the nature of men and women's views without evidence to support such assumptions. Results of recent studies by (Fortune, Sande, and Kohut, 2005; Sande, 1993) indicate that such a category is certainly needed and allows for a more accurate picture of gender role attitudes to emerge.

In order to measure these attitudes Reiss (as cited in Crawford and Popp, 2003) devised a pair of parallel 12-items scales, one with a male referent, and one with a female referent. Although he did find evidence of a traditional double standard, it was a minority view held most often by men, and the majority of men and women endorsed abstinence for both or permissiveness for both. Research by Peplau, Rubin, and Hill (1977), suggested that by the late 1970's most young people had come to hold virtually the same sexual standards. They found that men and women judged it equally acceptable for either sex to have premarital sex.

Milhausen and Herold (1999) asked female participants to complete a measure of perceptions of societal double standards and a measure of personal endorsement of double standards. Overwhelmingly, 95% definitely or probably believed there was a double standard for sexual behaviour that favoured men. Approximately 93% of

participants believed that women who have many sexual partners are judged more harshly than men who do so. However, an unexpected result emerged as 42% of women believed that it is other women who judge women who have had many sexual partners more harshly. With respect to personal endorsement of double standards, results showed that “women were more likely to discourage a female friend from dating a man who has 10 previous partners than to discourage a male friend from dating a woman who had 10 previous partners.” (Milhausen & Herold, 1999, p. 365).

These results do not fit with the previous research in that they find evidence of at least a perceived double standard favouring men. According to Crawford and Popp (2003) the heterosexual double standard has been a “now you see it, now you don’t” phenomenon. They suggest that despite claims that double standards are slowly fading away, they may exist in contemporary forms that continue to influence the behaviour of men and women.

### *Violent Behaviour*

Simon et al. (2001) found that, consistent with previous research, both male and female respondents were more tolerant of women hitting men than of men hitting women. Straus (as cited in Simon et al., 2001) found the approval of a husband using violence against his wife has dropped dramatically in the U.S since 1968 but approval for a wife using violence against her husband has remained stable. Analysis of the results of a 1994 Gallup survey on marital violence by Straus et al. (as cited in Simon et al., 2001) revealed that when asked if there were “any situation that you can imagine in which you would approve of a wife slapping a husband,” approximately 22% said yes. (p.120). In contrast, approximately 10% approved of a husband slapping a wife.



Research by Harris and Knight-Bohnhoff (1996) found that although most participants thought aggression was equally unacceptable from a man or a woman, those who did judge aggression differently, judged men's aggression as less acceptable. There is evidence that people attribute greater aggressiveness to men than to women, and that people perceive greater aggression when the target is a woman than a man. Furthermore, research suggests that people view aggression as less acceptable when a man is the aggressor or a woman the target. (Harris & Knight-Bohnhoff, 1996).

Stewart-Williams (2002) suggested that when it comes to violence between partners, we see what we expect to see. In ambiguous situations, people are likely to interpret events in a manner consistent with their expectations or schemas. Mildly inconsistent information is likely to be assimilated in to the schema. Fiske and Taylor (as cited in Stewart-Williams, 2002), suggest that the stronger the schema is, the more inconsistent a behaviour must be to be noticed and remembered. Stereotypes still portray women as weak and submissive, and men as dominant and aggressive. With the exception of extreme cases of violence, evidence demonstrating that women can be just as aggressive as men is redefined in order to fit into the pre-existing schema. For example, some people might assume that if a woman killed a man it was in self-defence, whereas no such assumption is made when a man kills a woman. Stewart-Williams (2002) also noted that "even if a stereotype contains an element of truth, it can still lead to inaccurate social perception" (p.178).

Stewart-Williams pointed out that when men and women perceive the same level of aggression, their level of acceptance of that aggression is the same. It appears that it is not a matter of which acts they view as more acceptable, but rather how they interpret an

event as constituting aggression. He suggests that men tend to perceive less aggression overall and therefore it would be premature and inaccurate to suggest that they perceive violence as more acceptable than do women. If gender differences with respect to acceptability are to be documented, research must include acts that males and females perceive as equally aggressive. When Stewart-Williams asked participants to predict the acceptability ratings men and women would endorse for several aggressive acts, an interesting result emerged. Both male and female participants predicted same-gender favouritism with respect to the degree or acceptability of aggressive acts. In reality, no such result was found, which suggests to the researcher that, "people may overestimate the average level of gender bias" (p.185).

While this seems to go against the idea that traditional stereotypes are no longer widely accepted in western society, he suggested that although the "prevalence of these stereotypes has been changing, people's beliefs about the stereotypes' prevalence may not have been keeping up the pace with this change." (Stewart-Williams, 2002, p.185)

#### *Public Behaviour*

Research by Parks and Scheidt (2000) found that men held a double standard when evaluating alcohol consumption by women in bars. The male participants made similar attributions for men and women's alcohol consumption, citing reasons such as socializing or creating a diversion from the routine aspects of daily life. However, the male participants also thought that women, but not the men who drank at bars were sexually promiscuous and were acting in a provocative manner. (Parks & Schedit, 2000).

*Parenting*

Double standards still appear to operate in the domain of parenting. Deutsch and Saxon (1998) found that men and women were criticized when they deviated from traditional gendered parenting norms. Male and female participants criticized mothers for too little involvement at home or too much involvement in paid work. In contrast, male and female participants criticized fathers for too much involvement at home or too little involvement in paid work. (Deutsch & Saxon, 1998). Silverstein (1997) argued that these double standards are “largely based on the cultural stereotype that mothers are a child’s primary parent because they are ‘naturally’ more capable caregivers than fathers” (p. 18). Eagly (1987) (as cited in Hoffman and Moon), points to gender stereotypes as the root cause of this bias as women are stereotyped as more sensitive, caring, and nurturing than men.

According to a National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth conducted by the Department of Justice Canada, court orders place more than 80% of children in their mother’s care and even in cases where joint custody was awarded, 69% of children lived primarily with their mother (Marcil-Gratton & Le Bourdais, 1999). Thus, the parenting role of fathers remains secondary or minimal, with the exception of providing financial support.

#### Research Objectives

The first objective of this research was to replicate the findings of Fortune, Sande, Kohut (2005) using a refined version of the MIDSQ. The refined version included only those items that were sorted with a consensus-rate above 70 percent, with the exception of three items that were included, as they were deemed critical to the integrity of the

domains. Consistent with the work of Fortune, Sande, Kohut (2005), a within-subjects design was employed to assess double standards.

The second objective of this research was to compare the results of previous research utilizing traditional measures of double standards, such as the ATWS or SATWS with a combined or simultaneous version of the MIDSQ.

In the time-lag format, the two versions of the MIDSQ were completed during separate testing sessions, with a time-lag of approximately 8 weeks between sessions. In the simultaneous format, the two versions of the MIDSQ were completed in a pairs. For example, "Any man who hits a woman should be punished by the courts," will be paired with, "Any woman who hits a man should be severely punished by the courts." Presenting the items this way increased the transparency of the construct being measured and highlighted social desirability concerns. This type of presentation was an attempt to mimic the issues that plague the ATWS and SATWS, while also allowing for a reasonable comparison of results.

Paulhus (1984) documented two independent components of socially desirable responding: self-deceptive enhancement and impression management. Self-deceptive enhancement can be characterized as a positively biased self-presentation style whereas impression management represents a hypervigilance to social cues from others. Paulhus found that self-deceptive enhancement was relatively immune to situational demands while impression management was susceptible to influence under circumstances that demand positive self-presentation. He also suggests that given that impression management reflects two different psychological processes, any attempt to address the question of the role of socially desirable responding in self-report data should be

approached from a two-factor perspective. Paulhus (1991) also suggested that under anonymous testing conditions, impression management might be tapping social conventionality or other personality features so that high correlations cannot necessarily be interpreted as evidence of contamination.

Under these conditions, participants were expected to endorse significantly fewer double standards due to social desirability concerns. Alternatively, it was suggested that participants would continue to endorse double standards in certain domains but not in others. For example, it was proposed that participants would continue to endorse pro-female double standards in the domains of violent behavior and public behavior, despite the salience of the discrepancy between their responses. If this alternative hypothesis was supported, it was considered evidence that some double standards are socially acceptable so that participants feel comfortable expressing them publicly.

The unfortunate reality of our times that some prejudice is still acceptable and that the only thing that has changed is the target of the prejudice. Blatant prejudice such as the ethnic and racial slurs aimed at African American or Mexican individuals that used to be commonplace on television shows like "All in the Family", is deemed largely unacceptable today. However, particularly post September 11, 2001, prejudice targeting Arab or Islamic individuals is commonplace and to some degree socially acceptable. It may be that double standards that favour women at the expense of men are a new form of socially acceptable prejudice.

#### Theoretical Explanations for Double Standards

The results of Sande (1993) and Fortune, Sande, Kohut (2005) were surprising in light of a long history of research documenting traditional double standards favouring

men. Even taking into account social change, the pervasive pro-female double standards endorsed by both men and women are difficult to explain. Although this research was not intended to be an exhaustive comparison of potential explanations, several theoretical explanations are discussed and some preliminary evidence testing these explanations was gathered.

### *Self-interest*

The most parsimonious way to understand double standards may be to point to the emphasis western society places on the norm of self-interest. The norm of self-interest suggests that people act in ways that maximize positive emotions or material gains, and minimize negative emotions or losses. This norm is so firmly entrenched that it should come as no surprise when individuals selectively endorse certain items that favour their own social group.

According to research by Miller and Ratner (As cited in Miller, 1999), the layperson tends to believe that other people's attitudes and behaviours are heavily influenced by financial incentives or other personal stakes. Miller (1999) suggested that "individuals who are perceived to benefit materially from the introduction of a social policy are expected to have more favourable attitudes toward that policy than those who would not." (p. 1056) This could explain the pro-female endorsements found by Fortune, Sande, Kohut (2005) in the domains of education and career, but this does not account for why men would favour women on items that clearly make salient their personal stake.

However, Miller and Ratner (as cited in Miller, 1999) suggest that the story is a bit more complicated as "the predictive power individuals accord self-interest is largely unaffected by the explanatory power it has for their own behaviour." (p. 1056). In other

words, even when one's own attitudes are incongruent with their level of vested interest, they perceive others as having attitudes that are congruent with their self-interest.

Thus, it may not be genuine self-interest motivating the endorsement of pro-same gender attitudes but rather the anticipation of self-interested behaviour from others.

Miller and Ratner (1998) suggest that people pursue self-interest when they anticipate self-interested behaviour from others because they fear that to do otherwise would lead to their exploitation. The norm of self-interest is so strong in western society that its influence may extend beyond the attitudes expressed. It may also influence the explanations individuals provide for these actions and opinions. Miller and Ratner (1998) refer to work by Mills that suggested that individuals cite the shared cultural norm of self-interest because it removes any guilt or dissonance that accompanies that thoughts or actions.

It may be that women perceive men as being much more self-interested than they are in reality. These inaccurate beliefs may result in the expectation that men will endorse pro-male attitudes and this may account for women's endorsement of pro-female attitudes. However, this explanation fails to account for the pro-female responses on the part of male participants and suggests that a different explanation may be at work for men's responses to the double standards questionnaire.

#### *Automatic In-Group Bias*

Research indicates that men are less likely than women to show an automatic in-group bias. "Whereas women strongly prefer female gender when response latency techniques are used, men typically show neutral gender attitudes" (Nosek & Banaji, Richeson & Ambady, as cited in Rudman & Goodwin, 2004, p. 494). Men have

historically been viewed as the dominant sex, but they appear to possess weaker in-group bias than woman. "Even when men are responding automatically, their in-group bias is surprisingly frail and that women's in-group bias is particularly strong at the implicit level (stronger than men's by a factor of 4.5)." (Rudman and Goodwin, 2004, p.506)

Ellemers, Spears, and Doosje (1997) use social identity theory to explain such a result and suggest that women share a lower status and therefore a collective bond that men may lack. Building on this idea, recent research cites the rejection-identification model, which suggests that "societal discrimination can lead to a desire for group mobility that in turn creates a stronger affinity among women than men." (Schmitt, Branscombe, Kobrynowicz, & Owen, as cited in Rudman & Goodwin, 2004, p. 508). If males see themselves as very different from the average male, this could foster a lack of group cohesion. However, this suggests that women see themselves as more like other women, and does not account for the research that documents "Queen Bee syndrome" (Ellemers et al., 2004).

According to Eagly, Diekmann, Johannesen, Smith, & Koenig (2005), gender may influence attitudes "through self-regulatory processes that follow from people deriving their social identity from their gender group." (p. 800). Women's attention is not only focused on policies' implications for gender-centric behaviours but more generally to implications for their overall status in society. Eagly et al. (2005) suggest that this heightened state of vigilance may have been fostered by the work of the feminist movement that documented the barriers women face when their occupational and educational opportunities are defined by their gender. The authors' note that the "absence



of a comparable social movement concerned with preserving or changing men's status"(p. 800) may have resulted in men identifying with their gender group less.

If this is indeed the case then women should endorse a stronger pro-female bias than men. Alternatively, men's weak identification with their own gender group may result in more of a focus on equality or social desirability, rather than on advancing the rights and privileges of men. In that case, one might witness men selectively endorse pro-female attitudes on items in which strong social norms dictate pro-female attitudes, such as partner violence. In contrast, men may endorse neutral responses on items not as strongly linked to pro-female norms such as career opportunities or sexual behaviour.

### *Stereotype Inaccuracy*

The majority of research examining the accuracy of gender stereotypes has involved examining inferences about personality traits. Only a select number of studies have examined inferences about attitudes. Button, Grant, Ross, and Hannah (1997) contend that although traits and attitudes are conceptually similar, there are also important differences between them that carry implications for the assessment of stereotypes and stereotype accuracy. They cited work by Judd and Park as evidence of these implications. First, people usually have more direct access to their attitudes than to their personality traits (Judd & Park, as cited in Button et al., 1997). Second, people talk about their attitudes more often than their traits, which make information about others' attitudes more readily available. Third, although all self-report measures are susceptible to social desirability bias, "the problem of misrepresentation seems less severe in the case of attitudes" (Judd & Park, as cited in Button et al., 1997).

Edmonds, Cahoon, and Shipman (1992) examined the extent of agreement with statements concerning sex-role stereotyping, adversarial sexual beliefs, sexual conservatism, acceptance of interpersonal violence, and rape-myth acceptance. They found that men's estimates of women's attitudes were fairly accurate. Women however, were less accurate in judging men's attitudes. Women consistently thought men would hold more negative social attitudes than were documented. Button et al. (1997) built upon the study by Edmonds, using a "full accuracy design" (Judd & Park, as cited in Button et al, 1997).

They conducted three studies, the first of which assessed the attitudes of male and female students on a range of social and political issues. The second study involved a new sample of students estimating the attitudes of typical males and females on those same issues. These estimates were used to select a set of stereotypic male and stereotypic female statements (those which males or females were expected to agree with more respectively). Finally, the third study asked participants to estimate the attitudes of male and female university students on the two sets of stereotypic statements. These final estimates were compared with the answers of the first group to assess accuracy.

In Study 1, they found a significant difference between men and women on only 5% of the 110 items. In Study 2 they found a main effect for sex of target on 47% of the items but a main effect for sex of participant on only 2%. Overall, men and women did not respond that differently but both men and women expected other men and women to respond differently. In Study 3 when it came to stereotypic male statements, men and women were similarly accurate in their predictions of a female target's responses. In contrast, both men and women overestimated the extent to which a male target would

agree with the stereotypic male statements and this overestimation was greater on the part of female participants. A similar result was found for female stereotypic statements, with both men and women being similarly accurate in their prediction of a female target's responses. Again, both men and women made significant errors in predicting how men would respond to these statements. However, in this case, both underestimated men's agreement with these statements.

Button et al. (1997) suggested a number of potential explanations for these findings. First, they note the fact there have been many articulate and outspoken members of the feminist movement who spent decades publicizing the importance of changing women's roles. In contrast, public discussion about the importance of changing male roles has only recently transpired and has been burdened by considerable ambivalence on the part of both men and women alike (Burn, 1996; Doyle, 1989, as cited in Button et al.).

In addition, they suggest that society is sending mixed messages by on the one hand stressing the importance of assertiveness and independence as part of the traditional male role, while on the other hand encouraging expressions of intimacy and the nurturing of children. It appears that the changes that have taken place over the last few decades with respect to the men's attitudes, are understood and accepted, but not widely expressed publicly. Thus, if women base their perceptions of male attitudes from public behaviour, they may remain unaware that significant changes have occurred.

A second explanation may be that "the feminist movement has made women more proud of their gender identity and men perhaps, somewhat less proud of theirs." (p. 88). Burn (As cited in Button et al., 1997) suggested that "women's pride in their female

identity and their desire for solidarity with other women can sometimes lead them to exaggerate gender differences, particularly on characteristics that have a strong value component.” (p. 88).

Finally, Button et al. propose that women may be justified in their skepticism about fundamental changes in men’s attitudes. They suggest that men may be expressing the politically correct attitude rather than their true attitude. The “dissembling” hypothesis suggests that men are aware of the political incorrectness of expressing stereotypically male attitudes and thus avoid doing so. However, stereotypical female attitudes are generally viewed more positively and therefore women may feel more comfortable publicly expressing them.

Diekman, Eagly, and Kulesa (2002) asked 173 students to write down the social and political attitudes that are typical of men and women. Then they asked them to estimate the “percentage of women [men] that would endorse each option.” They found that participants were less accurate in their estimates of male targets than of female targets. Furthermore, although participants “underestimated the extremity of both sexes’ agreement with these attitude items, they underestimated the agreement of male targets more than of female targets” (p. 272). The fact that this error in estimating men’s attitudes was committed by both men and women means it cannot be explained by theories predicting less accuracy for out-group members. Furthermore, this pattern of error cannot be explained by individuals’ tendency to overestimate the influence of self-interest because women’s attitudes were not exaggerated.

The underestimation of men’s agreement increased as the items became more female stereotypic. For example, one item asks, “What percentage of men [women] think

that on the whole, it should or should not be the government's responsibility to provide housing for those who cannot afford it?" A similar relationship between item stereotypicality and error in estimating women's attitudes was not found. The authors suggest that, "Female stereotypic items may have more pronounced implications for women than the male stereotypic items have for men" (p. 274). The overall bias consisted of exaggerating men's opposition to policies that were perceived as endorsed by and beneficial to women and exaggerating men's support for policies that were perceived as endorsed by men and detrimental to women. These results indicate that male and female group interest had divergent implications for the accuracy of estimating men and women's attitudes.

Research on stereotype inaccuracy can be clearly linked with Miller and Ratner's work on perceived self-interest. For example, if women inaccurately perceive men as acting in self-interested ways, such that men will oppose policies that might benefit women, this could lead women to act in self-interested ways in return. For example, research by Eagly et al. (2005) suggested that women perceive men as being opposed to affirmative action policies that benefit women at the expense of men.

These theoretical approaches may interact to produce the strong pro-female double standards that recent research has documented. Women may inaccurately assume that men hold traditional double standards and as such, will act in ways that benefit their group at the expense of women. This may lead women to overcompensate by endorsing strongly pro-female double standards of their own.

### Research Objectives

To reiterate, the first objective was to replicate previous research that documented a shift in the endorsement of double standards by men and women (Sande, 1990; Fortune, Sande, Kohut, 2005). The second objective was to examine the results of the MIDSQ including a condition in which participants complete both versions simultaneously. This was intended to examine how the traditional method of assessing double standards by requiring participants to evaluate the appropriate roles for men and women at the same time can be heavily influenced by the social desirability bias. This was also an opportunity to investigate whether certain double standards are socially acceptable and are therefore unaffected by the influence of the social desirability bias. Imbedded within these first two objectives was the goal of demonstrating the utility of the Mirror Image Double Standards Questionnaire (MIDSQ) as an improved measure of social attitudes. The third objective was to measure the perceptions men and women hold about the double standards held by other men and women and to compare these perceptions with their own endorsement of such double standards.

### Hypotheses

Based on previous research and the stated objectives of this research, the following hypotheses were advanced:

1. In Study 1 ("Mirror-Image" Time-Delay), when completing the two versions of the MIDSQ separately with a time lag in between testing sessions, it was predicted that men and women would endorse pro-female responses across all domains. For example, they would more strongly agree with the statement "Any man who hits a woman should

be severely punished by the courts” than they would with the statement “Any woman who hits a man should be severely punished by the courts.”

2. In Study 2 (“Mirror-Image” Simultaneous), when completing the two versions of the MIDSQ simultaneously, it was predicted that men and women would endorse fewer double standards, because of social desirability bias.

3a. In Study 1b, when completing the MIDSQ as they perceive the “typical female” would complete it, it was predicted that participants would perceive the “typical female” as endorsing pro-female double standards in all domains.

3b. In addition, it was predicted that women would perceive the “typical female” as endorsing a greater number of pro-female double standards than they themselves endorse.

4a. In Study 1b, when completing the MIDSQ as they perceive the “typical male” would complete it, it was predicted that participants would perceive the “typical male” as endorsing pro-male double standards in all domains.

4b. In addition, it was predicted that men would perceive the “typical male” as endorsing more pro-male double standards than they themselves endorse.

5. After comparing participants’ perceptions of the double standards of the “typical male” and “typical female”, with the actual responses of other students from Study 1a, it was predicted that a negative correlation between perception of bias on the part of the opposite sex and pro-same gender responses would emerge.

## Method

### *Measures*

*Mirror-Image Double Standards Questionnaire (MIDSQ)*. The MIDSQ (Sande, 1990) consists of two “mirror-image” versions, each composed of 37 items. For example, a question from version one reads, “Any man who hits a woman, should be punished by the courts,” while the other version says, “Any woman who hits a man, should be punished by the courts.” If individuals believe a man should be punished for hitting a woman, but not that a woman should be punished for hitting a man that would be recorded as a double standard. The 37 items measure sexual behaviour, violence between sexes, public behaviours, education and career opportunities, relationships with partners, and parenting behaviours. The participants indicate their agreement or disagreement with each statement on a 9-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 9 (strongly agree).

### *Participants*

There are two separate participant samples discussed in this research paper.

*Study 1 (a & b) “Mirror-Image” Time-Delay*. Participants were 1929 Introductory Psychology students (1082 females, 748 males, 98 unspecified). The age of the participants ranged from 16 to 47, with a mean age of 19.73 (SD = 3.39). The ethnic breakdown of the sample is as follows: White (63.2%), Chinese (10.8%), Filipino (6.1%), Black (2.9%), South Asian (2.6%), Métis (2.5%), and Aboriginal/First Nations (2.3%).

### *Procedure*

*“Mirror-Image” Time-Delay*. Participants in this sample completed one version of the Mirror-Image Double Standards Questionnaires (MIDSQ) as part of a mass-testing questionnaire distributed in their Introductory Psychology classes. Half of the participants



completed version 1 of the MIDSQ in mass testing and the other half completed version 2. They were asked to provide their contact information if they were willing to be called about future studies being conducted in their Department of Psychology.

Approximately 8 weeks later, 290 of these students (161 female, 129 males) were recruited by telephone utilizing the contact information provided earlier. Calling lists were generated based on participant codes and approximately equal numbers of male and female participants were selected from each list.

The second testing session involved completing the other version of the MIDSQ; followed by completing the MIDSQ as they believed the “typical male” and “typical female” in their Introductory Psychology class would complete it. The order of completion varied but participants always completed the MIDSQ for self (personal endorsement) first, followed by either the “typical male” then “typical female” activities, or the reverse. Repeated measures ANOVA’s were conducted in order to test for order effects but there was only one significant effect for order at the  $p < .001$  level set for all analysis. Therefore, no discussion of order effects will follow.

*‘Mirror-Image’ Simultaneous.* Participants in the simultaneous sample were 220 Introductory Psychology students (140 females, 80 males). No other demographic information was collected on this sample but it should be noted that they were selected from the same Introductory Psychology student pool as the mirror-image sample.

#### *Procedure*

*“Mirror-Image” Simultaneous.* Participants in this sample were recruited directly from Introductory Psychology classes that had not taken part in mass testing. This was done in ensure that participants had not been exposed to the MIDSQ prior to participating

in this study. Participants completed a simultaneous version of the MIDSQ in which each item was presented with its counterpart. For example, “Any man who hits a woman should be severely punished by the courts,” was paired back-to-back with, “Any woman who hits a man should be severely punished by the courts.” Participants also completed the MIDSQ as they believe the “typical male” and “typical female” would complete it. Consistent with the procedure for the time-delay sample, the order of presentation always began with completion of the MIDSQ for self, followed by the “typical male” then “typical female,” or the reverse.

#### Calculating a Double Standard

Analysis of each item-pair on the MIDSQ can yield one of three results. First, participants may show greater endorsement of rights, freedoms, and opportunities for women than for men, indicative of a pro-female double standard. For example, participants may strongly agree with punishment for violence perpetrated by a man against a woman, but disagree or only slightly agree with punishment for violence perpetrated by a woman against a man.

Second, participants may show greater endorsements of rights, freedoms, and opportunities for men, indicative of a pro-male double standard. For example, participants may strongly disagree that mothers should not be given preference in terms of child custody decisions but disagree or only slightly agree that fathers should not be given preference in terms of child custody decisions.

Third, participants may show equal endorsement of rights, freedoms, and opportunities for men and women, indicative of no double standard. For example,

participants may strongly agree with the importance of sending daughters and sons to college or university equally.

Analysis involved comparing participants' responses to item-pairs. For example, analysis involved comparing their agreement or disagreement with the acceptability of men hugging other men as compared to the acceptability of women hugging other women. As a result of the large number of item-pairs analyzed separately, only differences significant at  $p < .001$  were considered to be significant.

#### Item Analyses

Analysis began with all 37 items of the original MIDSQ, but upon further examination, it was decided that some item-pairs demonstrated a double standard that could be classified as pro-male or pro-female, while others did not. For example, if a participant strongly disagreed with the item, "The courts should be lenient with a man who hits a woman who constantly nags and insults him," but only slightly disagreed with its counterpart, "The courts should be lenient with a woman who hits a man who constantly nags and insults her," this was classified as a pro-female double standard.

In contrast, if a participant strongly agreed with the item, "When it comes to setting priorities, a man's wife and children should be more important to him than his career," but only slightly agreed with its counterpart, "When it comes to setting priorities, a woman's husband and children should be more important to her than her career," this was more difficult to classify. Agreement or disagreement here did not appear to clearly connote more rights, freedoms, or opportunities to either sex. This involved an inherently subjective judgment about whether career or family was the preferred option. This is not to imply that such differential endorsement does not reflect a double standard, it clearly

does. This is to suggest that items such as these reflect a more complex view of social roles and include a focus on priorities that does not clearly fall under the pro-male or pro-female categorization.

In order to confirm which items should be included in each domain, 30 Introductory Psychology students were recruited by telephone to complete a sorting task. Each participant sat at their own table and was given 37 item-pairs on separate slips of paper. At the top of each of their tables were the original six domains (Education/Career, Violent Behaviour, Public Behaviour, Sexual Behaviour, Parenting, Relationships). Participants were instructed to focus on the behaviour in the item and to place each slip of paper under the domain in which they felt best fit. They were also given the option of placing items into a miscellaneous domain if they did not believe the item fit into any of the pre-determined domains. An index of agreement was calculated by dividing the frequency with which each item was placed in a domain by the total number of sorters. For example, if item 9 was placed in the violence domain by 28 of 30 sorters, the index of agreement was 93%. Agreement ranged from 39% to 100% with a mean level of agreement of 75.4%.

Taking into consideration the results of the sorting task as well as our own analysis of the wording and connotation of certain items, 9 items were excluded from analysis. In all but three cases [1, 6, and 30], items that did not reach 70% agreement were excluded from domain analyses. The remaining 28 items were grouped into five domains and an additional four-item index of priorities was created to examine the importance of family and career priorities. The domains are presented in Appendix C.

## Results

Consistent with the objectives outlined for this research project, results are presented in order of the hypotheses that were advanced.

### *Hypothesis 1.*

When completing the two versions of the MIDSQ separately with a time lag in between testing sessions, it was predicted that men and women would endorse pro-female responses across all domains.

### *Total Score Analysis*

In order to establish a pattern of double standards, a total double standards score was computed for each participant for male and female behavior. The mean scores for the 18 items grouped into the five domains and the 6 individually presented items were added together to produce an overall double standards score. When necessary, the means were recoded such that larger numbers always represented endorsement of more rights, freedoms, and opportunities for the target in the item.

Total scores were analyzed using a 2 (sex of participant) x 2 (sex of target) x 2 (order) ANOVA. No significant order effects were found. The results for the ANOVA indicated a significant main effect for sex of target,  $F(1, 254) = 190.74, p < .01$ . The ANOVA also indicated a significant sex of target x sex of participant interaction,  $F(1, 254) = 47.24, p < .01$ .

Male and female participants endorsed pro-female double standards. Male participants' total score was ( $M = 131.46$ ) for female behaviour and ( $M = 124.29$ ) for male behaviour. Female participants' pro-female double standards were of a greater

magnitude with the total score of ( $M = 139.32$ ) for female behaviour and ( $M = 117.96$ ) for male behaviour.

Follow-up paired-samples t-tests indicated that both male and female participants endorsed pro-female double standards, male participants,  $t(1, 113) = 4.42, p < .01$ , and female participants,  $t(1, 141) = 16.22, p < .01$ .

#### *Domain Analyses*

In order to examine all potential interactions a  $2$  (sex of participant)  $\times 2$  (sex of target)  $\times 2$  (order)  $\times 5$  (domain) was conducted. Results of the ANOVA indicated a main effect for domain,  $F(4, 254) = 98.92, p < .01$ , and a main effect for sex of target,  $F(1, 257) = 41.86, p < .01$ . There was a significant domain  $\times$  sex of target interaction,  $F(4, 254) = 81.63, p < .01$ , as well as a significant domain  $\times$  sex of target  $\times$  sex of participant interaction,  $F(4, 254) = 6.90, p < .01$ . This three-way interaction indicates that male and female participants endorsed different double standards in different domains. Consistent with our a-priori decision, this interaction highlights the importance of examining double standards in each domain individually. Separate sex of target  $\times$  sex of participant ANOVA's were conducted for each domain.

Examination of the domains revealed that female participants endorsed pro-female double standards in all five domains. Male participants endorsed pro-female double standards in violent behavior, public behavior, and parenting behavior, and non-significant double standards in the domains of sexual behavior and career opportunities. Results of the repeated measures ANOVA for each domain are presented in Tables 8 through 12. The means and standards deviations for each of the domains are presented in

Table 2. The means and standard deviations for the index of priorities and the six individually presented items are presented in Table 30.

*Hypothesis 2.*

When completing the two versions of the MIDSQ simultaneously, it was predicted that men and women would endorse very few double standards because of social desirability biases.

*Total Score Analyses*

Consistent with the analysis conducted on the 'mirror-image' sample, a total double standards score was computed for each participant for male and female behavior.

A repeated measures ANOVA was conducted with sex of target as the within-subjects factor and sex of participant and order of target as between-subjects factors. The results for the ANOVA indicated only a significant main effect for sex of target,  $F(1, 214) = 131.18, p < .01$ .

Male and female participants endorsed pro-female double standards. Male participants' total score was ( $M = 129.12$ ) for female behaviour and ( $M = 118.87$ ) for male behaviour. Female participants' total score was ( $M = 131.23$ ) for female behaviour and ( $M = 116.92$ ) for male behaviour.

*Domain Analyses*

In order to examine all potential interactions a 2 (sex of participant) x 2 (sex of target) x 2 (order of target) x 5 (domain) ANOVA was conducted. Results of the ANOVA indicated a main effect for domain,  $F(4, 210) = 812.63, p < .01$ , and a main effect for sex of target,  $F(1, 213) = 15.78, p < .01$ . There was a significant domain x sex of target interaction,  $F(4, 210) = 39.54, p < .01$ , as well as a significant domain x sex of

target x sex of participant interaction,  $F(4, 210) = 4.71, p < .01$ . This three-way interaction indicates that male and female participants endorsed different double standards in different domains. Consistent with our a-priori decision, this interaction highlights the importance of examining double standards in each domain individually. Separate sex of participant x sex of target ANOVA's were conducted for each domain.

Examination of the domains revealed that male and female participants endorsed pro-female double standards in violent behavior, public behavior, and parenting behavior domains and non-significant double standards in the sexual behavior and career opportunities domains. The means and standards deviations for each of the domains are presented in Table 3. The results of the repeated measures ANOVA's for each domain are presented in Tables 8 through 12.

#### *Hypothesis 3a.*

When completing the MIDSQ as they perceive that the "typical female" Introductory Psychology student would complete it, it was predicted that participants would perceive the "typical female" as endorsing pro-female double standards in all domains.

Participants in the "mirror-image time-delay" and "mirror-image simultaneous" samples completed the MIDSQ as they believed the "typical female" would complete it. Results are presented separately for each sample.

#### *Typical Female Mirror-Image Time-Delay Sample.*

Consistent with the analysis conducted on participants' personal endorsement of double standards, a total double standards score was computed for each participant's perceptions of the "typical female" for male and female behavior.



*Total Score Analyses*

A repeated measures ANOVA was conducted with sex of target as the within-subjects factor and sex of participant and order as the between-subjects factors. The results for the ANOVA indicated a significant main effect for sex of target,  $F(1, 282) = 617.93, p < .01$ . The ANOVA also revealed a significant sex of target x sex of participant interaction,  $F(1, 282) = 22.12, p < .01$ . This interaction was significant because male participants' predicted that the "typical female" would endorse greater pro-female double standards than did female participants.

Participants believed that the "typical female" would endorse strong pro-female double standards. Female participants' total score was ( $M = 144.10$ ) for female behaviour and ( $M = 107.72$ ) for male behaviour. Male participants' total score was ( $M = 151.19$ ) for female behaviour and ( $M = 97.83$ ) for male behaviour.

*Domain Analyses*

In order to examine all potential interactions a 2 (sex of participant) x 2 (sex of target) x 2 (order) x 5 (domain) was conducted. Results of the ANOVA indicated a main effect for domain,  $F(4, 275) = 73.59, p < .01$ , and a main effect for target,  $F(1, 278) = 393.14, p < .01$ . There were also three significant interactions. There was a significant target x sex of participant interaction,  $F(1, 278) = 16.97, p < .01$ , a significant domain x sex of target interaction,  $F(4, 275) = 158.67, p < .01$ , and a significant domain x sex of target x sex of participant interaction,  $F(4, 275) = 7.08, p < .01$ . This three-way interaction indicates that male and female participants' perceptions of the typical females' double standards were significantly different, and that they differed across domains. Consistent with our a-priori decision, this interaction highlights the importance

of examining double standards in each domain individually. Separate sex of participant by sex of target ANOVA's were conducted for each domain.

Examination of the domains revealed that both male and female participants believed that the "typical female" would endorse pro-female double standards in all five domains. In the domain of career opportunities there was a significant sex of participant by sex of target interaction,  $F(1, 285) = 11.29, p < .01$ , such that male participants believed that the typical female would endorse a significantly larger pro-female double standard. The means and standards deviations for each of the domains are presented in Table 4. The results of the repeated measures ANOVA's for each domain are presented in Tables 13 through 17.

*Typical Female – Mirror-Image Simultaneous Sample.*

*Total Score Analyses*

Consistent with the analysis conducted on the participants' personal endorsement of double standards, a total double standards score was computed for each participant's perceptions of the "typical female" for male and female behavior.

A repeated measures ANOVA was conducted with sex of target as the within-subjects factor and sex of participant and order as between-subjects factors. The results for the ANOVA indicated only a significant main effect for sex of target,  $F(1, 212) = 560.26, p < .01$ .

Female and male participants both believed that the "typical female" would endorse pro-female double standards. Female participants' total score was ( $M = 147.13$ ) for female behaviour and ( $M = 108.91$ ) for male behavior. Male participants' total score was ( $M = 148.26$ ) for female behaviour and ( $M = 101.92$ ) for male behaviour.

*Domain Analyses*

In order to examine all potential interactions a 2 (sex of participant) x 2 (sex of target) x 2 (order of target) x 5 (domain) was conducted. Results of the ANOVA indicated a main effect for domain,  $F(4, 208) = 62.63, p < .01$ , and a main effect for sex of target,  $F(1, 211) = 178.36, p < .01$ . There was a significant domain x sex of target interaction,  $F(4, 208) = 133.10, p < .01$ . This interaction suggests that participants' perceived the "typical female" to endorse greater double standards in some domains than in others. Participants perceived the "typical female" to endorse the greatest pro-female double standard in the violence behaviour domain, followed by parenting, career opportunities, public behaviour, and sexual behaviour.

Consistent with our a-priori decision, this interaction highlights the importance of examining double standards in each domain individually. Separate sex of participant x sex of target ANOVA's were conducted for each domain.

Examination of the domains revealed that participants believed that the "typical female" would endorse pro-female double standards in all five domains. The means and standards deviations for each of the five domains are presented in Table 4. The results of repeated measures ANOVA's for each domains are presented in Tables 13 through 17.

*Hypothesis 4a.*

When completing the MIDSQ as they perceive that the "typical male" Introductory Psychology student would complete it, it was predicted that participants would perceive the "typical male" as endorsing pro-male double standards across all five domains.

*Typical Male 'Mirror-Image' Time-Delay Sample.**Total Scores Analyses*

Consistent with the analysis conducted on the participants' personal endorsement of double standards, a total double standards score was computed for each participant's perceptions of the "typical male" for male and female behavior.

A repeated measures ANOVA was conducted with sex of target as the within-subjects factor and sex of participant and order as between-subjects factors. The results for the ANOVA indicated a significant main effect for sex of target,  $F(1, 282) = 108.98$ ,  $p < .01$ . Participants believed that the "typical male" would endorse pro-male double standards. Female participants' total score was ( $M = 121.94$ ) for female behaviour and ( $M = 142.78$ ) for male behaviour. Male participants' total score was ( $M = 124.91$ ) for female behaviour and ( $M = 138.77$ ) for male behavior.

In order to examine all potential interactions a 2 (sex of participant) x 2 (sex of target) x 2 (order of target) x 5 (domain) was conducted. Results of the ANOVA indicated a main effect for domain,  $F(4, 276) = 215.27$ ,  $p < .01$ , and a main effect for sex of target,  $F(1, 279) = 18.74$ ,  $p < .01$ . There was a significant domain x sex of participant interaction,  $F(1, 276) = 3.55$ ,  $p < .05$ . A significant domain x sex of target interaction,  $F(4, 276) = 158.48$ ,  $p < .01$ , as well as a significant domain x sex of target x sex of participant interaction,  $F(4, 276) = 2.85$ ,  $p < .05$ . These interactions indicate that male and female participants' perceptions of the typical males' double standards were significantly different, and they differed across domains. Consistent with our a-priori decision, this interaction highlights the importance of examining double standards in each

domain individually. Separate sex of participant x sex of target ANOVA's were conducted for each domain.

Examination of the domains revealed that female participants believed that the "typical male" would endorse pro-male double standards in the domains of sexual behavior, career opportunities, and parenting responsibilities, a pro-female double standard in public behaviour, and a non-significant double standard on violent behavior. Male participants believed that the "typical male" would endorse pro-male double standard on sexual behavior and career opportunities, pro-female double standards on public behavior and violence, and a non-significant double standard in the parenting domain. The means and standards deviations for each of the five domains are presented in Tables 6. The results of repeated measures ANOVA's for each domain are presented in Tables 18 through 22.

*Typical Male Mirror-Image Simultaneous Sample.*

Consistent with the analysis conducted on the participants' personal endorsement of double standards, a total double standards score was computed for each participant's perceptions of the "typical male" for male and female behavior.

A repeated measures ANOVA was conducted with sex of target as the within-subjects factor and sex of participant and order as between-subjects factors. The results for the ANOVA indicated a significant main effect for sex of target,  $F(1, 209) = 137.67$ ,  $p < .01$ . Participants believe that the "typical male" would endorse pro-male double standards. Female participants' total score was ( $M = 119.47$ ) for female behaviour and ( $M = 144.81$ ) for male behaviour. Male participants' total score was ( $M = 118.71$ ) for female behaviour and ( $M = 136.20$ ) for male behaviour.

In order to examine all potential interactions a 2 (sex of participant) x 2 (sex of target) x 2 (order) x 5 (domain) was conducted. Results of the multivariate ANOVA indicated two main effects. There was a main effect for domain,  $F(4, 207) = 164.45, p < .01$ , and a main effect for sex of target,  $F(1, 210) = 17.38, p < .01$ . There was a significant domain x sex of target interaction,  $F(4, 207) = 90.10, p < .01$ . This interaction suggests that male and female participants' perceptions of the typical males' double standards differed across domains. Consistent with our a-priori decision, this interaction highlights the importance of examining double standards in each domain individually. Separate sex of participant x sex of target ANOVA's were conducted for each domain.

#### *Domain Analyses*

Examination of the domains revealed that female participants believed that the "typical male" would endorse pro-male double standards in the domains of sexual behavior, career opportunities, and parenting responsibilities, and non-significant double standards on public behavior and violent behavior. Male participants believed that the "typical male" would endorse pro-male double standards in the domains of sexual behavior and career opportunities, pro-female double standards in the public behavior and violent behavior domains, and a non-significant double standard in the domain of parenting responsibilities. The means and standards deviations for each of the five domains are presented in Tables 6. The results of the repeated measures ANOVA's for each domain, are presented in Tables 18 through 22.

#### *Hypothesis 3b.*

It was predicted that women would perceive other women as endorsing more pro-female double standards than they themselves endorse.

A multivariate ANOVA was conducted on female participants only, with two within-subjects factors, self-reported double standards and prediction of the “typical female’s” double standards. The ANOVA compared female participants’ personal endorsement of double standards with their perceptions of the typical female’s endorsement of double standards. The ANOVA indicated a main effect for self-reported double standards,  $F(1, 138) = 438.45, p < .01$  as well as a main effect for perceptions of the “typical female’s” double standards,  $F(1, 138) = 9.49, p < .01$ . In addition, a significant interaction occurred such that female participants’ believed that the typical female would endorse significantly greater pro-female double standards than they would,  $F(1, 138) = 32.09, p < .01$ .

Female participants’ mean total score for female behavior was ( $M = 139.37$ ) and ( $M = 118.02$ ) for male behavior. In contrast, the mean total score for female participants’ perceptions of the “typical female” evaluating female behavior was ( $M = 143.76$ ) and ( $M = 107.48$ ) for the “typical female” evaluating male behavior.

*Hypothesis 4b.*

It was predicted that men would perceive other men as endorsing more pro-male double standards than they themselves endorse.

A multivariate ANOVA was conducted on male participants only, with two within-subjects factors, self-reported double standards and perceptions of the “typical male’s” double standards. The ANOVA compared male participants’ personal endorsement of double standards with their perceptions of the typical male’s endorsement of double standards. The ANOVA indicated a main effect for self-reported double standards,

$F(1, 109) = 14.43, p < .01$ . In addition, a significant interaction occurred such that male participants' believed that the "typical male" would endorse significantly greater pro-male double standards than they would,  $F(1, 109) = 50.16, p < .01$ .

Male participants' mean total score for female behavior was ( $M = 131.14$ ) as compared with ( $M = 124.35$ ) for male behavior. In contrast, the mean total score for the "typical male" evaluating female behavior was ( $M = 125.34$ ) and ( $M = 137.77$ ) for the "typical male" evaluating male behavior.

#### *Hypothesis 5.*

After comparing participants' perceptions of the double standards endorsed by the "typical male" and "typical female" with the actual responses of participants in the "mirror-image" time-delay sample, it was predicted that a negative correlation between perception of same-gender bias on the part of the opposite sex and pro-same gender responses would be evidenced.

A difference score was calculated for each domain by subtracting the mean domain score for male behavior from the mean domain score for female behavior. This calculation was repeated for completion of the MIDSQ for the "typical female" and "typical male." The data file was then split and the correlation between personal endorsement of double standards and perceptions of the double standards of the opposite sex typical other was analyzed.

Overall, there was no significant correlation between female participants' personal endorsement of pro-female double standards and their perceptions of the "typical male" as endorsing pro-male double standards. However, there were significant correlations between male participants' pro-female double standards and their



perceptions of the “typical female” as endorsing pro-female double standards. These significant correlations were evidenced in the domains of sexual behavior, parenting, and violent behavior. The results of the correlational analyses are presented in Table 12.

#### *Distribution and Analyses of Quartile Groups*

An examination of the distribution of mean scores for each domain revealed considerable spread. Considering this spread, an attempt was made to isolate which individuals within the greater sample endorse double standards of the greatest magnitude. For example, would participants’ at the extreme ends of the scale endorse larger double standards than those with means falling in the middle of the scale?

Analysis involved computing an average domain score by summing the mean domain score for female behavior and the mean domain score for male behavior, then dividing it by the number of items in the domain. This average domain score represents participants’ overall endorsement of the behaviour or roles, irrespective of the gender of the target. For example, the average domain score for sexual behaviour represents participants’ overall attitudes toward the acceptability of sexual behaviour across gender.

Next, descriptive statistics were calculated for the domain scores including quartiles. Based on the quartile splits, four groups were created for each domain: participants with mean scores below the 25<sup>th</sup> quartile were designated group 1, those between the 25<sup>th</sup> and 50<sup>th</sup> quartiles were designated group 2, those between the 50<sup>th</sup> and 75<sup>th</sup> quartiles were designated group 3, and those above the 75<sup>th</sup> quartile were designated group 4.

The double standards evidenced by each quartile group were compared utilizing a repeated measures ANOVA with average domain score as the within-subjects factor and

sex of participant and quartile group as between-subjects factors. Overall, these results suggest that no one subset of the sample endorsed greater double standards than did another group. In fact, the double standards endorsed by each domain group were quite consistent. In the rare instances when one domain group mean was significantly higher than another group, no discernible pattern could be established. The means and standard deviations for each quartile group in each domain are presented in Table 31.

### Discussion

Previous research utilizing scales such as the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (ATW, Benson & Vincent, 1980) suggested that double standards exist in people's attitudes toward men and women. A double standard is an attitude that more strongly supports rights, freedoms, and opportunities for one sex than the other. Indeed, many of us have grown up with double standards that favoured men over women. For instance, higher education was believed by many to be more important for men than women. Careers that entailed more ability, responsibility, opportunity, and remuneration were believed to be more suitable for men than for women. Boys were encouraged to become doctors, girls to become nurses. In the realm of social behaviour, more freedoms were believed to be appropriate for men than women. For example, a man who had multiple sexual partners might be called a "stud" whereas a woman who did the same might be labelled a "slut."

In the last few years, however, there appears to have been a change in attitudes. People have become more aware that women have been disadvantaged by double standards. Increased awareness has been accompanied by social action. Social policies such as affirmative action programs have been enacted to counteract the results of double

standards that favoured men over women and, in fact, the number of women in many previously male-dominated careers has dramatically increased. That does not necessarily mean that people have changed their attitudes to accord as much freedom and opportunity to women. Sometimes changes in attitudes lag behind legislated changes in behaviour. This research used an innovative technique to assess attitudes toward women relative to attitudes toward men. The results may be characterized as good news and bad news.

Participants expressed strong positive attitudes toward rights, freedoms, and opportunities for women. However, attitudes toward the same rights, freedoms, and opportunities for men were somewhat less positive. In addition, participants were fairly accurate in predicting the attitudes of the "typical female" university student. They correctly predicted that those attitudes would be very positive toward women but less positive toward men. However, both female and male participants were very inaccurate in their assumptions about the attitudes of the "typical male" university student. They incorrectly predicted that men would hold what might be called "old-fashioned" attitudes that demonstrated a pro-male double standard, and seemed quite unaware that the attitudes of men were, in fact, either unbiased or pro-female.

Analysis of the total scores obtained using the timed-delayed measurement technique confirmed the first hypothesis. Both male and female participants showed significant pro-female biases. They had very positive attitudes toward rights, freedoms, and opportunities for women. This is true not only for total scores, but also for every behavioural domain for female participants. This is a very encouraging finding, especially to people who have worked diligently for many years to make society aware of the existence, and unjust consequences of, negative attitudes toward women. Part of this

attitude change has involved making people aware of the often unspoken negative assumptions about women's abilities and aspirations. Another part has involved convincing people that these negative assumptions underlying "traditional" pro-male double standards have very real effects on opportunities for women.

The present research indicates that public education has, at least for some people, led to real attitude change. Legislated behaviour change, such as affirmative action programs, may also have made a substantial contribution to attitude change. Cognitive consistency theories, notably cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957) demonstrated that sometimes attitudes follow from behaviours. Ensuring that women have opportunities that match their abilities may have actually led to support for women's rights and freedoms. Whatever the combination of attitude change mechanisms, few would disagree with the proposition that the positive attitudes toward women shown in this study constitute good news.

In an interesting reversal of traditional double standards, participants in this study actually expressed more favourable attitudes toward women than toward men. This was true of female participants' total scores and true for every behavioural domain. It was also true for male participants' total scores and for three of the five domains. These results are consistent with previous research using the MIDSQ, which, unlike measures such as the ATWS, allowed for the measurement of pro-female double standards.

#### *'Mirror-Image' Time-Delay Sample*

##### *Sexual Behavior*

According to recent research, it is a widely held belief in contemporary society that men and women are held to different standards when it comes to sexual behavior

(Milhausen & Herold, 2001). However, as Marks and Fraley (2005) point out, despite considerable research, there is no consistent or conclusive evidence for the existence of this supposedly pervasive double standard. In fact, several studies find little to no evidence of such a double standard (Gentry, 1998; Sprecher, McKinney, Walsh, & Anderson, 1997). Marks and Fraley (2005) suggest that if the sexual double standard is indeed as pervasive as people seem to think it is, the plethora of empirical research conducted to detect it, should reveal “a cross-over interaction such that the association between sexual experience and evaluations is negative for women but positive for men.” (p. 176).

It is important to note that the double standard held by female participants in this domain is unlike the traditional double standard, which held that premarital sex was acceptable for men but unacceptable for women. Female participants believed that sex was acceptable for men but even more acceptable for women. Male participants believed that sex was acceptable for both. That is not to say that all the participants believed that premarital sex or multiple partners is a good thing. Clearly some participants strongly approve, some strongly disapprove, and most are somewhere in between. Interestingly, whether female participants approved or disapproved of the sexual behaviours described in the scale, they still endorsed a pro-female double standard. That is, those who thought that these sexual behaviours were acceptable still thought they were more acceptable for women than men. Those who thought them to be unacceptable thought that they were less unacceptable for women than men. On the other hand, regardless of their general attitude toward these sexual behaviours, male participants held no double standards and regarded these behaviours as equally acceptable or unacceptable for women and men.

The belief that a pervasive sexual double standard exists seems to persist despite little evidence to support such a belief. Marks and Fraley (2005) suggest that it might reflect a confirmation bias such that people tend to notice evidence that confirms their beliefs and tend to ignore evidence that contradicts their beliefs. If a majority of people believe in the existence of a traditional double standard and the media continues to portray this as reality, it is possible that people are more likely to process information that is consistent with that belief. They also make the important point that the media may perpetuate the sexual double standard unintentionally by providing the public with confirming evidence and overlooking disconfirming evidence.

#### *Career Opportunities*

In the domain of career opportunities, female participants held pro-female double standards while male participants held no double standard. It should be noted that female participants were not “anti-male” in the sense that they thought that men should have no access to higher education or career opportunities. Participants expressed stronger positive feelings toward opportunities for women than men. This may be the result of self-interest, public education initiatives that have made people particularly aware of the importance of these opportunities for women, and the lack of corresponding initiatives regarding opportunities for men.

#### *Public Behavior*

Very little research has examined double standards about public behaviours like hugging, crying, swearing, drunkenness, and telling sexist jokes. Although all of these items clearly represent public behaviour, there is a dichotomy between some of these items, which is evidenced in the overall results for this domain. On the one hand, there is

a clear pro-female bias with respect to public hugging between same-sex friends and crying at movies. These effects are significant and provide strong evidence that certain traditional double standards have continued despite significant change. The freedom of emotional expression is an important topic to consider, particularly from a developmental perspective. If early socialization continues to downplay the emotional outlets for young boys, this is an area of concern.

On the other hand, the freedom to swear, to get drunk, and to tell jokes about men or women as a group, may not seem like something society should put a great deal of emphasis on. However, it has long been considered the domain of men following in line with the “boys will be boys” mentality. A young woman that curses and gets drunk was viewed quite differently than a young man exhibiting the same behavior. In this regard, the results represent a significant departure from traditional beliefs in that participants endorse particularly neutral attitudes about these behaviors. A critical point to note is that drunkenness and swearing have become more acceptable for women, not less acceptable for men.

#### *Violent Behavior*

The results in the violent behavior domain clearly reflect a good news/bad news situation. It is evident that people have been educated about the unacceptability of violence toward women. The fact that this attitude is strongly endorsed by both female and male participants is a very good thing. However, the fact that they trivialize violence toward men is clearly negative. It is negative not only in an absolute sense, in that violence toward any human is a bad thing, but also in a practical sense. The most common form of domestic violence is “mutual combat” where both partners hit, and the

violence of one triggers or increases the violent behaviour of the other. When women hit men it is not only wrong, it increases the chances that they will be hit and that the violence will mutually escalate. The overarching goal should be to reduce all forms of partner violence and in order to accomplish that, current education programs must be changed so that they promote the message that all forms of violence are equally wrong and destructive. Simon et al. (2001) noted that, "although females are considerably less likely to injure their partners, the violence prevention message should emphasize that physical violence is unacceptable for both genders." (p. 123).

#### *Parenting Responsibilities*

Both male and female participants showed a double standard that seems to be based on the stereotype that women are more nurturing and "are 'naturally' more capable caregivers" (Silverstein, 1997, p.9). It is also consistent with the notion that parenting is more appropriately part of the mother role than the father role. People who believe that parenting consists of a set of duties interpret this to mean that women are required to take on the demands and responsibilities of parenting in addition to working outside of the home. On the other hand, if parenting and the opportunity to parent is seen as an opportunity, custody decisions that favour mothers over fathers are seen as a double standard that disadvantage men relative to women.

#### *Index of Priorities*

The index of priorities addresses the priority of placing family before career. The results are intuitively surprising, as men and women believed that the family priorities should be more important for men than for women. This challenges traditional division of labour that stressed the importance of a man's career and of a woman's family. These



rather surprising results could be a by-product of decades of public education about the importance of women's educational and career aspirations. For example, to suggest to a young woman today that she should sacrifice or postpone her career in order to start a family would be a socially undesirable opinion to express. However, caution must be exercised in interpreting these results as recent research indicates that although women are entering the workforce in increasing numbers, their responsibilities at home are not decreasing. Thus, while people may not think that a woman should place her family before her career, they may expect her to balance both successfully.

### *Simultaneous Sample*

It was expected that using a simultaneous method to measure attitudes toward men and women would result in the disappearance of, or dramatic decrease in, self-reported double standards. In fact, the creation of the mirror-imaged attitude scales that could be used in a time-delayed assessment technique was an effort to avoid the social desirability effects that occur in scales like the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (Spence & Helmreich, 1972) in which the comparison between attitudes toward men and women is obvious. This hypothesis was based on the assumption that overt expression of double standards is in fact socially undesirable. This has not always been the case. Until very recently, negative attitudes toward women and certain ethnic groups were openly expressed. Many people may remember politicians in the southern United States publicly saying that African-Americans were not capable of succeeding in college or in professional occupations. Similarly, the opinion that women ought to be kept 'pregnant, barefoot, and in the kitchen' was acceptable for social expression. Not all double standards have always been socially undesirable.

Things have changed in North American society to the extent that public expression of these attitudes is no longer appropriate in most places. Social desirability concerns not only entail the need to manage others' impression of us, but also the need to enhance our own view of self (Paulhus, 1984). That is, people not only wish to make a positive impression on others they also wish to avoid privately expressing attitudes that seem repulsive to the self. Participants in this research did not express attitudes publicly; so social desirability in the present context involves a reluctance to privately express attitudes that might cause one to see oneself in a negative light (e.g., to see oneself as holding double standards). The expectation was, then, that to the extent that the expression of double standards, even to self, is socially undesirable, participants would respond to the simultaneous measure by reporting fewer double standards toward men and women than participants in the time-delay sample.

The results indicated that female participants responded to the simultaneous measure by expressing fewer double standards than did female participants in the time-delay measurement. It should be noted, however, that assessment of the significance of this decrease is not possible in this study because no participant completed both the time-delayed and simultaneous versions of the MIDSQ, and participants in this study were not randomly assigned to either the time-delayed or simultaneous conditions. Nevertheless, in the time-delayed version the total score difference for the male and female targets was approximately 21 points (139.3 – 117.9) whereas the difference in the simultaneous version was about 14 points (131.2 – 116.9). In addition, female participants showed double standards in each of the five domains when measurement was time-delayed and in three of the five domains when measurement was simultaneous. Male participants did

not show a decrease in double standards, either total score or number of domains, when the simultaneous method was used. It appears, then, that expression of some double standards, at least to oneself, is acceptable. It would be interesting to include conditions in future research in which participants' self-reported attitudes were measured in private using the time-delay technique and then they were required to publicly express their attitudes in the simultaneous measure.

When the simultaneous measure was used, both female and male participants showed significant double standards in the domains of public behaviour, parenting, and violence. Thus, acknowledging that one has different expectations of men and women in these domains still appears to be acceptable. For instance, men might readily admit to themselves and to others that women are better parents, consistent with the prevailing stereotype of women as more naturally nurturing. Men might admit that there is something wrong with a man who cries at the movies, but not a woman, consistent with the prevailing stereotype of women as more emotional. Furthermore, men might admit that male-perpetrated violence is worse than female-perpetrated violence, consistent with the prevailing stereotype of men as more aggressive and dangerous.

With the simultaneous measurement technique, both female and male participants showed no double standard in the domains of sexual behaviour and educational and career opportunities. This represents no change from the time-delayed measure for male participants, indicating that the men in the present study really do not have a double standard in these domains. On the other hand, female participants did show double standards in these domains when time-delayed assessment was used, but not with simultaneous assessment. This may represent females hiding their true attitudes, at

least from themselves, because they believe that expression of double standards in these two domains is unacceptable or difficult to justify. Unlike the other three domains, there is no prevailing stereotype of women as having traits that would justify greater rights, freedoms, or opportunities in the domains of sexual behaviour or education and career. It is interesting to note that prevailing stereotypes previously existed in support of traditional double pro-male double standards. That is, men used to be viewed as more capable of success in college and in business supporting a double standard that education and opportunity was less important for women. Men used to be viewed as having a greater interest in sex than women (who were seen as more passive and chaste), justifying the double standard holding that a greater interest in sex was more important (or at least more understandable) for men than women. It does not seem that the male or female participants in this study would be likely to subscribe to those stereotypes.

#### *Participants' Perceptions of the "Typical Female"*

Eagly et al. (2002) suggested that there is a tendency for members of powerful groups to evidence bias in their perceptions of less powerful others, but to be perceived as less biased by those less powerful others. Based on this idea, it was suggested that because "men hold greater power in society, men will be perceived accurately by both men and women, but women will be perceived inaccurately by men." (p.269). The results of the typical other exercises suggest the exact opposite effect in fact.

It was predicted, and confirmed, that participants would accurately predict that females would hold pro-female double standards. One component of this double standard is a very positive attitude toward rights, freedoms, and opportunities for women. Both male and female participants were aware of the commonness of these beliefs. This

is not at all surprising given the attention to women's issues in the media and the vocal advocacy of the women's movement. In addition, participants in this study were university students who are studying in an environment in which very capable women (professors and students) are not at all shy about discussing the issue of women's rights. Why, however, would participants assume that the "typical female" student would be less supportive about the rights, freedoms, and opportunities of men? One possibility is that the subject just does not come up much. That is, one is more likely to hear concerns expressed about women's rights than men's. Many people believe that men have been favoured by a social system based on traditional double standards, and that what needs to be focused on is the status of women who have been disadvantaged. In light of that, expression of concerns for the rights, freedoms, and opportunities of males may be socially inappropriate. That is, women may be concerned about the rights of males but are unlikely to say so, at least to the extent that they publicly support men's rights. Some would contend that there has been a certain amount of public "male-bashing" in which the most vocal, and therefore most salient, advocates of women's rights have expressed very negative stereotypes of men and very little concern about their rights. That is not to say that most women's advocates had done this, merely that there are some very salient and memorable examples of this, and this salience has influenced participants (especially male participants) estimates of the attitudes of the "typical female."

#### *Participants Perceptions of the "Typical Male"*

It was predicted, and confirmed, that participants would inaccurately predict that men would hold pro-male double standards. That is, their predictions were opposite to men's self-reported attitudes. Earlier research by Spence & Helmreich (1972) found that

men held “traditional” pro-male double standards, and apparently, these participants believe that little has changed. Part of the explanation for this may lie in a lack of information about men’s real attitudes. Men may simply be less vocal about their beliefs. When they express equitable or pro-female attitudes, they might not be believed because others might infer that such expressions are attempts to be politically correct and socially desirable. Salience can play a role in these inaccurate predictions. A male who expresses socially undesirable “traditional” attitudes toward women might be the exception, but at the same time might be salient and memorable and thereby influence participants’ estimations of the attitudes of the typical male. The author’s advisor conducted a classroom demonstration in which female students were asked to estimate the attitudes of the typical male student and to report who they were thinking of when they derived their estimation. Those female students reported believing that most male students held anti-female attitudes and also reported basing their estimations on men such as, “the guy I met at the bar the other night who was a real pig.” The salience of such examples might exert more influence than they ought to on estimations of typical or average group members.

Part of the explanation may result from a portrayal of men in the popular media. Men are frequently portrayed as being “Neanderthal” in their attitudes toward women. Examples can be found on several popular primetime television shows such as Homer Simpson of “The Simpson’s”, Tim ‘the tool-man’ Taylor of “Home Improvement”, Ray from “Everybody Loves Raymond”. This might seem farfetched, but we know that portrayal of members or racial (e.g., Aboriginal, Arab, etc.) or religious (e.g., Muslim) groups can influence viewers’ impressions of the group as a whole.

*Self versus Typical Other*

It was predicted that participants would view themselves as significantly less biased than other members of their sex. The results provide considerable support for this prediction. Female participants viewed themselves as endorsing fewer pro-female double standards than the typical female overall. However, the perceived difference was most evident in the domains of parenting responsibilities and violent behavior. In these domains, female participants viewed themselves as significantly less pro-female. These results are interesting in that it appears women had some motivation for appearing less biased in favour of their own gender in these domains. However, the more interesting result is that women do not see themselves as that different from the typical female in the domains of sexual behavior, public behavior, and career opportunities. Male participants viewed themselves as significantly less pro-male than the typical male. In fact, whereas male participants endorsed pro-female double standards overall, they estimated the attitudes of the typical male to be pro-male.

This lends support to the idea that women share a lower status and thus a collective bond that men lack (Ellemers, Spears, and Doosje, 1997). In addition, it falls in line with research suggesting that the discrimination faced by women as a group may have resulted in a desire for group mobility and a stronger affinity among women than among men (Schmitt, Branscombe, Kobrynowicz, & Owen, as cited in Rudman & Goodwin, 2004). Furthermore, Eagly et al. (2005) suggested that the absence of a men's movement may have resulted in weaker in-group identification among men.

### *Correlational Analyses*

Contrary to prediction, correlational analyses did not indicate a significant relationship between female participants' pro-female double standards and their perceptions of the "typical male" as endorsing pro-male double standards. This can be interpreted as evidence that the women's pro-female double standards are not a reaction or "backlash" against perceived pro-male bias on the part of men. It is more likely that such pro-female attitudes reflect a focus on the empowerment and upward mobility of women, independent of beliefs about the attitudes of men.

Although the predicted correlation was not evidenced, an interesting finding emerged when male participants' pro-female endorsement were correlated with their perceptions of the "typical female". It appears that not only are men keenly aware that the typical female has a pro-female bias, but the more pro-female they view the typical female, the less pro-female men are. However, this cannot be interpreted as a real "backlash" by men as they did not respond to their exaggerated perceptions of pro-female bias on the part of females by endorsing pro-male double standards themselves.

### *Future Research*

Despite the unique contribution this research makes to the field of gender role research, there were some considerations to be noted for future research. First, the participants in this study were Introductory Psychology students at a University in central Canada. The majority of the sample identified as Caucasian, and the mean age of participants was 19 years. In addition, as university students, these participants represent a highly educated population and are more likely to come from families with higher socioeconomic status. These are young men and women who are more likely to have



highly educated parents and who are being exposed to different gender role models through their participation in university. As such, these results may not generalize to other populations.

Measuring double standards is a good first step because these are young people that have grown up during decades of substantial changes in women's roles. However, future research should attempt to measure double standards in older populations, with different ethnic and religious groups, and in community samples with lower educational attainment. Another consideration is the potential construal of the wording of the items. Although participants are asked to respond to "mirror-image" items that differ only with respect to the gender of the target, it is possible that different interpretations are made. For example, it may be that participants interpret the item, "Any woman who hits a man should be severely punished by the courts," quite differently than they interpret, "Any man who hits a woman should be severely punished by the courts." Our stereotypes and mental schemas often bias our interpretation and the stereotype of men as aggressors and women as victims of aggression, could result in a different construal of the violence items for example.

Future scale development should include a focus on wording the items in a way that reduces differential construal effects. Violence items should focus on a specific act of aggression such as a kick or a punch, as opposed to a more generic term like hit. Furthermore, these items should speak to the consequences of the violent act. For example, item 24, "Any woman who hits a man should be severely punished by the courts," could be reworded to state, "Any woman who punches a man in the face, breaking his nose, should be severely punished by the courts." This may help participants

visualize the item the same way for both male and female targets. However, some level of construal difference cannot be controlled and in itself, represents a gender bias.

### *Conclusions*

In summary, confirming the hypotheses and consistent with recent research utilizing the MIDSQ, participants' endorsed pro-female double standards, or no double standards. In addition, the inaccuracy with which participants estimated the attitudes of the "typical male" speaks to a shared negative stereotype of men. The women's movement has made considerable contributions in terms of increasing freedoms and opportunities for women, but it seems that an unfair and inaccurate view of men persists.

The media continues to perpetuate the notion that men and women are adversaries or competitors who hold fundamentally different attitudes. The results of this recent suggest that this is not the case. However, if true equality with respect to the rights, freedoms, and opportunities for men and women is ever to be achieved, no bias in either direction can be deemed socially acceptable. This results of this recent research is a key first step in documenting a pro-female bias but future research should attempt to better understand the mechanisms underlying this bias for men and women.

## References

- Benokraitis, N. V. (Ed.). (1997). *Subtle sexism: Current practice and prospects for change*. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications.
- Benson, P. L., & Vincent, S. (1980). Development and validation of the sexist attitudes toward women scale (SATWS). *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 5, 276-291.
- Biernat, M., & Vescio, T. K. (2002). She swings, she hits, she's great, she's benched: Implications of gender-based shifting standards for judgment and behaviour. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 66-77.
- Button, C. M., Grant, M. J., Ross, A. S., & Hannah, T. E. (1997). Accuracy of attitude stereotypes: The case of inferences based on gender. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 29, 83-91.
- Crawford, M., & Popp, D. (2003). Sexual double standards: A review and methodological critique of two decades of research. *Journal of Sex Research*, 40, 13-26.
- Crawford, M., & Unger, R. (2000). *Women and gender: A feminist psychology (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.)*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Der-Karabetian, A., & Smith, A. J. (1977). Sex-role stereotyping in the United States: Is it changing? *Sex Roles*, 3, 193-198.
- Deutsch, F. M., & Saxon, S. E. (1998). The double standard of praise and criticism for mothers and fathers. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 22, 665 -683.
- Diamont, L., & Lee, J. A. (2002). *The psychology of sex, gender, and jobs: Issues and Solutions*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Diekmann, A. B., Eagly, A. H., & Kulesa, P. (2002). Accuracy and bias in stereotypes about the social and political attitudes of women and men. *Journal of Experimental*

- Social Psychology*, 38, 268-282.
- Eagly, A. H., & Diekmann, A. B., & Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & Koenig, A. M. (2004). Gender Gaps in Sociopolitical Attitudes: A Social Psychological Analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87, 796-816.
- Edmonds, E. M., Cahoon, D. D., & Shipman, M. (1992). Predictions of opposite-sex attitudes concerning gender-related social issues. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society*, 29, 295-296.
- Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (1997). Sticking together or falling apart: in-group identification as a psychological determinant of group commitment versus individual mobility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72, 617-626.
- Festinger, L. (1957). *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Fortune, K. A., Sande, G. N., & Kohut, C. (2005, June). *Double standards in gender-role attitudes*. Poster session presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association, Montreal, Canada.
- Frehill, L. M. (1997). Education and occupational sex segregation: the decision to major in engineering. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 38, 225-249.
- Gentry, M. (1998). The sexual double standard: The influence of number of relationships and level of sexual activity on judgments of men and women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 22, 505-511.
- Harris, R. J., & Firestone, J. M. (1998). Changes in predictors of gender role ideologies among women: A multivariate analysis. *Sex Roles*, 38, 239 – 251.
- Harris, M. B., & Knight-Bohnhoff, K. (1996). Gender and aggression: Perceptions of

- aggression. *Sex Roles*, 35, 1-26.
- Hoffman, C. D., & Moon, M. (2000). Mothers' and fathers' gender-role characteristics: The assignment of post-divorce childcare and custody. *Sex Roles*, 42, 917-924.
- Marcil-Gratton, N., & LeBourdais, C. (1999). Custody, Access, and Child Support: Findings from The National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth. Retrieved July 11, 2006, from, <http://www.justice.gc.ca/en/ps/pad/reports/anlsc/anlsc.pdf>
- Marks, M. J., & Fraley, R. C. (2005). The sexual double standard: Fact or fiction? *Sex Roles*, 52, 175-186.
- Milhausen, R. R., & Herold, E. S. (1999). Does the sexual double standard still exist? Perceptions of university women. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 36, 361-368.
- Miller, D. T. (1999). The norm of self-interest. *American Psychologist*, 54, 1053-1060.
- Miller, D. T., & Ratner, R. K. (1998). The disparity between the actual and assumed power of self-interest. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 53-62.
- Myers, D. G. & Spencer, S. J. (2004). *Social psychology: Second Canadian edition*. Toronto, ON: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.
- Nesbitt, M. M., & Penn, N. E. (2000). Gender stereotypes after thirty years: A replication of Rosenkrantz et al. (1968). *Psychological Reports*, 87, 493 – 511.
- Parks, K. A., & Scheidt, D. M. (2000). Male bar drinkers' perspective on female bar drinkers. *Sex Roles*, 43, 927-941.
- Paulhus (1984). Two-component models of socially desirable responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46, 598-609.
- Paulhus, D.L. (1991). Measurement and control of response bias. In J.P.

- Robinson, P.R. Shaver, & L.S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes* (pp.17-59). New York: Academic Press.
- Peplau, L. A., Rubin, Z., & Hill, C. T. (1977). Sexual intimacy in dating relationships. *Journal of Social Issues, 33*, 86-109.
- Phillips, S. D., & Imhoff, A. R. (1997). Women and career development: A decade of research. *Annual Review of Psychology, 48*, 31-59.
- Plaks, J. E., Stroessner, S. J., Dweck, C. S., & Sherman, J. W. (2001). Person theories and attention allocation: Preferences for stereotypic versus counterstereotypic information. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80*, 876 – 893.
- Rider, E. A. (2000). *Our voices: Psychology of Women*. Belmont, CA, Wadsworth.
- Rudman, L. A., & Goodwin, S. A. (2004). Gender Differences in Automatic In-Group Bias: Why Do Women Like Women More Than Men Like Men? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87*, 494, 509.
- Sande, G. N. (1993). [Double standards in gender-role attitudes]. Unpublished raw data.
- Silverstein, L. B. (1996). Fathering is a feminist issue. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 20*, 3-37.
- Simon, T. R., Anderson, M., Thompson, M. P., Crosby, A. E., Shelley, G., & Sacks, J. J. (2001). Attitudinal acceptance of intimate partner violence amount U.S. adult. *Violence and Victims, 16*, 115-126.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. (1972). The Attitudes toward Women Scale: An objective instrument to measure attitudes toward the rights and roles of women in contemporary society. *Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 66-67*.
- Sprecher, S., Regan, P. C., McKinney, K., Maxwell, K., & Wazienski, R. (1997).

Preferred level of sexual experience in a date or mate: The merger of two Methodologies. *Journal of Sex Research*, 34, 327-337.

Statistics Canada: Centre for Education Statistics. (2005, February 17).

*University qualifications granted by field of study, by sex*. Retrieved August 25, 2005, from <http://www40.statcan.ca/l01/cst01/healtheduc21.htm>

Stewart-Williams, S. (2002). Gender, the perception of aggression, and the overestimation of gender bias. *Sex Roles*, 46, 177-189.

Valentine, S., & Mosely, G. (1998). Aversion to women who work and perceived discrimination among Euro-Americans and Mexican-Americans. *Perceptual & Motor Skills*, 86, 1027-1033

Yoder, J. D., & Schleicher, T. (1996). Undergraduates regard deviation from occupational gender stereotypes as costly for women. *Sex Roles*, 34, 171-188.

Appendix A

Mirror-Image Double Standards Questionnaire Version 1

- 1 = Very strongly disagree with this statement.
- 2 = Strongly disagree with this statement
- 3 = Moderately disagree with this statement.
- 4 = Slightly disagree with this statement.
- 5 = You feel exactly and precisely neutral about this statement.
- 6 = Slightly agree with this statement.
- 7 = Moderately agree with this statement.
- 8 = Strongly agree with this statement.
- 9 = Very strongly agree with this statement.

1. The government should provide financial support for paid paternity leave for men, following the birth of a baby.
2. I think it is repulsive when a woman swears or uses obscenity.
3. Male reporters should not be allowed into the locker rooms of female athletes.
4. There is nothing wrong with a man staring at the body of an attractive female.
5. A divorced woman who earns more money than her ex-husband, should be expected to pay him alimony.
6. I do not think women should hug their female friends in public.
7. There is something wrong with a man who does not want to have children.
8. For men to vote for a male political candidate just because he is male is very unfair.
9. The courts should be lenient with a woman who hits a husband who constantly nags and insults her.
10. I see nothing wrong with women who are primarily interested in a man because of his looks.
11. There is something wrong with a man who cries at movies.
12. In the event of a divorce, mothers should not be given preference over fathers for custody of the children.
13. For occupations in which men are under-represented (e.g., nursing, daycare workers), men should be given preferential access to training and jobs.



14. There is nothing wrong with a man having sex with any woman he pleases, as long as appropriate protection against pregnancy and disease is used.
15. The sight of an intoxicated man is offensive.
16. A man's earning potential should be an important consideration for any woman contemplating marriage.
17. One of the most important priorities in a woman's life is to have a career that is fulfilling and satisfying.
18. If a man asks a woman out to dinner, he should be prepared to pay the full bill.
19. In today's technological society, one of parents' first priorities should be to ensure that their daughters go to college or university.
20. It is totally unacceptable for male comedians to tell jokes that make fun of women as a group.
21. Television programs that show a woman slapping a man, should be censored.
22. Even after she gets married, it is a good idea for a woman to have a "night out" with her female friends on a frequent basis.
23. When the child of working parents gets sick, it is the father's responsibility to stay home and care for the child.
24. Any woman who hits a man should be severely punished by the courts.
25. A woman can never really be a complete and happy person until she finds a good man to settle down with.
26. I think it is wrong for men to engage in premarital sex.
27. Women should expect to work until the usual retirement age of 60 or 65.
28. All-male organizations, from which women are barred, should be banned by law.
29. A man should feel flattered if a woman whistles at him.
30. Men should assume most of the leadership roles in the political and economic life of the community.
31. Wives should not be favoured by law over husbands in property settlements following

a divorce.

32. If a mother and father disagree about how to raise a child, it is only natural for the father to have the final say.
33. There are many professional careers that men are less well suited for than women.
34. Girls should be allowed to play on boy's sports teams if they are equally skilled.
35. There is something wrong with a woman who lets her husband tell her what to do.
36. Nightclubs that feature male strippers are demeaning to men.
37. When it comes to setting priorities, a man's wife and children should be more important to him than his career

## Appendix B

## Mirror-Image Double Standards Questionnaire Version 2

- 1 = Very strongly disagree with this statement.
- 2 = Strongly disagree with this statement
- 3 = Moderately disagree with this statement.
- 4 = Slightly disagree with this statement.
- 5 = You feel exactly and precisely neutral about this statement.
- 6 = Slightly agree with this statement.
- 7 = Moderately agree with this statement.
- 8 = Strongly agree with this statement.
- 9 = Very strongly agree with this statement.

1. The government should provide financial support for paid maternity leave for women, following the birth of a baby.
2. I think it is repulsive when a man swears or uses obscenity.
3. Female reporters should not be allowed into the locker rooms of male athletes.
4. There is nothing wrong with a woman staring at the body of an attractive male.
5. A divorced man who earns more money than his ex-wife, should be expected to pay her alimony.
6. I do not think men should hug their male friends in public.
7. There is something wrong with a woman who does not want to have children.
8. For women to vote for a female political candidate just because she is female, is very unfair.
9. The courts should be lenient with a man who hits a wife who constantly nags and insults him.
10. I see nothing wrong with men who are primarily interested in a woman because of her looks.
11. There is something wrong with a woman who cries at movies.
12. In the event of a divorce, fathers should not be given preference over mothers for custody of the children.
13. For occupations in which women are under-represented (e.g., engineering, industrial

- workers), women should be given preferential access to training and jobs.
14. There is nothing wrong with a woman having sex with any man she pleases, as long as appropriate protection against pregnancy and disease is used.
  15. The sight of an intoxicated woman is offensive.
  16. A woman's earning potential should be an important consideration for any man contemplating marriage.
  17. One of the most important priorities in a man's life is to have a career that is fulfilling and satisfying.
  18. If a woman asks a man out to dinner, she ought to be prepared to pay the full bill.
  19. In today's technological society, one of parents' first priorities should be to ensure that their sons go to college or university.
  20. It is unacceptable for female comedians to tell jokes that make fun of men as a group.
  21. Television programs that show a man slapping a woman, should be censored.
  22. Even after he gets married, it is a good idea for a man to have a "night out" with his male friends on a frequent basis.
  23. When the child of working parents gets sick, it is the mother's responsibility to stay home and care for the child.
  24. Any man who hits a woman ought to be severely punished by the courts.
  25. A man can never really be a complete and happy person until he finds a good woman to settle down with.
  26. I think it is wrong for women to engage in premarital sex.
  27. Men should expect to work until the usual retirement age of 60 or 65.
  28. All-female organizations, from which men are excluded, should be banned by law.
  29. A woman should feel flattered if a man whistles at her.
  30. Women should undertake most of the leadership roles in the political and economic life of the community.
  31. Husbands should not be favoured by law over wives in property settlements

following a divorce.

32. If a mother and father disagree about how to raise a child, it is only natural for the mother to have the final say.
33. There are many professional careers that women are less well suited for than men.
34. Boys should be allowed to play on girl's sports teams if they are equally skilled.
35. There is something wrong with a man who lets his wife tell him what to do.
36. Nightclubs that feature female strippers are demeaning to women.
37. When it comes to setting priorities, a woman's husband and children should be more important to her than her career.

Appendix C

Double Standards Domains, Index of Priorities, and Individually Presented Items.

Sexual Behaviour

Includes items: 4, 14, 26

Public Behaviour

Includes items: 2, 6, 11, 15, 20

Violent Behaviour

Includes items: 9, 21, 24

Parenting

Includes items: 1, 12, 32

Career Opportunities

Includes items: 13, 19, 30, 33

Index of Priorities

Includes items: 7, 17, 25, 37

Individually Presented Items

Includes items: 5, 18, 22, 31, 35, 36

Note:

Items 3, 8, 10, 16, 23, 27, 28, 29, 34 were excluded from domain analyses due to less than 70% agreement between sorters or poor wording.

Appendix D

Research Project Title: Beliefs and Perceptions about Roles.

Researcher: Kathleen Fortune

This consent form, a copy of which will be left with you for your records and reference, is only part of the process of informed consent. It should give you the basic idea of what the research is about and what your participation will involve. If you would like more detail about information not included here, you should feel free to ask.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this research project. The purpose of this study is to examine commonly held beliefs about individuals' roles in society. Participation will involve completing an anonymous questionnaire concerning your personal beliefs. Your questionnaire booklet will be labelled with an identifying code and you will be asked NOT to put your name or any other personally identifiable information on your booklet or answer form.

This session should take approximately 60 minutes and you will receive 2 experimental credits toward your Introduction to Psychology grade. Your participation in this study is voluntary. If, at any time you do not wish to continue participating, you are free to stop without penalty. At the end of the school year, the results of this study will be posted outside P504B Duff Roblin Building.

Your signature on this form indicates that you have understood to your satisfaction the information regarding participation in the research project and agree to participate as a subject. In no way does this waive your legal rights nor release the researchers, sponsors, or involved institutions from their legal and professional responsibilities. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time, and/or refrain from answering any questions you prefer to omit, without prejudice or consequence. Your continued participation should be as informed as your initial consent, so you should feel free to ask for clarification or new information throughout your participation.

Kathleen Fortune  
umfortu1@cc.umanitoba.ca

Dr. Gerry Sande  
gsande@cc.umanitoba.ca

This research has been approved by the Psychology/Sociology Research Ethics Board. If you have any concerns or complaints about this project, you may contact any of the above-named persons or the Human Ethics Secretariat at 474-7122. A copy of this consent form has been given to you for your records and reference.

---

Participant's Signature

Date

---

Researcher and/or Delegate's Signature

Date

Table 1

*Analysis of Variance Results for Domain, Sex of Participant, Sex of Target, and Order Variables for the "Mirror-Image" Time-Delay Sample.*

Source	<u>df</u>	F	eta <sup>2</sup>
Domain	4	98.92**	.61
Domain x Sex	4	2.86*	.04
Domain x Order	4	.40	.01
Domain x Sex x Order	4	1.02	.02
Target	1	41.86**	.14
Target x Sex	1	5.97*	.02
Target x Order	1	.28	.00
Target x Sex x Order	1	1.57	.00
Domain x Target	4	81.63**	.56
Domain x Target x Sex	4	6.90**	.10
Domain x Target x Order	4	.72	.01
Domain x Target x Sex x Order	4	.18	.00

\* p <.05

\*\* p <.01

a. Sex = Sex of Participant

b. Target = Sex of Target



Table 2

*Domain Means and Standard Deviations for the "Mirror-Image" Time-Delay Sample.*

Domain	Male Behavior		Female Behavior	
	M	SD	M	SD
	Male Participants			
Sexual Behavior	4.07	1.01	3.90	1.32
Parenting Responsibilities	4.48	1.07	5.29	1.16
Public Behavior	3.82	1.28	3.19	1.05
Career Opportunities	4.86	1.11	4.71	1.23
Violent Behavior	4.03	1.31	5.24	1.29
	Female Participants			
Sexual Behavior	4.29	1.17	3.71	1.11
Parenting Responsibilities	4.48	1.11	5.43	1.21
Public Behavior	3.84	1.30	3.13	1.24
Career Opportunities	4.58	1.05	5.17	1.12
Violent Behavior	3.39	1.34	4.92	1.36

Table 3

*Domain Means and Standard Deviations for the "Mirror-Image" Simultaneous Sample.*

Domain	Male Behavior		Female Behavior	
	M	SD	M	SD
	Male Participants			
Sexual Behavior	3.84	1.75	3.95	1.79
Parenting Responsibilities	4.51	1.20	4.97	1.27
Public Behavior	4.15	1.13	3.82	1.12
Career Opportunities	5.05	1.32	4.72	1.20
Violent Behavior	3.94	1.43	4.94	1.25
	Female Participants			
Sexual Behavior	4.63	1.84	4.62	1.86
Parenting Responsibilities	4.64	1.20	5.41	1.22
Public Behavior	4.05	1.17	3.71	1.00
Career Opportunities	5.03	1.16	5.08	1.10
Violent Behavior	3.47	1.37	4.64	1.50

Table 4

*Domain Means and Standard Deviations for Perceptions of the Typical Female in the "Mirror-Image" Time-Delay Sample.*

Domain	Male Behavior		Female Behavior	
	M	SD	M	SD
	Male Participants			
Sexual Behavior	5.83	1.51	4.48	1.40
Parenting Responsibilities	4.08	1.20	6.90	1.37
Public Behavior	5.29	1.18	3.82	1.15
Career Opportunities	4.47	1.10	6.12	1.14
Violent Behavior	2.77	1.32	6.23	1.62
	Female Participants			
Sexual Behavior	5.11	1.70	4.34	1.55
Parenting Responsibilities	4.43	1.29	6.48	1.32
Public Behavior	4.97	1.36	3.90	1.11
Career Opportunities	4.84	1.06	5.87	1.27
Violent Behavior	3.18	1.31	5.46	1.56

Table 5

*Domain Means and Standard Deviations for Perceptions of the Typical Female in the "Mirror-Image" Simultaneous Sample.*

Domain	Male Behavior		Female Behavior	
	M	SD	M	SD
	Male Participants			
Sexual Behavior	5.48	1.67	4.55	1.57
Parenting Responsibilities	4.65	1.27	6.56	1.34
Public Behavior	5.42	1.20	3.92	1.19
Career Opportunities	4.66	.98	5.81	1.24
Violent Behavior	3.13	1.64	6.18	1.41
	Female Participants			
Sexual Behavior	5.24	1.74	4.48	1.63
Parenting Responsibilities	4.68	1.27	6.52	1.30
Public Behavior	5.30	1.32	3.92	.96
Career Opportunities	5.21	1.05	5.86	1.21
Violent Behavior	3.15	1.37	5.97	1.43

Table 6

*Domain Means and Standard Deviations for Perceptions of the Typical Male in the "Mirror-Image" Time-Delay Sample.*

Domain	Male Behavior		Female Behavior	
	M	SD	M	SD
	Male Participants			
Sexual Behavior	2.29	1.36	3.59	1.67
Parenting Responsibilities	5.78	1.40	5.45	2.48
Public Behavior	4.49	1.59	3.59	1.34
Career Opportunities	6.15	1.14	4.36	1.06
Violent Behavior	4.64	1.69	5.41	1.51
	Female Participants			
Sexual Behavior	1.99	1.30	3.51	1.72
Parenting Responsibilities	5.94	1.34	5.18	1.07
Public Behavior	4.13	1.05	3.85	1.23
Career Opportunities	6.36	1.12	4.56	1.06
Violent Behavior	4.62	1.40	4.80	1.34

Table 7

*Domain Means and Standard Deviations for Perceptions of the Typical Male in the "Mirror-Image" Simultaneous Sample.*

Domain	Male Behavior		Female Behavior	
	M	SD	M	SD
	Male Participants			
Sexual Behavior	2.61	1.59	3.98	1.73
Parenting Responsibilities	5.81	1.32	5.27	1.32
Public Behavior	4.64	1.08	3.81	1.47
Career Opportunities	6.16	1.40	4.53	1.44
Violent Behavior	4.56	1.75	4.91	1.72
	Female Participants			
Sexual Behavior	1.99	1.05	3.50	1.73
Parenting Responsibilities	6.20	1.29	5.44	1.16
Public Behavior	4.43	.94	4.14	1.19
Career Opportunities	6.68	2.28	4.69	1.01
Violent Behavior	4.61	1.42	4.72	1.55

Table 8

*Analysis of Variance for Sexual Behavior for "Mirror-Image" Time-Delay and "Mirror-Image" Simultaneous samples.*

Source	df	F	eta <sup>2</sup>
Mirror-Image Time-Delay			
Target (T)	1	24.47**	.08
Sex (S)	1	.00	.00
T x S	1	4.52*	.02
Error	277		
Mirror-Image Simultaneous			
Target (T)	1	1.54	.01
Sex (S)	1	8.33	.04
T x S	1	2.19	.01
Error	218		

\*p < .05. \*\*p < .01.

Table 9

*Analysis of Variance for Parenting Responsibilities in the "Mirror-Image" Time-Delay and "Mirror-Image" Simultaneous Samples.*

Source	df	F	eta <sup>2</sup>
Mirror-Image Time-Delay			
Target (T)	1	85.57**	.24
Sex (S)	1	.23	.00
T x S	1	1.33	.00
Error	273		
Mirror-Image Simultaneous			
Target (T)	1	36.14**	.21
Sex (S)	1	3.87	.00
T x S	1	4.17*	.02
Error	218		

\*p < .05. \*\*p < .01.



Table 10

*Analysis of Variance for Public Behavior in the "Mirror-Image" Time-Delay and "Mirror-Image" Simultaneous Samples.*

Source	df	F	eta <sup>2</sup>
Mirror-Image Time-Delay			
Target (T)	1	90.04**	.25
Sex (S)	1	.03	.00
T x S	1	.41	.00
Error	276		
Mirror-Image Simultaneous			
Target (T)	1	48.40**	.18
Sex (S)	1	.49	.00
T x S	1	.12	.00
Error	216		

\*p < .05. \*\*p < .01.

Table 11.

*Analysis of Variance for Career Opportunities in the "Mirror-Image" Time-Delay and "Mirror-Image" Simultaneous Samples.*

Source	df	F	eta <sup>2</sup>
Mirror-Image Time-Delay			
Target (T)	1	5.17*	.02
Sex (S)	1	.74	.00
T x S	1	23.30**	.02
Error	271		
Mirror-Image Simultaneous			
Target (T)	1	6.08*	.03
Sex (S)	1	1.19	.01
T x S	1	12.10**	.05
Error	216		

\*p < .05. \*\*p < .01.

Table 12

*Analysis of Variance for Violent Behavior in the "Mirror-Image" Time-Delay and "Mirror-Image" Simultaneous Samples.*

Source	df	F	eta <sup>2</sup>
Mirror-Image Time-Delay			
Target (T)	1	173.33**	.39
Sex (S)	1	15.97**	.06
T x S	1	2.49	.01
Error	276		
Mirror-Image Simultaneous			
Target (T)	1	126.35**	.37
Sex (S)	1	5.02	.02
T x S	1	.75	.00
Error	218		

\*p < .05. \*\*p < .01.

Table 13.

*Analysis of Variance for Sexual Behavior for Perceptions of the Typical Female in the "Mirror-Image" Time-Delay Sample and "Mirror-Image" Simultaneous Samples.*

Source	df	F	eta <sup>2</sup>
Mirror-Image Time-Delay			
Target (T)	1	146.08**	.34
Sex (S)	1	6.85*	.02
T x S	1	10.48**	.04
Error	277		
Mirror-Image Simultaneous			
Target (T)	1	66.01**	.23
Sex (S)	1	.45	.00
T x S	1	.61	.00
Error	218		

\*p < .05. \*\*p < .01.

Table 14.

*Analysis of Variance for Parenting for Perceptions of the Typical Female in the "Mirror-Image" Time-Delay Sample and "Mirror-Image" Simultaneous Sample.*

Source	df	F	eta <sup>2</sup>
Mirror-Image Time-Delay			
Target (T)	1	396.29**	.58
Sex (S)	1	.17	.00
T x S	1	9.77*	.03
Error	285		
Mirror-Image Simultaneous			
Target (T)	1	175.81**	.45
Sex (S)	1	.89	.00
T x S	1	.01	.00
Error	215		

\*p < .05. \*\*p < .01.

Table 15.

*Analysis of Variance for Public Behavior for Perceptions of the Typical Female in the "Mirror-Image" Time-Delay Sample and the "Mirror-Image" Simultaneous Sample.*

Source	df	F	eta <sup>2</sup>
Mirror-Image Time-Delay			
Target (T)	1	305.88**	.52
Sex (S)	1	.95	.00
T x S	1	7.33*	.03
Error	285		
Mirror-Image Simultaneous			
Target (T)	1	191.85**	.47
Sex (S)	1	.18	.00
T x S	1	.33	.00
Error	217		

\*p < .05. \*\*p < .01.

Table 16.

*Analysis of Variance for Career Opportunities for Perceptions of the Typical Female in the "Mirror-Image" Time-Delay Sample and "Mirror-Image" Simultaneous Sample.*

Source	df	F	eta <sup>2</sup>
Mirror-Image Time-Delay			
Target (T)	1	253.23**	.43
Sex (S)	1	.40	.00
T x S	1	11.29**	.04
Error	285		
Mirror-Image Simultaneous			
Target (T)	1	76.60**	.26
Sex (S)	1	.02	.00
T x S	1	6.02*	.03
Error	218		

\*p < .05. \*\*p < .01.

Table 17

*Analysis of Variance for Violent Behavior for Perceptions of the Typical Female in the "Mirror- Image" Time-Delay Sample and the "Mirror-Image" Simultaneous Sample.*

Source	df	F	eta <sup>2</sup>
Mirror-Image Time-Delay			
Target (T)	1	563.95**	.66
Sex (S)	1	1.93	.01
T x S	1	24.80**	.08
Error	285		
Mirror-Image Simultaneous			
Target (T)	1	412.54**	.37
Sex (S)	1	.52	.00
T x S	1	.65	.00
Error	217		

\*p < .05. \*\*p < .01.



Table 18.

*Analysis of Variance for Sexual Behavior for Perceptions of the Typical Male in the "Mirror-Image" Time-Delay Sample and the "Mirror-Image" Simultaneous Sample.*

Source	df	F	eta <sup>2</sup>
Mirror-Image Time-Delay			
Target (T)	1	184.02**	.39
Sex (S)	1	1.60	.01
T x S	1	1.04	.00
Error	284		
Mirror-Image Simultaneous			
Target (T)	1	126.02**	.37
Sex (S)	1	9.89**	.11
T x S	1	.39	.00
Error	213		

\*p < .05. \*\*p < .01.

Table 19.

*Analysis of Variance for Parenting Responsibilities for Typical Male in the "Mirror-Image" Time-Delay Sample and the "Mirror-Image" Simultaneous Sample.*

Source	df	F	eta <sup>2</sup>
Mirror-Image Time-Delay			
Target (T)	1	15.54**	.05
Sex (S)	1	.57	.01
T x S	1	2.43	.00
Error	285		
Mirror-Image Simultaneous			
Target (T)	1	25.30**	.11
Sex (S)	1	5.13*	.02
T x S	1	.42	.00
Error	218		

\*p < .05. \*\*p < .01.

Table 20.

*Analysis of Variance for Public Behavior for Perceptions of the Typical Male in the "Mirror-Image" Time-Delay Sample and the "Mirror-Image" Simultaneous Sample.*

Source	df	F	eta <sup>2</sup>
Mirror-Image Time-Delay			
Target (T)	1	51.80**	.15
Sex (S)	1	.17	.00
T x S	1	5.40	.02
Error	284		
Mirror-Image Simultaneous			
Target (T)	1	30.86**	.13
Sex (S)	1	.20	.00
T x S	1	6.82*	.03
Error	216		

p < .05. \*\*p < .01.

Table 21.

*Analysis of Variance for Career Opportunities for Perceptions of the Typical Male in the "Mirror-Image" Time-Delay Sample and "Mirror-Image" Simultaneous Sample.*

Source	df	F	eta <sup>2</sup>
Mirror-Image Time-Delay			
Target (T)	1	429.31**	.60
Sex (S)	1	4.62*	.02
T x S	1	.40	.00
Error	285		
Mirror-Image Simultaneous			
Target (T)	1	131.69**	.13
Sex (S)	1	3.92*	.02
T x S	1	1.45	.00
Error	213		

\*p < .05. \*\*p < .01.

Table 22.

*Analysis of Variance for Violent Behavior for Perceptions of the Typical Male in the "Mirror-Image" Time-Delay Sample and the "Mirror-Image" Simultaneous Sample.*

Source	df	F	eta <sup>2</sup>
Mirror-Image Time-Delay			
Target (T)	1	16.01**	.06
Sex (S)	1	6.17*	.02
T x S	1	5.90*	.02
Error	286		
Mirror-Image Simultaneous			
Target (T)	1	2.38	.01
Sex (S)	1	.66	.00
T x S	1	.42	.00
Error	217		

\*p < .05. \*\*p < .01.

Table 23

*Correlation between Personal Endorsement of Double Standards (DS) and Perceptions of Typical Male and Female Double Standards (DS) in Sexual Behavior.*

Source	1	2	3
Female Participants (n = 159)			
1. Self DS	—	.04	-.06
2. Typical Female DS		—	-.20*
3. Typical Male DS			—
Male Participants (n = 129)			
1. Self DS	—	.23	.03
2. Typical Female DS		—	-.27**
3. Typical Male DS			—

\* p < .05

\*\* p < .01

Table 24

*Correlation between Personal Endorsement of Double Standards (DS) and Perceptions of Typical Male and Female Double Standards (DS) in Parenting.*

Source	1	2	3
Female Participants (n = 159)			
1. Self DS	—	.10	.01
2. Typical Female DS		—	.24**
3. Typical Male DS			—
Male Participants (n = 128)			
1. Self DS	—	.16	.21*
2. Typical Female DS		—	-.03
3. Typical Male DS			—

\* p <.05

\*\* p <.01

Table 25

*Correlation between Personal Endorsement of Double Standards (DS) and Perceptions of Typical Male and Female Double Standards (DS) in Public Behavior.*

Source	1	2	3
Female Participants (n = 159)			
1. Self DS	—	.14	-.01
2. Typical Female DS		—	.11
3. Typical Male DS			—
Male Participants (n = 129)			
1. Self DS	—	.08	.13
2. Typical Female DS		—	-.07
3. Typical Males DS			—

\* p < .05

\*\* p < .01



Table 26

*Correlation between Personal Endorsement of Double Standards (DS) and Perceptions of Typical Male & Female Double Standards (DS) in Career Opportunities.*

Source	1	2	3
Female Participants (n = 159)			
1. Self DS	—	-.01	-.07
2. Typical Female DS		—	-.44**
3. Typical Male DS			—
Male Participants (n = 128)			
1. Self DS	—	-.06	.13
2. Typical Female DS		—	-.36**
3. Typical Male DS			—

\* p < .05  
 \*\* p < .01

Table 27

*Correlation between Personal Endorsement of Double Standards (DS) and Perceptions of Typical Male and Female Double Standards (DS) in Violent Behavior.*

Source	1	2	3
Female Participants (n = 153)			
1. Self DS	—	.15	-.02
2. Typical Female DS		—	.08
3. Typical Male DS			—
Male Participants (n = 129)			
1. Self DS	—	.23*	.29**
2. Typical Female DS		—	.06
3. Typical Male DS			—

\* p < .05

\*\* p < .01

Table 28

*Analysis of Variance for Female Participants Double Standards (Self) and Perceptions of the Typical Female Double Standards (Typical Female).*

Source	df	F	eta <sup>2</sup>
Self Total	1	438.45**	.76
Typical Female Total	1	9.49*	.06
Self x Typical Female	1	32.09**	.19
Error	138		

\*p < .05. \*\*p < .01.

Table 29

*Analysis of Variance for Male Participants Double Standards (Self) and Perceptions of the Typical Male Double Standards (Typical Male).*

Source	df	F	eta <sup>2</sup>
Self Total	1	2.57	.02
Typical Male Total	1	14.43**	.12
Self x Typical Male	1	50.16**	.32
Error	109		

\*p < .05. \*\*p < .01.

Table 30

*Means and Standard Deviations for Individual MIDSQ Items.*

Domain	Male Behavior		Female Behavior	
	M	SD	M	SD
	Male Participants			
Alimony	3.62	1.01	6.17	1.32
Paying the Bill	6.52	1.07	4.19	1.16
“Night-Out”	7.12	1.28	6.80	1.05
Property	5.57	1.31	7.06	1.23
Tell what to do	4.98	1.31	5.16	1.29
Strippers	4.12	1.28	4.46	1.26
Priorities Index	4.99	1.43	4.12	1.34
	Female Participants			
Alimony	4.96	1.01	4.29	1.32
Paying the Bill	6.00	1.07	5.49	1.16
“Night-Out”	6.73	1.28	7.51	1.05
Property	6.89	1.11	5.69	1.23
Tell what to do	4.37	1.31	6.42	1.29
Strippers	4.62	1.28	5.54	1.33
Priorities Index	4.29	1.21	3.64	1.18

Table 31

*Difference Scores by Quartile Group for each Domain.*

Domain	Quartile Group			
	1	2	3	4
Male Participants				
Public Behavior	-.43	-.05	-.78	-1.02
Parenting Responsibilities	-.48	-.28	-1.44	-.57
Violent Behavior	-1.37	-1.09	-1.37	-1.02
Career Opportunities	.23	.36	.16	.28
Sexual Behavior	-.38	-.28	-.07	-.34
Female Participants				
Public Behavior	-.57	-.78	-.73	-.71
Parenting Responsibilities	-.67	-.90	-1.14	-1.16
Violent Behavior	-1.62	-1.43	-1.43	-1.80
Career Opportunities	-.37	-.55	-.68	-.76
Sexual Behavior	-.49	-.46	-.64	-.80