

MATRIARCHS AND SWEETHEARTS AND REBELS, OH MY!  
ARCHETYPES AS AN APPROACH TO MULTIPLE GROUP  
MEMBERSHIP

by

ALISSA NICOLE GEBBEN

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the Honors in the Major Program in Psychology  
in the College of Sciences  
and in The Burnett Honors College  
at the University of Central Florida  
Orlando, Florida

Fall Term, 2015

Thesis Chair: Barbara Fritzsche, Ph.D.

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of this thesis was to examine a potential cognitive mechanism for simultaneous processing of age, race, and gender schemas. Marcus and Fritzsche (2014) propose that the outcome of the tripartite relationship of age, race, and sex are associated with archetypes, and that these archetypes categorize different intersections uniquely. To facilitate this, age groups selected were “old” and “young”, race groups selected were “Black” and “White”, and sex/gender groups selected were “female” and “male”. Several photographs representing each intersection were selected from LinkedIn for use in the pilot study, which were rated via a survey measuring the target’s stereotype, and the items included were chosen with the intent of selecting archetypal pictures for the main study that were the relatively equivalent across several dimensions. The main study used the selected photographs to address perceptions of participants ( $n=84$ ) regarding adjectives used to represent each of the eight archetype conditions. Results suggest partial support for the proposed archetype theory, but the study faced limitations with respects to the photographs used in the main study. Inconsistencies with the literature suggest that the archetypes may be measured improperly, were conceived incorrectly, or do not exist. However, this study serves as a step towards understanding the complex relationship between a person’s age, race, and sex.

## **DEDICATION**

For my mother, Judy Gebben, whose constant love, support, guidance, and encouragement has  
sustained me throughout life.

She is an eternal inspiration to me.

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

Foremost, I would like to acknowledge and thank my mentor and adviser, Dr. Barbara Fritzsche, for her adamant support. Her confidence in my abilities has inspired me in all areas of life, and I give unconditional gratitude to her for this.

Also, I wish to thank my committee members, Dr. Elizabeth Grauerholz and Dr. Victoria Pace, who were extremely generous in lending their time, expertise, and most importantly, patience.

I would also like to thank Steve Neal, whose encouragement and unconditional love surprises me more and more every day. I could never thank him enough.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	iv
INTRODUCTION .....	1
Ageism .....	2
Racism.....	3
Sexism.....	4
EMPIRICAL AND THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS .....	6
Multiple Group Membership.....	6
Theories of Intersectional Group Salience .....	7
Category Activation and Inhibition .....	7
Archetypes .....	8
HYPOTHESES .....	10
METHOD .....	12
Pilot Study.....	12
Participants .....	12
Materials .....	12
Procedure.....	13
Main Study .....	13
Participants .....	13
Materials .....	14

Procedure .....	14
RESULTS .....	15
Pilot Study .....	15
Main Study .....	16
DISCUSSION .....	25
Summary of Key Findings .....	26
Limitations and Directions for Future Research .....	28
Conclusion .....	29
REFERENCES .....	32
APPENDIX A: ADJECTIVE LIST .....	39
Adjectives .....	40
APPENDIX B: MATERIALS .....	44
Demographics and Photograph Rating Survey (Pilot Study) .....	45
Demographics and Photograph Rating Survey (Main Study) .....	47
Photographs Used in the Main Study .....	54
APPENDIX C: IRB APPROVAL LETTER .....	57

**LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1: All scale means, standard deviations, and coefficient alphas ..... 31

## INTRODUCTION

Extensive research has been conducted on perceived discrimination in the workplace and the effects thereof. Given that age, race, and sex are the most explicit facets of a person's demographic distinction, a large body of literature (Eagly, Makhijani & Klonsky, 1992; Finkelstein, Burke & Raju, 1995; Roth, Huffcutt & Bobko, 2003) examines the independent issues of ageism, racism, or sexism. Some studies (Duncan & Loretto, 2004; Kite, Deaux & Miele, 1991; Purdie-Vaughns & Eibach, 2008; Sesko & Biernat, 2010) aim to better understand dyads of ageism and racism, ageism and sexism, and racism and sexism and their effects. This is helpful, as humans are complex, with multiple group memberships. That is, a female may also be old and Black; a male may be young and White. However, research on the basis of the tripartite relationship of age, race, and sex is quite sparse. For example, much research on ageism has not taken into account the complexity of multiple-group memberships, but rather operationalizes older workers as a unitary category (Bal, Reiss, Rudolph, & Baltes, 2011). This is undesirable, as each younger or older worker is a younger or older *something* (i.e., older male; younger White female). It is therefore my aim to empirically study this triad to better understand the salient factors which cue the onset of prejudice and discrimination.

This review will start with a brief overview of the concepts of stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination. Then, I will provide a brief overview of ageism, racism, and sexism. Finally, I will introduce research and theories that address the intersection of age, race, and sex, which will lead to my study on whether or not age, race, and sex combine to form stereotypical archetypes that guide perception and behavior.



Stereotypes exist as a collection of beliefs regarding the characteristics and behaviors that are exhibited by members of a certain group (Hilton & von Hippel, 1996). These beliefs do not just include defining features (i.e., dark skin is a defining feature of a Black person), but are primarily about the attributes that groups share (Cox, Abramson, Devine & Hollon, 2012). As a function of knowledge, stereotypes exist to efficiently process information about a group of people (Crandall, Bahns, Warner & Schaller, 2011). Prejudice is traditionally defined as the application of these stereotypes, and includes both negative attitudes towards specific groups, and the tendency to prejudge individuals based on group membership (Hilton & von Hippel, 1996). Research suggests that whereas stereotypes may be automatically activated by a perceiver, prejudice can be moderated by personal beliefs (Devine, 1989). Whereas prejudice is an attitude, discrimination is its behavioral counterpart in the majority of cases, and is generally defined as the unequal treatment among groups (Quillian, 2006). The following paragraphs include a brief review of what is known about each of the focal sects of discrimination (age, race, and sex).

#### Ageism

In a study of 28 European countries, Ayalon (2014) found that among the majority of participating countries, ageism was the most widely experienced form of discrimination, followed by gender-based discrimination, and race- or ethnicity-based discrimination. This is unsurprising, as ageism is among the most socially tolerated forms of prejudice and discrimination, to the point that it is in essence institutionalized (Nelson, 2005). Additionally, intragenerational ageism exists as older people desire to differentiate themselves from those older than them (Giles & Reid, 2005). The older employees are also likely to mind these

stereotypes in decision-making processes (Posthuma & Campion, 2009). In a UK study focusing on the employees of a major financial services corporation in the UK, Duncan and Loretto (2004) found older employees are targeted for prejudice and discrimination, as they were informed that they were too old for promotion (a need existed to bring younger employees in), aging stereotypes with respect to “new technology” were also enforced (older employees denied work on projects involving new technology), and general negative attitudes (“I am sick and tired of people’s ageist comments which make me feel uncomfortable and unhappy”). This negative treatment can prompt older workers to retire early rather than cope with the discrimination. Other associations with early retirement include high physical job strain, low autonomy, and low organizational commitment on the organizational level, and withdrawal, disengagement, and an absence of social mobility on the personal level (Desmette & Gaillard, 2008).

### Racism

On the societal level, blatant and overt displays of racism are less common as dominant group members in America are less willing to deem them socially acceptable (Deitch et al, 2003). This has in turn given way to more subtle forms of racism, deemed “everyday racism”. Deitch et al (2003) operationalized everyday racism to include a variety of ways in which someone could be mistreated, such as being set up for failure, denied privileges that others received, damage to personal property, and being treated like one didn’t exist; necessarily, these items did not make any reference to discrimination or prejudice. In a study of first-line workers at an American corporation, and subsequently the United States Navy and Army, Deitch et al (2003) supported the existence of everyday racism as Black participants were not primed to

associate mistreatment with their race, yet still reported higher levels of mistreatment. This in turn lowered job satisfaction, and suggested that the Black participants had experienced everyday racism. There is also research suggesting that those surrounding us will significantly influence the probability of perceiving discrimination, as Black and Hispanic participants in the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission 40<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Civil Rights in the Workplace survey reported higher levels of perceived discrimination. Results also suggested that Black people were four times as likely as White people to experience discrimination (Avery, McKay & Wilson, 2008). Furthermore, the study looked at the effects of racially similar supervisor-subordinate relationships, and found that perceived racially-motivated discrimination decreased when Black employees had a Black supervisor, whereas the opposite was true of White people. Effects of racial discrimination in the workplace are well-documented, with reports of decreased organizational commitment, decreased job satisfaction, and increased work tension on the organizational level (Sanchez & Brock, 1996) and increased levels of anxiety and depression, decreased self-esteem, lower life satisfaction, and psychological distress among others, as well as physical effects including back pain and interrupted sleep (Vassillière, 2014). It has also been suggested that higher levels of discrimination can lead to higher levels of maladaptive, emotion-focused coping mechanisms (Vassillière, 2014).

### Sexism

Similar to the rise of everyday racism, explicit and overt displays of sexism have started to decline in the workplace (Swim, Aikin, Hall & Hunter, 1995), allowing for an increase of gender microaggressions, which are “brief and commonplace daily verbal, behavioral or environmental indignities”, and can be intentional or not while communicating hostile or

derogatory insults (Basford, Offermann & Behrned, 2014). They may be manifested in various forms, from resentment towards women receiving what could be perceived as “special favors” in the workplace (i.e., policies which support the advancement of women) to the exclusion of women from pertinent conversations (Basford, Offermann & Behrend, 2014). Also, women may be nearly 12.5 times more likely to perceive gender-based discrimination than their male counterparts, with the perceived discrimination more frequent among female employees with a higher proportion of male coworkers (Avery, McKay & Wilson, 2008). Research also suggests that the perceived prevalence of stereotypical information influences both men and women’s preconceptions about women; Duguid and Thomas-Hunt (2014) found that participants rated women more stereotypically when exposed to information stating that “the vast majority of people have stereotypical preconceptions, and their impressions and evaluations of others are consistently biased by these stereotypic preconceptions”. These participants also tended to be more resistant to work with members not part of the in-group. Furthermore, those experiencing perceived discrimination tend to have higher rates of physical withdrawal in the form of increased tardiness, absenteeism, and intentions to quit, and higher rates of psychological withdrawal marked by disengagement, and burnout, with women exposed to sex-based discrimination reporting increased anger and depression, and decreased self-esteem (Swim, Hyers, Cohen & Ferguson, 2001; Volpone & Avery, 2013).

## EMPIRICAL AND THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

### Multiple Group Membership

The cultural mosaic theory proposes that each person's identity is made up of a mosaic of individual demographic, geographical, and associative cultures (Chao & Moon, 2005). Focusing on the demographic category, age, ethnicity, gender, and race are included as individual "tiles". Chao and Moon (2005) propose that individuals draw upon combinations or sequences in their own cultural mosaic (e.g. ethnicity and gender) to influence behavior. As such, many individual tiles make up one individual's personal mosaic, and the tiles may intertwine or overlap. On an organizational level, maturation can affect tiles on the cultural mosaic as an individual ages, as Thumin, Johnson, Kuehl and Jiang (1995) found that older individuals tended to find ethical behavior more important than their younger counterparts. The same study found a variety of differences in corporate values among men and women, ranging from staffing methodology to the importance of employee motivation and job satisfaction. Gaines et al. (1997) also found that collectivism and familism were moderated by race/ethnicity, in that persons of color tended to show more collectivist and familistic tendencies. A substantial amount is known about individual tiles that make up a person's demographic mosaic, which is helpful for studying the "-isms" associated with each tile (e.g., racism, ageism, sexism).

However, competing hypotheses exist concerning the outcomes of multiple group membership. The double jeopardy hypothesis posits that individuals will experience aggregate expressions of discrimination stemming from multiple sources; for example, a minority female employee will experience disadvantages according to each the "minority" and "female"

subgroups (Barnum, Liden & Ditomaso, 1995). Conversely, the double advantage hypothesis states that individuals in multiple groups, particularly Black females, will benefit from additive effects of race and gender (Hosoda, Stone & Stone-Romero, 2006).

The ethnic prominence hypothesis proposes that the historical emphasis placed on ethnicity and race in the United States forces ethnicity to be the most salient factor when judgements are made about an individual (Levin, Sinclair, Veniegas & Taylor, 2002). Furthermore, the subordinate male target hypothesis states that minority men will endure the highest degree of discrimination (Derous et al, 2012; Veenstra, 2013). Finally, the intersectional invisibility hypothesis suggests that an incongruity exists between people with several subordinate identities and each identity's prototype, and as a result these individuals are marginalized among marginalized groups, rendering them invisible (Purdie-Vaughns & Eibach, 2008).

### Theories of Intersectional Group Salience

Moving forward, there are two relevant theories regarding intersectional group salience and multiple group membership. These are the category activation and inhibition theory, as proposed by Kulik, Roberson, and Perry (2007), and a theory regarding archetypes as an approach to multiple group membership, as proposed by Marcus and Fritzsche (2014).

### **Category Activation and Inhibition**

The category activation and inhibition theory presents a simpler idea than the aforementioned hypotheses. Specifically, when several conflicting categories (e.g., Black, female, disabled, etc) are activated, one category will be focal while the others will be inhibited

(Kulik, Roberson & Perry, 2007). Macrae, Bodenhausen and Milne (1995) showed participants a Chinese woman performing one of two things: eating with chopsticks, or applying makeup. Results suggested that participants shown the woman eating with chopsticks responded faster to stereotypical Chinese traits, and participants exposed to the woman applying makeup responded faster to stereotypical female traits. This suggests that in this scenario, both the 'Chinese' and 'female' categories were activated, but the one category was then inhibited as situational factors (i.e., eating with chopsticks, applying makeup) made the competing category more salient. Category activation and inhibition theory also proposes that motivated activation and inhibition may occur due to perceivers' interests in avoiding prejudice. Similarly, perceivers inspired by a desire to maintain their own self-esteem may activate a category associated with a negative stereotype - this is deemed "self-enhancement motivation" (Kulik, Roberson & Perry, 2007).

## **Archetypes**

Another idea about the interplay between age, sex, and race was offered by Marcus and Fritzsche (2014). They propose that the outcomes of the tripartite relationship of age, race, and sex are associated with archetypes, and that these archetypes categorize different intersections uniquely. Younger White males, for example, are archetyped as the norm, or "leaders", as they are the furthest from natural death and belonging to both the socially dominant race and gender (Marcus & Fritzsche, 2014), whereas younger White females have archetypal traits of being "sweetheart" or "family oriented" (Hummert, 1990; Kite, Deux & Miele, 1991). Running counter to this, younger minority males are archetyped as being "rebels" or "having an attitude", while older minority males are categorized as "sages" or "intelligent" (Shih, 2002; Kite, Deux &

Miele, 1991). Older White females, however, tend to be classified as the “perfect grandparent” (Hummert, 1990). Additionally, younger minority females have an archetype of being “invisible”, while their older counterparts are seen as being “matriarchs” (Purdie-Vaughns & Eibach, 2008). As each of these archetypes is uniquely different and each has different cognitive profiles, it would therefore be expected that a “sage” would garner qualitatively different treatment or judgment than a “perfect grandmother”. The archetype idea has not yet been empirically tested, thus the purpose of this study is to explore whether participants rate photos of individuals who vary in age, race, and sex in the aforementioned archetypal ways.



## HYPOTHESES

Using a list of adjectives developed for the purpose of this study, I expected the following:

**Hypothesis 1:** The younger White male (the “normal” archetype) was expected to be rated higher than any other group on “skilled in business matters”, “competent” and “attractive”.

**Hypothesis 2:** The younger White female (the “sweetheart” archetype) was expected to be rated higher on “kind”, “family oriented” and “attractive” than the younger White male.

**Hypothesis 3:** The younger Black male (the “rebel” archetype) was expected to be rated higher on “antagonistic”, “aggressive”, “criminal”, “dissident”, “gangster”, “rebellious”, “quarrelsome”, “frightful”, “devious”, and “deceitful” than the younger White male.

**Hypothesis 4:** The younger Black female (the “invisible” archetype) was expected to be rated higher on “pitiable”, “subordinate”, “easily influenced”, “obedient”, “submissive”, “fearful”, and “need for security” than the younger White male.

**Hypothesis 5:** The older Black male (the “sage” archetype) was expected to be rated higher on “knows the way of the world”, “experienced”, “wise”, “knowledgeable”, “sober”, “intuitive”, “objective”, “logical” than the younger White male.

**Hypothesis 6:** The older Black female (the “matriarch” archetype) was expected to be rated higher on “authoritative”, “dominant”, and “firm” than the younger White male.

**Hypothesis 7:** The older White male (the “gentleman” archetype) was expected to be rated higher on “refined”, “cultured”, “distinguished”, “elegant”, and “polite” than the younger White male.

**Hypothesis 8:** The older White female (the “grandmother” stereotype) was expected to be rated higher on “caring”, “nurturing”, “grandparent-like”, “thoughtful”, “personable”, “merciful”, and “sympathetic” than the younger White male.

**Hypothesis 9:** The young White male was expected to be rated higher on hireability than all other conditions.

**Hypothesis 10:** The young White male was expected to be rated higher on stability than all other conditions.

**Hypothesis 11:** The young White male was expected to be rated higher on adaptability than all other conditions.

**Hypothesis 12:** The young White male was expected to be rated higher on interpersonal skills than all other conditions.

**Hypothesis 13:** The young White male was expected to be rated higher on performance capacity than all other conditions.

## METHOD

This study will have two phases: the first of which will be a pilot test with the purpose of selecting the photographs to be used in the second phase, the main study.

### Pilot Study

#### **Participants**

Forty-seven undergraduate students at the University of Central Florida were recruited via the online SONA system. Participation was voluntary, and those who chose to participate were awarded course credit as compensation. Of the participants, 25.5% ( $n=12$ ) were male, and 74.5% ( $n=35$ ) were female. 59.6% ( $n=28$ ) of participants were White or Caucasian, 21.3% ( $n=10$ ) were Hispanic or Latino, 10.6% ( $n=5$ ) were Asian or Pacific Islander, 6.4% ( $n=3$ ) were Black or African American, and 2.1% ( $n=1$ ) was of mixed race or ethnicity, or other. The mean age was 20.17 ( $SD=5.38$ ). All participants gave their informed consent.

#### **Materials**

Using the professional networking website LinkedIn, 11 to 13 photographs were found for each condition, with 96 total pictures that were of similar professionalism and clarity. The survey used had 22 items including demographic information and 16 items measuring the target's stereotype. The three remaining items served as manipulation checks, asking participants to report the subjective age, race, and biological sex of the individual in each photograph to ensure that each participant viewed the older people as older, etc. Sample items included "This person looks youthful", and "This person seems competent", and participants rated their agreement or disagreement on a 5-point Likert scale. Items included were chosen

with the intent of selecting archetype pictures for the main study that are the same across the dimensions of competence, attractiveness and intelligence.

## **Procedure**

This phase of the study was designed to use a between-subjects approach, and participants were to be randomly assigned to one of the eight conditions and shown a series of photographs of individuals in their assigned intersectional grouping. After showing participants the aforementioned photographs, they were then asked to rate each photograph using the survey created for this study. Due to a technical issue, participants were shown each of the eight conditions, though in randomized order. To guard against practice effects, only the responses from each participant's first condition were kept. The purpose of the pilot to study was to ensure that the individuals selected for use in the main study were viewed as equivalent on competence, intelligence and attractiveness.

## Main Study

### **Participants**

For the main study, undergraduate students ( $n=84$ ) were recruited through the same SONA system as mentioned above. Participation was again voluntary, and course credit was given as well. Of the participants, 20.2% ( $n=17$ ) were male, and 79.8% ( $n=67$ ) were female. 46.4% ( $n=39$ ) were White or Caucasian, 28.6% ( $n=24$ ) were Hispanic or Latino, 14.3% ( $n=12$ ) were Black or African American, 8.3% ( $n=7$ ) were Asian or Pacific Islander, and 2.4% ( $n=2$ ) were of mixed race or ethnicity, or other. The mean age of participants was 22.21 ( $SD=6.52$ ), and all participants gave their informed consent.

## **Materials**

Upon conclusion of the pilot study, one photograph was chosen to represent each condition, and these chosen photographs are included in Appendix B.

The survey used in this phase included a total of 81 items, including demographic questions, and the same manipulation checks used in the pilot study. Other items included the adjectives that correspond to each of the proposed archetypes, which were taken from a study currently being conducted in Turkey (a list of the adjectives used in this study is available in Appendix A), and sample items include “This person is aggressive” and “This person is competent in business matters”. Also included were three items regarding workplace hierarchy such as “This person is likely to be my subordinate in a work environment” and “This person is likely to be my supervisor in a work environment”. The multidimensional applicant rating scale used in Finkelstein, Demuth and Sweeney (2007) was also included to rate each photograph across the dimensions of hireability, stability, adaptability, interpersonal skills, and performance capacity.

## **Procedure**

Using a between-subjects design, participants were randomly assigned to each intersection’s condition and then rated the singular photograph according to the survey created for the main study. Each condition received between 9 and 12 participants.

## RESULTS

### Pilot Study

The overarching goal of the pilot study was to select photographs that were relatively and reasonably equal on characteristics such as professionalism, competence, intelligence, and attractiveness. It was imperative to ensure that the individuals in the photographs appeared either old or young, Black or White, or a male or female. Necessarily, each of the photographs for the younger conditions had mean subjective ages in their twenties, while the mean subjective age for all of the photographs in the older conditions were in their fifties. Each of the items were scored on a 5-point Likert scale, with “strongly disagree” having a value of 1, and “strongly agree” having a value of 5. For dimensions having more than one item to assess it (i.e., intelligence), the mean score across all items was used.

The selected photograph for the young White male condition had a mean subjective age of 27.43 ( $SD=0.90$ ), also being rated moderately high on professionalism ( $M=4.00$ ,  $SD=0.82$ ), intelligence ( $M=3.90$ ,  $SD=0.63$ ), competence ( $M=3.86$ ,  $SD=0.90$ ), and attractiveness ( $M=3.21$ ,  $SD=0.70$ ).

The archetypal photograph selected for further use in the young White female condition had an average subjective age of 25.14 ( $SD=5.18$ ), and was also rated moderately high on intelligence ( $M=3.86$ ,  $SD=0.69$ ), competence ( $M=3.86$ ,  $SD=0.69$ ), professionalism ( $M=3.86$ ,  $SD=0.69$ ), and attractiveness ( $M=3.71$ ,  $SD=0.76$ ).

Similarly, the chosen photograph for the young Black male condition had a subjective age of 25.50 ( $SD=5.29$ ). This photo was rated similarly on professionalism ( $M=4.13$ ,  $SD=0.64$ ),

competence ( $M=4.00$ ,  $SD=0.53$ ), intelligence ( $M=3.67$ ,  $SD=0.87$ ), and attractiveness ( $M=3.00$ ,  $SD=0.76$ ).

Regarding the young Black female, the subjective age of the individual was 27.50 ( $SD=4.59$ ), and was rated similarly on professionalism ( $M=4.17$ ,  $SD=0.75$ ), competence ( $M=4.33$ ,  $SD=0.82$ ), intelligence ( $M=4.28$ ,  $SD=0.44$ ), and attractiveness ( $M=3.25$ ,  $SD=0.76$ ).

The subjective age of the old Black male was 52.20 ( $SD=8.23$ ), and this photograph also had relative ratings on professionalism ( $M=3.80$ ,  $SD=0.45$ ), competence ( $M=3.60$ ,  $SD=0.89$ ), intelligence ( $M=3.47$ ,  $SD=1.19$ ), and attractiveness ( $M=2.50$ ,  $SD=0.50$ ).

The old Black female had a mean subjective age of 50.14 ( $SD=4.34$ ), with similar ratings on intelligence ( $M=4.29$ ,  $SD=0.49$ ), competence ( $M=4.29$ ,  $SD=0.49$ ), professionalism ( $M=4.00$ ,  $SD=0.82$ ), and attractiveness ( $M=3.43$ ,  $SD=0.98$ ).

The old White male had a mean subjective age of 54.00 ( $SD=1.73$ ), and had adequate ratings on professionalism ( $M=4.00$ ,  $SD=0.00$ ), competence ( $M=4.00$ ,  $SD=0.00$ ), intelligence ( $M=4.00$ ,  $SD=0.00$ ) and attractiveness ( $M=2.67$ ,  $SD=0.58$ ).

Finally, the archetypal old White female selected had a mean subjective age of 53.75 ( $SD=10.44$ ), and had similar ratings in terms of professionalism ( $M=4.50$ ,  $SD=0.58$ ), competence ( $M=4.50$ ,  $SD=0.58$ ), intelligence ( $M=4.50$ ,  $SD=0.58$ ), and attractiveness ( $M=3.50$ ,  $SD=1.29$ ).

### Main Study

Seven of the hypotheses suggested a specific contrast to test (e.g., how does the old Black male compare to the young White male?). Thus, each hypothesis was tested using MANOVA where the hypothesized contrast was the independent variable and the relevant archetypal adjectives were the dependent variables. Then, an “archetype scale” was developed by summing

the scores for the relevant adjectives (scale means, standard deviations, and coefficient alphas are presented in Table 1). For each contrast, a univariate ANOVA was calculated with archetype scale as the dependent variable.

In addition, to explore possible differences between the focal condition and all other conditions (e.g., how does the old Black male compare to the young White female, the young Black male, etc.), MANOVAs and ANOVAs were conducted using age, race, and sex as independent variables and archetypical adjective ratings as the dependent variables. For ease of comprehension, results of each hypothesis will be listed by archetype, and all relevant results will be reported there.

Ensuingly, results for the remaining hypotheses will be reported according to dimension (e.g. hireability, etc.). Each dimension was tested for univariate effects as a whole scale across all conditions, followed by each contrast.

Hypothesis 1 stated that the young White male was expected to be rated higher than any other group on “skilled in business matters”, “attractive”, and “competent”. This scale had a coefficient alpha of 0.65, and without the “attractive” adjective, this alpha increased to 0.90. As a result, all further analysis with this scale was done without the “attractive” adjective. When testing the remaining hypothesized young white male adjectives (e.g., “competent”, and “skilled in business matters”) against all other conditions, there was a significant multivariate result for the interaction between race and sex ( $F(2,75)=3.77, p<0.05, \eta_p^2=0.09$ ), specifically for the “skilled in business matters” item ( $F(1,76)=7.31, p<0.01, \eta_p^2=0.09$ ), for which LSD post-hoc results showed that the Black male conditions ( $M=4.10, SD=0.83$ ) were rated higher than the Black female conditions ( $M=3.40, SD=0.50$ ), and that the Black female conditions were rated



higher than the White female conditions ( $M=3.90$ ,  $SD=0.91$ ). Likewise, there was a significant univariate result for the interaction between race and sex when testing the scale ( $F(1,76)=12.09$ ,  $p<0.05$ ,  $\eta_p^2=0.07$ ). LSD post-hocs indicate that the Black male conditions ( $M=8.14$ ,  $SD=1.59$ ) were rated higher on the young White male adjectives, as opposed to the Black female ( $M=6.95$ ,  $SD=0.94$ ) conditions. These findings suggest no support for Hypothesis 1.

Hypothesis 2 stated that the young White female was expected to be rated higher on “kind”, “family oriented” and “attractive” than the young White male. This scale had a coefficient alpha of 0.63, and without the “attractive” adjective, this coefficient increased to 0.75, so all further analysis with this scale was done without the “attractive” adjective. When testing the contrast between the young White female and the young White male, no significant differences were found when testing each adjective separately ( $F(2,18)=1.41$ ,  $p=0.27$ ,  $\eta_p^2=0.14$ ) or when testing the scale ( $F(1,19)=2.89$ ,  $p=0.11$ ,  $\eta_p^2=0.13$ ). However when testing how each adjective differed across all eight conditions, there was a significant multivariate effect for the interaction between race and sex ( $F(2,75)=3.63$ ,  $p<0.05$ ,  $\eta_p^2=0.09$ ). When interpreting the univariate effect, there was a significant effect for the “family oriented” adjective ( $F(1,76)=6.14$ ,  $p<0.05$ ,  $\eta_p^2=0.08$ ), with LSD post-hoc results suggesting that the Black male conditions ( $M=3.90$ ,  $SD=0.77$ ) and White female conditions ( $M=3.81$ ,  $SD=0.75$ ) were rated higher than the White male groups ( $M=3.32$ ,  $SD=0.78$ ). Accordingly, there was a marginally significant univariate effect for race when testing the scale across all conditions ( $F(1,76)=3.68$ ,  $p=0.06$ ,  $\eta_p^2=0.05$ ), in that the Black groups ( $M=7.56$ ,  $SD=1.27$ ) were rated higher on the young White female adjectives as opposed to the White groups ( $M=7.00$ ,  $SD=1.46$ ). These findings suggest no support for Hypothesis 2.

Hypothesis 3 stated that the young Black male was expected to be rated higher on “antagonistic”, “aggressive”, “criminal”, “dissident”, “gangster”, “rebellious”, “quarrelsome”, “frightful”, “devious”, and “deceitful” than the younger White male. Testing the multivariate contrast between the young Black male and young White male showed no significant differences ( $F(10,9)=0.90, p=0.57, \eta_p^2=0.50$ ), nor was there a significant difference when testing the scale ( $F(1,18)=2.32, p=0.15, \eta_p^2=0.11$ ). However, when examining how the archetype ratings differed across all conditions, there was a significant multivariate effect for race ( $F(10,67)=1.96, p=0.05, \eta_p^2=0.23$ ), suggesting that univariate tests could then be interpreted. Specifically, the adjective “antagonistic” was rated higher among the White individuals ( $M=2.84, SD=0.84$ ) than the Black individuals ( $M=2.24, SD=0.89$ ), ( $F(1,76)=9.67, p<0.01, \eta_p^2=0.11$ ). The adjective “aggressive” also had a significant effect ( $F(1,76)=8.65, p<0.01, \eta_p^2=0.10$ ), as White conditions ( $M=2.53, SD=0.91$ ) were rated as more aggressive than Black conditions ( $M=1.95, SD=0.84$ ), and “deceitful” had a significant effect ( $F(1,76)=7.60, p<0.01, \eta_p^2=0.09$ ) as White people ( $M=2.53, SD=0.98$ ) were rated as more deceitful than Black people ( $M=2.00, SD=0.84$ ). Similarly, the adjective “quarrelsome” ( $F(1,76)=5.77, p<0.05, \eta_p^2=0.07$ ) was rated higher across White conditions ( $M=2.42, SD=0.88$ ) as opposed to Black conditions ( $M=1.95, SD=0.84$ ). Finally, “devious” had a significant effect ( $F(1,76)=5.24, p<0.05, \eta_p^2=0.07$ ), in that the White conditions ( $M=2.40, SD=1.05$ ) were rated higher than the Black conditions ( $M=1.93, SD=0.82$ ). Furthermore, there was a significant effect for race when testing the scale across all conditions ( $F(1,76)=6.92, p<0.05, \eta_p^2=0.08$ ), such that White conditions ( $M=23.60, SD=6.98$ ) were rated higher on the scale as opposed to Black conditions ( $M=19.51, SD=7.16$ ). These findings suggest no support for Hypothesis 3.

Hypothesis 4 stated that the younger Black female was expected to be rated higher on “pitiable”, “subordinate”, “easily influenced”, “obedient”, “submissive”, “fearful”, and “need for security” than the younger White male. When testing the contrast between the young Black female and the young White male, no differences were found when testing each adjective separately ( $F(7,14)=0.76, p=0.63, \eta_p^2=0.28$ ) or when testing the young Black female archetype scale ( $F(1,20)=0.52, p=0.82, \eta_p^2=0.00$ ). There was also not a significant result when testing how each adjective rating differed across all eight conditions, however when testing the scale across all conditions, there was a significant effect for sex ( $F(1,76)=5.30, p<0.05, \eta_p^2=0.07$ ), such that female conditions ( $M=20.59, SD=3.58$ ) were rated higher on these adjectives, as opposed to males ( $M=18.65, SD=3.54$ ). These findings suggest no support for Hypothesis 4.

Hypothesis 5 stated that the older Black male was expected to be rated higher on “knows the way of the world”, “experienced”, “wise”, “knowledgeable”, “sober”, “intuitive”, “objective”, and “logical” than the younger White male. When testing the contrast between the old Black male and the young White male, no differences were found when testing each adjective separately ( $F(8,14)=0.85, p=0.58, \eta_p^2=0.33$ ) or when testing the old Black male archetype scale ( $F(1,21)=1.197, p=0.29, \eta_p^2=0.05$ ). However, when examining how each archetypal adjective rating differed across all eight conditions, there was a significant multivariate effect for age, ( $F(8,69)=2.06, p=0.05, \eta_p^2=0.19$ ), suggesting that the univariate tests could be interpreted. For the adjective, “experienced,” there was a significant main effect ( $F(1,76)=4.89, p<0.05, \eta_p^2=0.192$ ). Specifically, older people were rated as more experienced ( $M=3.84, SD=0.81$ ) than younger people ( $M=3.44, SD=0.78$ ). There was no significant

univariate effect for the scale across all eight conditions. These findings suggest no support for Hypothesis 5.

Hypothesis 6 stated that the old Black female was expected to be rated higher on “authoritative”, “dominant”, and “firm” than the younger White male. When testing the contrast between the old Black female and the young White male, no significant differences were found when testing each adjective separately ( $F(3,16)=2.30, p=0.12, \eta_p^2=0.30$ ), though a significant difference was found when testing the old Black female archetype scale as a whole ( $F(1,18)=5.70, p<0.05, \eta_p^2=0.24$ ), such that the old Black female ( $M=10.56, SD=2.13$ ) was rated higher on the archetype’s scale than the young White male ( $M=8.45, SD=1.81$ ). Furthermore, when testing how each adjective’s rating differed across all conditions, there was a significant three-way interaction ( $F(3,74)=4.04, p<0.05, \eta_p^2=0.14$ ). There was a significant main effect for “authoritative” ( $F(1,76)=9.96, p<0.01, \eta_p^2=0.12$ ), and LSD post-hoc results suggest that the younger Black male ( $M=4.00, SD=0.71$ ) was rated higher on authoritativeness than the old Black male ( $M=3.25, SD=0.87$ ), young Black female ( $M=3.00, SD=0.78$ ), and young White male ( $M=2.82, SD=0.87$ ). Likewise, the old White male ( $M=3.91, SD=0.54$ ) was rated higher on authoritativeness than the young Black female and young White male. The old Black female ( $M=3.56, SD=0.73$ ) was also rated higher on authoritativeness than the young White male. There was also a significant main effect for “dominant” ( $F(1,76)=9.85, p<0.01, \eta_p^2=0.12$ ), with LSD post-hocs specifying that the young Black male ( $M=3.78, SD=0.83$ ) is rated higher on “dominant” than the old White female ( $M=3.00, SD=1.10$ ), young Black female ( $M=2.91, SD=0.30$ ), and young White male ( $M=2.64, SD=0.67$ ). The old White male ( $M=3.64, SD=0.67$ ) was also rated higher on the dominant adjective compared to the young Black female ( $M=2.91,$

$SD=0.30$ ) or the young White male ( $M=2.64$ ,  $SD=0.67$ ). Finally, the old Black female ( $M=3.44$ ,  $SD=0.73$ ) was rated higher than the young White male. Additionally, there was a significant three-way interaction for scale across all conditions ( $F(1,76)=9.32$ ,  $p<0.01$ ,  $\eta_p^2=0.11$ ), with LSD post-hoc results suggesting that the young Black male ( $M=11.89$ ,  $SD=1.96$ ) was rated higher on the old Black female archetype scale than the old White female ( $M=9.73$ ,  $SD=3.04$ ), young White female ( $M=9.60$ ,  $SD=2.37$ ), and young Black female ( $M=9.09$ ,  $SD=1.64$ ). Also, the old White male ( $M=11.09$ ,  $SD=1.92$ ) was rated higher on this scale than the young Black female and the young White male ( $M=8.45$ ,  $SD=1.81$ ). Finally, the old Black female ( $M=10.56$ ,  $SD=2.13$ ) was rated higher on this scale than the young White male. These findings do suggest support for Hypothesis 6.

Hypothesis 7 stated that the older White male was expected to be rated higher on “refined”, “cultured”, “distinguished”, “elegant”, and “polite” than the younger White male. When testing the contrast between the old White male and the young White male, no significant differences were found when testing each adjective separately ( $F(5,16)=1.03$ ,  $p=0.43$ ,  $\eta_p^2=0.24$ ) or when testing the old White male archetype scale ( $F(1,22)=2.25$ ,  $p=0.15$ ,  $\eta_p^2=0.10$ ). Furthermore, no significant difference was found when examining how each adjective rating differed across all conditions, though a significant three way interaction between age, race, and sex existed when testing univariate effect for the scale across all conditions ( $F(1,76)=6.54$ ,  $p<0.05$ ,  $\eta_p^2=0.08$ ). LSD post-hoc results suggest that the both old Black female ( $M=20.11$ ,  $SD=2.20$ ) and young Black male ( $M=19.89$ ,  $SD=3.02$ ) were rated significantly higher on the old White male adjectives, compared to the young White male ( $M=16.09$ ,  $SD=1.97$ ). These findings suggest no support for Hypothesis 7.

Hypothesis 8 stated that the older White female was expected to be rated higher on “caring”, “nurturing”, “grandparent-like”, “thoughtful”, “personable”, “merciful”, and “sympathetic” than the younger White male. When testing the contrast between the old White female and the young White male, a multivariate significant result ( $F(7,14)=2.90, p<0.05, \eta_p^2=0.59$ ) found that the “grandparent” adjective was rated significantly higher in the old White female condition ( $M=4.09, SD=0.54$ ) as opposed to the young White male condition ( $M=2.64, SD=1.03$ ). Additionally, there was a significant difference when testing the scale ( $F(1,20)=5.173, p<0.05, \eta_p^2=0.05$ ), in that the old White female ( $M=24.64, SD=2.66$ ) was rated higher on the hypothesized adjectives than the young White male ( $M=21.45, SD=3.80$ ). When looking at archetypal adjective ratings across all conditions, there was a significant difference in responses due to the condition’s age ( $F(7,70)=3.68, p<0.05, \eta_p^2=0.27$ ). Specifically, the “grandparent” adjective ( $F(1,76)=21.97, p<0.01, \eta_p^2=0.224$ ) was rated higher in the older conditions ( $M=3.57, SD=0.72$ ) as opposed to the younger conditions ( $M=2.76, SD=1.07$ ). The condition’s sex had also produced significantly different responses ( $F(7,70)=2.85, p<0.05, \eta_p^2=0.22$ ), as the “nurturing” adjective ( $F(1,76)=8.63, p<0.01, \eta_p^2=0.10$ ) was rated higher in the female conditions ( $M=3.73, SD=0.81$ ) as opposed to the male conditions ( $M=3.26, SD=0.73$ ). Similarly, the “grandparent” adjective ( $F(1,76)=4.28, p<0.05, \eta_p^2=0.05$ ) was rated higher in female conditions ( $M=3.41, SD=1.07$ ) rather than male conditions ( $M=3.05, SD=0.93$ ), and the same result was found for the “thoughtful” adjective ( $F(1,76)=4.09, p<0.05, \eta_p^2=0.05$ ), as female conditions ( $M=3.68, SD=0.69$ ) were rated higher than the male conditions ( $M=3.37, SD=0.66$ ). When looking at univariate effects for the scale across all conditions, there was a significant main effect for sex ( $F(1,76)=4.39, p<0.05, \eta_p^2=0.06$ ), such that female

conditions ( $M=25.27$ ,  $SD=4.09$ ) garnered higher ratings on the old White female scale than male conditions ( $M=23.42$ ,  $SD=3.94$ ). These findings suggest support for Hypothesis 8.

Hypothesis 9 stated that the young White male was expected to be rated higher on hireability than all other conditions. There was a significant univariate effect for race when testing across all conditions ( $F(1,76)=4.99$ ,  $p<0.05$ ,  $\eta_p^2=0.06$ ), such that the Black conditions ( $M=15.73$ ,  $SD=2.83$ ) were rated higher than White conditions ( $M=14.47$ ,  $SD=2.56$ ). Additionally, when testing the contrasts, there was a significant difference ( $F(1,18)=11.46$ ,  $p<0.01$ ,  $\eta_p^2=0.39$ ) between the young Black male ( $M=17.44$ ,  $SD=2.70$ ) and young White male ( $M=14.00$ ,  $SD=1.84$ ) conditions, in that the young Black male condition was rated higher. These findings suggest no support for Hypothesis 9.

Hypothesis 10 stated that the young White male was expected to be rated higher on stability than all other conditions. There was no significant univariate effect for stability across all eight conditions, though there was a significant effect for the contrast between the young Black male and young White male ( $F(1,18)=4.81$ ,  $p<0.05$ ,  $\eta_p^2=0.21$ ), in which the young Black male ( $M=12.78$ ,  $SD=1.64$ ) was rated higher than the young White male ( $M=11.18$ ,  $SD=1.60$ ), which suggests no support for Hypothesis 10.

Hypothesis 11 stated that the young White male was expected to be rated higher on adaptability than all other conditions. There was no significant effect for stability across all conditions, nor was there a significant effect for any of the contrasts. Thus, there is no support for Hypothesis 11.

Hypothesis 12 stated that the young White male was expected to be rated higher on interpersonal skills than all other conditions. There was no significant effect for interpersonal

skills across all conditions, though there was a significant effect for the contrast between the young Black male and the young White male ( $F(1,18)=8.29, p<0.05, \eta_p^2=0.32$ ), such that the young Black male ( $M=24.22, SD=3.03$ ) was rated higher than the young White male ( $M=20.36, SD=2.94$ ). This finding suggests no support for Hypothesis 12.

Finally, hypothesis 13 stated that the young White male was expected to be rated higher on performance capacity than all other conditions. There was no significant effect for performance capacity across all condition, though there was a significant effect for the contrast between the young Black male and young White male ( $F(1,18)=7.11, p<0.05, \eta_p^2=0.28$ ), in that the young Black male ( $M=20.44, SD=2.51$ ) was rated higher than the young White male ( $M=17.64, SD=2.69$ ). This finding suggests no support for Hypothesis 13.

## **DISCUSSION**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the archetypes proposed to be representative of eight major intersections of age, race, and sex. This was done by developing eight different scales including adjectives that were meant to adequately describe the characteristics of that archetype. Given that these archetypes arose from objective differences in age, race, and sex, it was expected that individuals at each intersection would then face objectively different stereotypes and attitudes. Specifically, these archetypes would be triggered when viewing individuals qualitatively different in terms of age, race, and sex, and the individuals would then be rated differently according to the adjectives associated with each archetype.



### Summary of Key Findings

The supported hypothesis regarding both old female conditions gives credence to this proposed archetype theory. As both the old Black female and old White female's ratings significantly differed from the young White male on their respective archetype scales, there was a statistically significant three-way interaction for the former. These findings suggest that there is some interplay between an individual's age, race, and sex during social cognition. That is, the participants reacted to a combination of the old Black, and old White, female's characteristics to make certain judgements about her character. This could have been facilitated by stereotypes that allow for quick judgements to be made when no other salient factors are available.

However, there is also evidence to suggest that the archetypes presented here were either not measured properly, were conceptualized incorrectly, or do not exist. To illustrate the former, the old White male was rated relatively high on the old Black female scale. This suggests that the adjectives used for the old Black female may also be applicable to the old White male. For example, it's reasonable to say that an old White male is authoritative and dominant, as leaders in Western society generally exhibit of these characteristics. To illustrate this, the mean age of the 114th United States Congress is 57.0 years for the House of Representatives, and 61.0 years for the Senate, 81.5% of this congress is White, and 80% of this is male (Manning, 2015). Additionally, the results for the ratings of the young Black female yielded no interaction effects, which suggests that the adjectives chosen to represent this archetype were incorrectly conceived. Shih (2002) suggests that employers see Black women more positively than the hypothesized adjectives suggested in this study; Black women are seen, instead, as more stable, responsible, and dependable. Of course, it is also possible that these archetypes do not exist. Research put forth by Kulik, Roberson and Perry (2007) supports an approach to multiple

group membership that is more dependent upon contextual factors or behaviors, in which perceivers ultimately depend on one category to base impressions on.

One of the more curious findings relate to the young Black male. Research suggests that the majority of employers describe Black applicants and employees as “having an attitude”, and more specifically that young Black men exhibit hostility and anger (Shih, 2002). It was due to these stereotypes that the adjectives associated with the young Black male archetype were generally more dissident in nature. However, Bodenhausen, Schwarz, Bless and Wänke (1993) suggest that exposure to positive exemplars may prompt sympathetic beliefs about a group. As the young Black male’s archetypal picture was selected in part due to the individual’s professionalism, this very quality could have skewed the perception of this individual, removing him from the targeted archetype. As a result, the young Black male was perceived favorably with respect to the multidimensional work scale, in that he was rated higher on hireability, stability, interpersonal skills, and performance capacity than the young White male. An additional effect of this was seen as the Black conditions had low mean ratings on “antagonistic”, “aggressive”, “deceitful”, “quarrelsome”, and “devious”, compared to the average mean ratings that the White conditions received across these adjectives. Another possible reason for this result could be due to the individual’s stature. Whether due to specific photographic illusions, or true physicality, it is reasonable for the young Black male to be perceived as being large in size. Research suggests that large Black men could be seen as more intelligent, successful, hardworking, and more of a leader than either large or thin White men (Trautner, Kwan & Savage, 2013). This could explain why the Black male conditions were rated higher on “skilled in business matters” and the young White male archetype scale, which included “competent”,

and why the young Black male was rated higher on “authoritative” and “dominant”, as well as the old Black female archetype scale which also included “firm”. These findings also poses questions for future research regarding the the effects of divergent prototypes used as stimuli.

Furthermore, the results for the young White male were not as expected. This could be due to the fact that the individual in the photograph was wearing glasses. Though the results of the pilot suggested that he was rated relatively the same in terms of attractiveness, it is possible that there was an entirely different variable that he would have scored very low in, such as “masculinity”. In a study exploring gender types, Green and Ashmore (1998) found that participants agreed that the stereotypical “nerd” was a male that had a slouched posture, glasses, and a “weak appearance”. The male in the archetypal photograph was both slouched, and wearing glasses, so it is possible that he could also be perceived as being weak or otherwise unmasculine. This could explain the young White male’s low ratings on “authoritative”, “dominant”, the old White male archetype scale, among others..

With regards to the archetype theory proposed by Marcus and Fritzsche (2014), partial support was obtained, in that there was evidence for the existence of some type of archetype-based social cognition mechanism. Further testing is encouraged in order to conceptualize a more representative archetype for each intersection, as well as achieve a more concrete understanding of the process by which humans form impressions about individuals.

#### Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Given the above inconsistencies, the photograph selection for the archetypes is a limitation to this research, as it could be conceived that the pilot study did not sufficiently highlight disparities between conditions. Future research could also use two photographs per

condition. In this way, the manipulated condition is not confounded with all of the unique characteristics of the specific person presented in the photograph (e.g., the glasses worn by the young White male in this study). An additional method to tackling this would be to use actors to pose for pictures in which the appearance, clothing, posture, and background are all controlled.

Furthermore, the use of students as participants, while common in applied psychological research (Barr & Hitt, 1986), does call external validity into question. One study regarding ageism expressed by college students found that, for a variety of occupations (e.g. “doctor”, “dentist”, “lawyer”, and “congressional representative”), the preferred age range was 30-49 years of age (Kalavar, 2001), which contrasts with the mean age of 50.44 ( $SD=6.04$ ) found across the old conditions in the present study. Also, research suggests that students tend to make decisions that differ from those of managers (Barr & Hitt, 1986). Even though there are limitations with using college students, research also suggests that the stereotypes of older adults have remained relatively consistent over the preceding 30 years (Schmidt & Boland, 1986), suggesting that young adults carry these stereotypes into adulthood. Thus, future research should also seek to continue testing the archetype scales with a larger sample that varies on the basis of age and occupation.

### Conclusion

This study examined the intersections that are created by a person’s age, race, and sex in attempts to suggest evidence for the existence of archetypes as a heuristic for social cognition, and approach to multiple group membership. Specifically in an organizational context, examination of this tripartite relationship is necessary as the workforce is aging, and each

individual is an older or younger *something* (i.e., White female), and the present study serves as a step towards understanding this complex relationship.

*Table 1: All scale means, standard deviations, and coefficient alphas*

Scale	Number of items	Scale Mean	Standard deviation	Chronbach's Alpha
Young White male archetype	2	7.60	1.47	0.90
Young White female archetype	2	7.27	1.39	0.75
Young Black male archetype	10	21.61	7.32	0.95
Young Black female archetype	7	19.60	3.67	0.78
Old Black male archetype	8	28.88	4.61	0.89
Old Black female archetype	3	10.00	2.33	0.88
Old White male archetype	5	18.19	3.22	0.86
Old White female archetype	7	24.32	4.10	0.85
Hireability	4	15.08	2.75	0.92
Stability	4	11.63	1.85	0.85
Adaptability	7	25.24	4.44	0.91
Interpersonal Skills	6	22.11	3.60	0.86
Performance Capacity	5	18.68	2.97	0.85

## REFERENCES

- Avery, D. R., McKay, P. F., & Wilson, D. C. (2008). What are the odds? How demographic similarity affects the prevalence of perceived employment discrimination. *Journal Of Applied Psychology, (2)*, 235.
- Ayalon, L. (2014). Perceived Age, Gender, and Racial/Ethnic Discrimination in Europe: Results from the European Social Survey. *Educational Gerontology, 40(7)*, 499-517.  
doi:10.1080/03601277.2013.845490
- Bal, A. C., Reiss, A. B., Rudolph, C. W., & Baltes, B. B. (2011). Examining positive and negative perceptions of older workers: A meta-analysis. *The Journals Of Gerontology: Series B: Psychological Sciences And Social Sciences, 66B(6)*, 687-698.  
doi:10.1093/geronb/gbr056
- Barnum, P., Liden, R. C., & Ditomaso, N. (1995). Double jeopardy for women and minorities: Pay differences with age. *Academy Of Management Journal, 38(3)*, 863-880.  
doi:10.2307/256749
- Barr, S. H., & Hitt, M. A. (1986). A comparison of selection decision models in manager versus student samples. *Personnel Psychology, 39(3)*, 599-617. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1986.tb00955.x
- Basford, T. E., Offermann, L. R., & Behrend, T. S. (2014). Do you see what I see? Perceptions of gender microaggressions in the workplace. *Psychology Of Women Quarterly, 38(3)*, 340-349. doi:10.1177/0361684313511420

- Bodenhausen, G. V., Schwarz, N., Bless, H., & Wänke, M. (1995). Effects of atypical exemplars on racial beliefs: Enlightened racism or generalized appraisals?. *Journal Of Experimental Social Psychology, 31*(1), 48-63. doi:10.1006/jesp.1995.1003
- Chao, G. T., & Moon, H. (2005). The Cultural Mosaic: A Metatheory for Understanding the Complexity of Culture. *Journal Of Applied Psychology, 90*(6), 1128-1140. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1128
- Crandall, C. S., Bahns, A. J., Warner, R., & Schaller, M. (2011). Stereotypes as justifications of prejudice. *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin, 37*(11), 1488-1498. doi:10.1177/0146167211411723
- Cox, W. L., Abramson, L. Y., Devine, P. G., & Hollon, S. D. (2012). Stereotypes, prejudice, and depression: The integrated perspective. *Perspectives On Psychological Science, 7*(5), 427-449. doi:10.1177/1745691612455204
- Deitch, E., Barsky, A., Butz, R., Chan, S., Brief, A., & Bradley, J. (2003). Subtle yet significant: the existence and impact of everyday racial discrimination in the workplace. *Human Relations, 56*(11), 1299-1324.
- Derous, E., Ryan, A. M., & Nguyen, H. D. (2012). Multiple categorization in resume screening: Examining effects on hiring discrimination against Arab applicants in field and lab settings. *Journal Of Organizational Behavior, 33*(4), 544-570. doi:10.1002/job.769
- Desmette, D. & Gaillard, M. (2008). When a "worker" becomes an "older worker": The effects of age-related social identity on attitudes towards retirement and work. *Career Development International, 13*(2), 168-185.



- Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, 56(1), 5-18. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.56.1.5
- Duguid, M. M., & Thomas-Hunt, M. C. (2014). Condoning Stereotyping?: How Awareness of Stereotyping Prevalence Impacts Expression of Stereotypes. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, doi:10.1037/a0037908
- Duncan, C., & Loretto, W. (2004). Never the Right Age? Gender and Age-Based Discrimination in Employment. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 11(1), 95-115. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0432.2004.00222.x
- Eagly, A. H., Makhijani, M. G., & Klonsky, B. G. (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 111(1), 3-22. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.111.1.3
- Finkelstein, L. M., Burke, M. J., & Raju, M. S. (1995). Age discrimination in simulated employment contexts: An integrative analysis. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, 80(6), 652-663. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.80.6.652
- Finkelstein, L. M., Demuth, R. F., & Sweeney, D. L. (2007). Bias against overweight job applicants: Further explorations of when and why. *Human Resource Management*, 46(2), 203-222. doi:10.1002/hrm.20157
- Gaines, S. J., Marelich, W. D., Bledsoe, K. L., Steers, W. N., Henderson, M. C., Granrose, C. S., & ... Page, M. S. (1997). Links between race/ethnicity and cultural values as mediated by racial/ethnic identity and moderated by gender. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, 72(6), 1460-1476. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.72.6.1460

- Giles, H., & Reid, S. A. (2005). Ageism across the lifespan: towards a self-categorization model of ageing. *Journal Of Social Issues, (2)*, 389.
- Green, R. J., & Ashmore, R. D. (1998). Taking and developing pictures in the head: Assessing the physical stereotypes of eight gender types. *Journal Of Applied Social Psychology, 28*(17), 1609-1636. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.1998.tb01692.x
- Hilton, J. L., & von Hippel, W. (1996). Stereotypes. *Annual Review Of Psychology, 47*, 237-271. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.47.1.237
- Hosoda, M., Stone, D. L., & Stone-Romero, E. F. (2003). The interactive effects of race, gender and job type on job suitability ratings and selection decisions. *Journal Of Applied Social Psychology, 33*(1), 145-178. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2003.tb02077.x
- Hummert, M. L. (1990). Multiple stereotypes of elderly and young adults: A comparison of structure and evaluations. *Psychology And Aging, 5*(2), 182-193. doi:10.1037/0882-7974.5.2.182
- Kalavar, J. M. (2001). Examining ageism: Do male and female college students differ?. *Educational Gerontology, 27*(6), 507-513. doi:10.1080/036012701316894199
- Kite, M. E., Deaux, K., & Miele, M. (1991). Stereotypes of young and old: Does age outweigh gender?. *Psychology And Aging, 6*(1), 19-27. doi:10.1037/0882-7974.6.1.19
- Kulik, C. T., Roberson, L., & Perry, E. L. (2007). The multiple category problem: Category activation and inhibition in the hiring process. *The Academy Of Management Review, 32*(2), 529-548. doi:10.2307/20159314

- Levin, S., Sinclair, S., Veniegas, R., & Taylor, P. (2002). Perceived Discrimination in the Context of Multiple Group Memberships. *Psychological Science (Wiley-Blackwell)*, *13*(6), 557-560.
- Macrae, C. N., Bodenhausen, G. V., & Milne, A. B. (1995). The dissection of selection in person perception: Inhibitory processes in social stereotyping. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, *69*(3), 397-407. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.69.3.397
- Manning, J. E. (2015). *Membership of the 114th Congress: A profile*. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service.
- Marcus, J., & Fritzsche, B.A. (2014). One size doesn't fit all: Toward a theory on the intersectional salience of ageism at work. *Organizational Psychology Review*. 1-21. doi:10.1177/2041386614556015
- Nelson, T. D. (2005). Ageism: Prejudice Against Our Feared Future Self. *Journal Of Social Issues*, *61*(2), 207-221. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2005.00402.x
- Posthuma, R. A., & Campion, M. A. (2009). Age Stereotypes in the Workplace: Common Stereotypes, Moderators, and Future Research Directions. *Journal Of Management*, *35*(1), 158-188.
- Purdie-Vaughns, V., & Eibach, R. P. (2008). Intersectional invisibility: The distinctive advantages and disadvantages of multiple subordinate-group identities. *Sex Roles*, *59*(5-6), 377-391. doi:10.1007/s11199-008-9424-4
- Quillian, L. (2006). New Approaches to Understanding Racial Prejudice and Discrimination. *Annual Review Of Sociology*, 32299-328. doi:10.1146/annurev.soc.32.061604.123132

- Roth, P. L., Huffcutt, A. I., & Bobko, P. (2003). Ethnic group differences in measures of job performance: A new meta-analysis. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, 88(4), 694-706.  
doi:10.1037/0021-9010.88.4.694
- Sanchez, J. I., & Brock, P. (1996). Outcomes of perceived discrimination among Hispanic employees: Is diversity management a luxury or a necessity?. *Academy Of Management Journal*, 39(3), 704-719. doi:10.2307/256660
- Schmidt, D. F., & Boland, S. M. (1986). Structure of perceptions of older adults: Evidence for multiple stereotypes. *Psychology And Aging*, 1(3), 255-260. doi:10.1037/0882-7974.1.3.255
- Sesko, A. K., & Biernat, M. (2010). Prototypes of race and gender: The invisibility of Black women. *Journal Of Experimental Social Psychology*, 46(2), 356-360.  
doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2009.10.016
- Shih, J. (2002). '...Yeah, I could hire this one, but I know it's gonna be a problem': How race, nativity, and gender affect employers' perceptions of the employability of job seekers. *Ethnic And Racial Studies*, 25(1), 99-119. doi:10.1080/01419870120112076
- Swim, J. K., Aikin, K. J., Hall, W. S., & Hunter, B. A. (1995). Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudices. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, 68(2), 199-214.  
doi:10.1037/0022-3514.68.2.199
- Swim, J. K., Hyers, L. L., Cohen, L. L., & Ferguson, M. J. (2001). Everyday Sexism: Evidence for Its Incidence, Nature, and Psychological Impact From Three Daily Diary Studies. *Journal Of Social Issues*, 57(1), 31-53.

- Thumin, F. J., Johnson, J. H., Kuehl, C., & Jiang, W. Y. (1995). Corporate values as related to occupation, gender, age, and company size. *The Journal Of Psychology: Interdisciplinary And Applied*, 129(4), 389-400. doi:10.1080/00223980.1995.9914976
- Trautner, M. N., Kwan, S., & Savage, S. V. (2013). Masculinity, competence, and health: The influence of weight and race on social perceptions of men. *Men And Masculinities*, 16(4), 432-451. doi:10.1177/1097184X13502667
- Vassillière, C.T., (2014). Minority Group Status, Perceived Discrimination, and Emotion-Focused Coping (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Texas at Austin, Texas.
- Veenstra, G. (2013). The gendered nature of discriminatory experiences by race, class, and sexuality: A comparison of intersectionality theory and the subordinate male target hypothesis. *Sex Roles*, 68(11-12), 646-659. doi:10.1007/s11199-012-0243-2
- Volpone, S. D., & Avery, D. R. (2013). It's self defense: How perceived discrimination promotes employee withdrawal. *Journal Of Occupational Health Psychology*, 18(4), 430-448. doi:10.1037/a0034016

## **APPENDIX A: ADJECTIVE LIST**

### Adjectives

The following is a list of adjectives used in the main study, in addition to alpha values for each.

This list is a part of a current study happening in Turkey. Turkish adjectives available on request.

---

<b>DIMENSION</b>	<b>ARCHETYPE</b>	<b>ADJECTIVES IN ENGLISH</b>
Competence ( $\alpha = .486$ )	Normal	Skilled in business matters Competent Attractive
Beauty ( $\alpha = .691$ )	Sweetheart	Beautiful Sweet/Pretty
Deviance ( $\alpha = .776$ )	Rebel	Antagonistic Aggressive Criminal Dissident Gangster Rebellious Quarrelsome Frightful Devious

---

---

		Deceitful
Submissiveness/Weakness ( $\alpha = .721$ )	Invisible	Pitiable Subordinate Easily Influenced Obedient Submissive Fearful Strong need for security
Wisdom ( $\alpha = .75$ )	Sage	Knows the way of the world Experienced Wise Knowledgeable Sober Intuitive Objective Logical

---



---

Dominance ( $\alpha = .675$ )	Matriarch	Authoritative
		Dominant
		Firm
Sophistication ( $\alpha = .817$ )	Gentleman	Refined
		Cultured
		Distinguished
		Elegant
		Refined
		Gentlemanly
Warmth ( $\alpha = .836$ )	Grandmother	Caring
		Kind-hearted
		Maternal
		Grandparent-like
		Thoughtful
		Personable
		Merciful
		Sympathetic

---



## **APPENDIX B: MATERIALS**

Demographics and Photograph Rating Survey (Pilot Study)

1. How old are you? \_\_\_\_\_
  
2. What is your sex?
  - a. Male
  - b. Female
  
3. What is your race or ethnic background?
  - a. White or Caucasian (non-Hispanic)
  - b. Black or African American (non-Hispanic)
  - c. Asian
  - d. American Indian or Native Alaskan
  - e. Hispanic or Latino
  - f. Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_

Please select the degree to which each question applies to the person in the photograph.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
4. This person looks kind.	1	2	3	4	5
5. This person is youthful.	1	2	3	4	5
6. This person looks professional.	1	2	3	4	5
7. This person looks smart.	1	2	3	4	5
8. This person looks happy.	1	2	3	4	5
9. This person looks American.	1	2	3	4	5
10. This person is attractive.	1	2	3	4	5
11. This person is old.	1	2	3	4	5
12. This person is an American.	1	2	3	4	5
13. This person seems competent.	1	2	3	4	5

---

14. This person seems intelligent.	1	2	3	4	5
15. This person is attractive.	1	2	3	4	5
16. The person in this photo looks aged.	1	2	3	4	5
17. The person in this photo looks organized.	1	2	3	4	5
18. The person in this photo looks intelligent.	1	2	3	4	5
19. The person in this photo is from America.	1	2	3	4	5

---

20. How old is the person in this photo? \_\_\_\_\_

21. What race or ethnicity of the person in this photo?

- a. White or Caucasian (non-Hispanic)
- b. Black or African American (non-Hispanic)
- c. Asian
- d. American Indian or Native Alaskan
- e. Hispanic or Latino
- f. Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_

22. What sex is the person in this photo?

- a. Male
- b. Female

Demographics and Photograph Rating Survey (Main Study)

1. How old are you? \_\_\_\_\_
2. What is your sex?
  - a. Male
  - b. Female
3. What is your race or ethnic background?
  - a. White or Caucasian (non-Hispanic)
  - b. Black or African American (non-Hispanic)
  - c. Asian
  - d. American Indian or Native Alaskan
  - e. Hispanic or Latino
  - f. Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_

Please select the number indicating the degree to which each adjective applies to the person in the photograph.

---

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
4. The person is attractive.	1	2	3	4	5
5. The person is skilled in business matters.	1	2	3	4	5
6. The person is competent.	1	2	3	4	5

---

---

7. The person is attractive.	1	2	3	4	5
8. The person is kind.	1	2	3	4	5
9. The person is family-oriented.	1	2	3	4	5
10. The person is antagonistic.	1	2	3	4	5
11. The person is aggressive.	1	2	3	4	5
12. The person is a criminal.	1	2	3	4	5
13. The person is dissident.	1	2	3	4	5
14. The person is a gangster.	1	2	3	4	5
15. The person is rebellious.	1	2	3	4	5
16. The person is quarrelsome.	1	2	3	4	5
17. The person is frightful.	1	2	3	4	5
18. The person is devious.	1	2	3	4	5
19. The person is deceitful.	1	2	3	4	5
20. The person is authoritative.	1	2	3	4	5
21. The person is dominant.	1	2	3	4	5
22. The person is firm.	1	2	3	4	5
23. The person is refined.	1	2	3	4	5
24. The person is cultured.	1	2	3	4	5
25. The person is distinguished.	1	2	3	4	5
26. The person is elegant.	1	2	3	4	5
27. The person is polite.	1	2	3	4	5

---

---

28. The person is pitiable.	1	2	3	4	5
29. The person is subordinate.	1	2	3	4	5
30. The person is easily influenced.	1	2	3	4	5
31. The person is obedient.	1	2	3	4	5
32. The person is submissive.	1	2	3	4	5
33. The person is fearful.	1	2	3	4	5
34. The person has a need for security.	1	2	3	4	5
35. The person is caring.	1	2	3	4	5
36. The person is nurturing.	1	2	3	4	5
37. The person is grandparent- like.	1	2	3	4	5
38. The person is thoughtful.	1	2	3	4	5
39. The person is personable.	1	2	3	4	5
40. The person is merciful.	1	2	3	4	5
41. The person is sympathetic.	1	2	3	4	5
42. The person knows the way of the world.	1	2	3	4	5
43. The person is experienced.	1	2	3	4	5

---



---

44. The person is wise.	1	2	3	4	5
45. The person is knowledgeable.	1	2	3	4	5
46. The person is sober.	1	2	3	4	5
47. The person is intuitive.	1	2	3	4	5
48. The person is objective.	1	2	3	4	5
49. The person is logical.	1	2	3	4	5
50. This person is likely to be my subordinate in a work environment	1	2	3	4	5
51. This person is likely to be my peer in a work environment.	1	2	3	4	5
52. This person is likely to be my supervisor in a work environment.	1	2	3	4	5
53. This person brings fresh solutions to problems.	1	2	3	4	5
54. This person has original ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
55. This person can adapt to a variety of situations.	1	2	3	4	5
56. This person is capable of	1	2	3	4	5

---

---

learning new things.

57. This person can catch on easily.	1	2	3	4	5
58. This person is easy to train.	1	2	3	4	5
59. This person can integrate new job knowledge.	1	2	3	4	5
60. This person can work effectively in groups.	1	2	3	4	5
61. This person works well with their coworkers.	1	2	3	4	5
62. This person can be helpful.	1	2	3	4	5
63. This person seems cooperative.	1	2	3	4	5
64. This person gets along with their manager.	1	2	3	4	5
65. This person seems energetic.	1	2	3	4	5
66. This person works well under pressure.	1	2	3	4	5
67. This person has a strong attendance record at their job.	1	2	3	4	5
68. This person seems reliable.	1	2	3	4	5
69. This person seems stable.	1	2	3	4	5

---

---

70. This person seems dependable.	1	2	3	4	5
71. This person is not well liked.	1	2	3	4	5
72. This person goes above and beyond in their work.	1	2	3	4	5
73. This person receives high job performance ratings.	1	2	3	4	5
74. This person takes pride in their work.	1	2	3	4	5
75. I would recommend this person for hire.	1	2	3	4	5
76. This person has the potential for advancement.	1	2	3	4	5
77. This person is qualified to perform their job.	1	2	3	4	5
78. This person will perform well in their job.	1	2	3	4	5

---

79. How old is the person in this photo? \_\_\_\_\_

80. What race is the person in this photo?

- a. White or Caucasian (non-Hispanic)
- b. Black or African American (non-Hispanic)

- c. Asian
- d. American Indian or Native Alaskan
- e. Hispanic or Latino
- f. Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_

81. What sex is the person in this photo?

- a. Male
- b. Female

Photographs Used in the Main Study

Young White male archetype photo



Young White female archetype photo



Young Black male archetype photo



Young Black female archetype photo



Old Black male archetype photo



Old Black female archetype photo



Old White male archetype photo



Old White female archetype photo



**APPENDIX C: IRB APPROVAL LETTER**





University of Central Florida Institutional Review Board  
Office of Research & Commercialization  
12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501  
Orlando, Florida 32826-3246  
Telephone: 407-823-2901 or 407-882-2276  
[www.research.ucf.edu/compliance/irb.html](http://www.research.ucf.edu/compliance/irb.html)

### Approval of Exempt Human Research

From: **UCF Institutional Review Board #1  
FWA00000351, IRB00001138**

To: **Barbara Fritzsche and Co-PI: Alissa N. Gebben**

Date: **August 03, 2015**

Dear Researcher:

On 08/03/2015, the IRB approved the following activity as human participant research that is exempt from regulation:

Type of Review: Exempt Determination  
Project Title: A Study on the Perceptions of Intersectional Group Salience  
using Archetypes  
Investigator: Barbara Fritzsche  
IRB Number: SBE-15-11483  
Funding Agency:  
Grant Title:  
Research ID: N/A

This determination applies only to the activities described in the IRB submission and does not apply should any changes be made. If changes are made and there are questions about whether these changes affect the exempt status of the human research, please contact the IRB. When you have completed your research, please submit a Study Closure request in iRIS so that IRB records will be accurate.

In the conduct of this research, you are responsible to follow the requirements of the [Investigator Manual](#).

On behalf of Sophia Dziegielewski, Ph.D., L.C.S.W., UCF IRB Chair, this letter is signed by:

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Joanne Muratori".

Signature applied by Joanne Muratori on 08/03/2015 04:08:06 PM EDT

IRB manager