

Can Legal Interventions Change Beliefs? The Effect of Exposure to Sexual Harassment Policy on Men's Gender Beliefs

JUSTINE EATENSON TINKLER
Stanford University

YAN E. LI
Stanford University

STEFANIE MOLLBORN
University of Colorado at Boulder

In spite of the relative success of equal opportunity laws on women's status in the workplace, we know little about the influence of such legal interventions on people's attitudes and beliefs. This paper focuses, in particular, on how sexual harassment policy affects men's beliefs about the gender hierarchy. We employ an experimental design in which we measure the effect of a policy intervention on men's explicit and implicit gender beliefs. Results show that the sexual harassment policy did not alter explicit gender beliefs. Explicit beliefs changed in a different way, however: Compared to the baseline condition, participants in the policy intervention condition believed that most people think both men and women are lower-status, less competent, and less considerate. The policy intervention also affected implicit gender beliefs. Participants in the policy condition displayed more entrenched male-advantaged gender beliefs compared to the baseline condition. We interpret this as evidence that sexual harassment policies may have the unintended effect of activating unequal gender beliefs, which run contrary to the policy's equalizing aims. This research also suggests the value of measuring both explicit and implicit gender beliefs.

Since the legal recognition that sexual harassment is a form of sex-based discrimination under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, more than 90% of large organizations have adopted a sexual harassment policy (Dobbin and Kelly 2007). With

the Supreme Court holding that employers can mitigate liability by providing evidence of sexual harassment procedures (*Faragher v. City of Boca Raton*, 524 U.S. 775 (1998)), organizations have increasingly protected themselves from lawsuits by training employees and employers on the harassment policies and their implications for appropriate behavior in the workplace. While organizations may enforce sexual harassment policies in large part to avoid legal liability (Dobbin and Kelly 2007), a primary function of equal employment opportunity laws such as Title VII is to promote equality. While research indicates that policy training and enforcement has reduced the incidence of sexual harassment in the workplace (U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board 1995), whether such regulation can effectively promote gender equality between men and women as status peers remains untested. Likewise, while past studies have examined people's attitudes and reactions toward sexual harassment policy (U.S. Merit

* Authorship order was randomly determined; all authors contributed equally to this article. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association held in Atlanta in 2003. Preparation of this paper was supported by a grant from the Department of Sociology at Stanford University, a National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship to S. Mollborn, and a Gerhard Casper Stanford Graduate Fellowship to Y. Li. Any opinions, findings, conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation or Stanford University. We thank Cecilia Ridgeway for her advisement and support on this paper, Leela Young for her research assistance, and members of the Stanford social psychology workshop for their comments on earlier drafts. Direct correspondence to Justine Tinkler, Department of Sociology, 450 Serra Mall, Building 120, Room 160, Stanford, CA 94305; jtinkler@stanford.edu.

Systems Protection Board 1995) and other Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA) laws (e.g., Bobo 1988; Steeh and Schuman 1992), there has been little research on the effect such policies have on attitudes toward and beliefs about the groups that these policies intend to protect.

In this paper, we adopt an experimental design to explore if and how simple, short-term exposure to a sexual harassment policy alters men's status beliefs about gender—i.e., whether the intervention leads to beliefs that are in congruence with or run counter to the policy's aim of promoting gender equality. This design represents a particularly stringent test of the effects of sexual harassment policy on beliefs because, in natural settings, exposure to sexual harassment policies likely entails a more involved, long-term process. Because men have been the primary target audience of sexual harassment policies and we are interested in the effects of these policies on gender beliefs, we restricted our participant pool to men. While understanding the effect of sexual harassment policies on women's gender beliefs is also important, our focus on men in this study is an important first step.¹ We draw upon status characteristics theory (Berger et al. 1977) to test competing effects of sexual harassment policy and the dual attitudes model (Wilson et. al. 2000) to interpret the results. We discuss theoretical and policy implications regarding the implementation of sexual harassment policies and EEO/AA laws in general.

BACKGROUND

Legal Interventions as Equalizing Instruments

Legally, sexual harassment is a violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the mandate that prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, religion, national origin, and sex. Previous studies have shown that these laws can have an equalizing effect on beliefs. Evidence from research on desegregation (Allport 1954; Moskos 1966; Pettigrew 1971),

attitudes about affirmative action (Taylor 1995), and the legal regulation of sexual harassment (Tinkler 2003) has shown that attitudes shift over time toward agreement with institutional policy. In spite of this success, both scholarly and popular discourse reflects concern that legal interventions inevitably engender resentment and backlash (Capasso 2005; Eyre 2000; Schultz 2003). For example, in a survey of federal employees, nearly 20% of males responded that fear of being accused of sexual harassment had made their workplace less comfortable; more than 30% believed that normal attraction is at least to some extent misinterpreted as sexual harassment (U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board 1995).

These findings highlight a seeming paradox whereby people embrace the concept of equality, but express negative attitudes about equalizing policies using claims of inequality and injustice. Part of the difficulty in understanding this paradox is due to unspecified micro-level mechanisms through which legal interventions affect beliefs. We propose two competing mechanisms below.

Conceptual Framework and Hypotheses

Systems of inequality are sustained by cultural beliefs about group difference and the enactment of those beliefs in behaviors and institutions (Eagly and Steffen 1984; Jackman 1994; Jost and Banaji 1994; Sewell 1992). Changing cultural beliefs about group difference and inequality should be necessary for legal interventions to effect lasting change. To assess the effectiveness of sexual harassment policies as instruments of cultural change, it is necessary to examine how the policies affect people's beliefs about gender.

Because a core element of gender beliefs is status beliefs, we believe that status characteristics theory (Berger et al. 1977; Wagner and Berger 1997) provides an effective way of understanding how gender beliefs may change following exposure to sexual harassment policies. Status characteristics theory is also relevant in that it explains how status beliefs reproduce status hierarchy and inequality. Status characteristics are attributes associated

¹ We are currently researching the effect of sexual harassment policies on women's gender beliefs.

with widely held *status beliefs*—i.e., cultural beliefs that people in one category of the attribute (e.g., males, whites) are more competent and held in higher esteem than those in the other category (e.g., females, racial minorities). Status beliefs inform individuals' *performance expectations* (expectations about others' performance in task situations), influencing the formation of hierarchies in the local setting and reinforcing cultural stereotypes at the societal level (Wagner and Berger 2002). Here, we study gender beliefs, which include both status beliefs about gender and other elements (e.g., considerateness, likeability). Sexual harassment policies could affect male-advantaged gender beliefs either by weakening them or by strengthening them.

Weakening male-advantaged gender beliefs. Some past evidence implies that sexual harassment policies may work in the intended way to equalize people's beliefs about women and men. Experimental research has shown that interventions can directly modify performance expectations that are based on status beliefs (Cohen 1982; Pugh and Wainman 1983). Since gender beliefs include a core element of status beliefs and status beliefs inform individuals' performance expectations, this past research suggests that sexual harassment policies could lead to equal beliefs. There is also evidence from real-life settings that interventions may directly weaken status beliefs—i.e., to a certain degree dissociate differential status beliefs from a social category or decrease the perceived status gap between groups. Research on the racial integration of the armed forces (Moskos 1966), school desegregation (Jacobson 1978), and affirmative action (Taylor 1995) has shown that policies, by virtue of being letters of the law, can have a direct effect on attitudinal change.

The processes by which sexual harassment policies could weaken status beliefs may be unique due to their focus on workplace interaction. Unlike affirmative action or gender discrimination laws aimed at hiring and promotion—events which individual workers experience infrequently and usually involve only hierarchically related parties—sexual harassment policies draw attention to every-

day workplace interactions among male and female peers, as well as between subordinates and superiors. By proscribing behaviors that typically highlight gender differences between harassers and their victims, such as sexual teasing, jokes, and propositions, sexual harassment policies may encourage men not only to treat women in a more equal way in daily interactions, but to think about women in a more equal way. In other words, sexual harassment policy may delegitimize the status hierarchy that disadvantages women, possibly leading to changes in men's gender beliefs.

Research on the effectiveness of sexual harassment training has found, at least in part, that trainees are more sensitive and aware of instances of sexual harassment following training (see Bisom-Rapp 2001 for a review; Tinkler 2003). Moreover, research has shown that educational campaigns, such as those used in workplace sexual harassment trainings, can be effective in promoting attitude alignment with institutional policies (Brophy 1946). Based on all of these empirical findings that equalizing interventions can lead to positive intergroup attitudes, we hypothesize:

Hypothesis 1a: Exposure to sexual harassment policies weakens male-advantaged gender beliefs.

Strengthening male-advantaged gender beliefs. While the aim of Equal Employment Opportunity laws is to “level the playing field,” it is possible that legal rules or policies could instead achieve the opposite effect, strengthening existing male-advantaged beliefs. It is likely that sexual harassment policy training makes gender salient in workplace interactions by forcing people to actively bear in mind the gender of their coworkers when they interact with them. Status characteristics research has shown that when gender is salient, gender status beliefs will disadvantage women and advantage men, unless the context is one in which people tend to believe females perform better (Wagner and Berger 1997). Thus, in normal work situations, sexual harassment policy training may make women and men especially aware of perceived gender differences. In addition to making gender

salient, sexual harassment policies may also reinforce the subordinate role of women in most workplace situations by reminding people that women are in need of legal “protection” from men. Policy training, then, may inadvertently legitimate such inequality.

Moreover, evidence from research on sexual harassment has shown that policy training and enforcement can have a negative effect (Quinn 2000; Epstein 1995). In response to a survey about sexual harassment attitudes and experiences, more than 50 percent of federal employees in 1994 reported that people are too quick to take offense when someone expresses a personal interest in them (U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board 1995). The common complaint that sexual harassment policies give space for overly sensitive women to misuse the law (Schultz 2003) is intrinsically linked to gender stereotypes about women’s emotionality and irrationality. If sexual harassment policies provoke this negative effect, then they may actually strengthen male-advantaged gender beliefs, as hypothesized below:

Hypothesis 1b: Exposure to sexual harassment policies strengthens male-advantaged gender beliefs.

METHOD

Overview of the Present Study

Much of the research on the effects of laws on attitudes and beliefs relies on observational and survey data. These data collection methods are subject to retrospective bias and reliability issues and may not be able to capture subtle causal processes. Experimental research is useful for testing theories and establishing causality because the researcher can isolate and manipulate the effects of the independent variables on the dependent variables, while controlling for confounding factors. Although other modes of investigation are important for generalizing findings outside of the laboratory, we conducted a social psychological experiment to test the rival hypotheses as a novel and important first step for examining the effects of sexual harassment policies on gender beliefs.

The experiment had three different manipulations in which male participants participated in a computer task with a fictitious female partner. In the experimental (*policy intervention*) condition, participants were exposed to a sexual harassment policy before the task. Two contrasting conditions served as comparisons to the experimental condition. In the main contrasting (*baseline*) condition, which we used to test Hypotheses 1A and 1B, there was no manipulation other than the presence of an opposite sex partner. In an additional contrasting (*male-advantaged*) condition, we examined further whether the policy would strengthen male-advantaged gender beliefs in the same manner as other known techniques (see “Experimental Manipulations” below for details). This would be useful to know if Hypothesis 1B is supported.

Participants

There were sixty-six freshman male volunteers aged 18 years or older that participated in this study for pay. Another seven participants were dropped due to suspicion of the computer task and/or the partner.

Procedure

A female staff member seated the male participants at a desk with a computer and told them that they were taking part in a study about how groups of diverse individuals arrive at joint decisions when different communication technologies are used. They were then instructed to work on a team-oriented task via a computer network with a female partner, actually a pre-programmed computer, who was supposedly in another room. To emphasize the gender of the female “partner” in a context in which participants’ other statuses were similar, the participants exchanged information with their “partner” about gender, year in school, and lab seat number and copied the information down for future reference.

The task, the “Contrast Sensitivity (CS) Test,” is commonly used to examine how status affects people’s willingness to grant influence to a partner (e.g., Troyer and Younts 1997) and involves judging which one of a pair of black and white patterned images con-

tains more white area. In reality, the black and white areas are always equal in both images. There were 25 trials in which participants and their partners each made an independent initial choice, exchanged their initial decisions, and decided whether to reject the partner's influence (stay with his initial choice) or defer to the partner (change his final choice to match his partner's initial response) if they disagreed (which was programmed to occur in 20 trials). To encourage motivation and cooperation, the participants were told that the team with the highest number of correct answers would receive a \$50 bonus.

After completing the Contrast Sensitivity test, participants filled out a brief questionnaire that assessed explicit gender status beliefs (Ridgeway et al. 1998). They then moved to another computer and were told that their next task was a categorization task done without a partner. This task was actually an Implicit Association Test (IAT), (Farnham 1997), which assesses the extent to which people automatically think in stereotypical terms about a stimulus. This was measured by the degree to which automatic association slows down the ability to respond to counter-stereotypical information about the stimulus (Greenwald, McGhee, and Schwartz 1998). We use the IAT to measure the strength of association between gender categories and levels of status, which taps into participants' automatic or implicit gender beliefs. After the IAT, participants completed a post-study questionnaire, which gathered more information about the participant and contained items checking for the effectiveness of the experimental manipulation. Finally, participants were debriefed and paid.

Experimental Manipulations

Policy intervention condition. Participants were randomly assigned to one of three conditions. In the policy intervention condition, experimenters told participants that all students paid by the university are required to sign a form acknowledging receipt of information about the university's sexual harassment policy. Participants were then handed a sheet with an excerpt from Stanford

University's official sexual harassment policy.² To ensure attention was paid to the policy, experimenters read the excerpt aloud while participants followed along in the handout, then asked the participants to initial the sheet indicating that they had been informed of the policy. Participants then moved on to the Contrast Sensitivity test.

Baseline condition. To test Hypotheses 1A and 1B, we compare the policy intervention condition to a baseline condition in which there was no manipulation. Participants were given the same information about the gender and other characteristics of their task partner as described above. They moved directly to the Contrast Sensitivity test without reading the sexual harassment policy.

Male-advantaged condition. In addition to testing the hypotheses, we included a comparison condition that allows us to further specify the effect of the policy intervention if it does strengthen rather than weaken male-advantaged gender beliefs compared to the baseline condition. This condition allows us to determine how much exposure to sexual harassment policy strengthens gender beliefs. In this condition, participants also moved directly to the computer task. However, they received the following information embedded in the screen instructions for completing the Contrast Sensitivity test: "Males have higher averages on tests of contrast sensitivity than females. Researchers do not know why and are currently investigating the reason for this

² The policy excerpt reads: "Stanford University strives to provide a place of work and study free of sexual harassment, intimidation, or exploitation. It is expected that students, faculty, staff and other individuals covered by this policy will treat one another with respect. Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other visual, verbal, or physical conduct of a sexual nature constitute sexual harassment when: **a.** it is implicitly or explicitly suggested that submission to or rejection of the conduct will be a factor in academic or employment decisions or evaluations, or permission to participate in a University activity; or **b.** the conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual's academic or work performance or creating an intimidating or hostile academic, work, or student living environment."

difference.” This manipulation follows Correll (2004).³

While in all conditions, gender is diffusely salient as a result of the mixed-sex context, the male-advantaged condition also makes gender difference directly relevant to the task. According to status characteristics theory, the more directly relevant gender is to a task, the stronger the impact of gender beliefs on behavior (Wagner and Berger 2002; Webster and Driskell 1978). While we do not believe that the policy intervention makes gender relevant in the same way as the male-advantaged condition, the latter condition is useful by providing a comparison group that should have stronger male-advantaged beliefs than the baseline condition. If the gender beliefs of those men in the policy intervention condition register more male advantage because the policy makes them extremely aware of the gender differences between themselves and their partners, then their beliefs may appear similar to those of participants in the male-advantaged condition. If male-advantaged gender beliefs in the policy intervention condition are actually strengthened instead because of a “backlash” effect of the policy, then the gender beliefs of men from the sexual harassment policy condition may favor males even more than those in the male-advantaged condition. Therefore, we include both the baseline and the male-advantaged conditions as contrasts to the policy intervention condition in order to clarify whether and how strongly the policy activates gender status beliefs.

Dependent Variables

Research on gender attitudes in the last four decades has shown that men have become less likely to express overt sexism, perhaps due to changing social norms.⁴ Meanwhile,

³ The wording of this manipulation that “researchers . . . are currently investigating the reason for this difference” might have inadvertently led participants to believe that this was the purpose of the current study.

⁴ In place of old, overt expressions of sexism, attitudes toward women now take more subtle forms, such as modern sexism (Swim et al. 1995), neo-sexism (Tougas et al. 1995), and ambivalent sexism (Glick and Fiske 1996), all of which do not appear hostile to women but are nonetheless discriminatory and prejudicial in effect.

more subtle forms of sexism are still widespread. Research has also shown that explicit beliefs (those that are conscious and controllable) and implicit beliefs (those that are unintentionally activated, existing outside of one’s awareness) coexist, and have different effects on behavior during interactions (Dovidio et al. 1997). To capture both overt and subtle forms of gender beliefs, we use both explicit and implicit measures.

Explicit beliefs. We adopted the “semantic differential” scales used in Ridgeway’s status construction experiments (Ridgeway et al. 1998; Ridgeway and Erickson 2000) to measure explicit gender beliefs. These items are seven-point scales for various pairs of words measuring three dimensions: (1) status: *respected/not respected, powerful/powerless, high status/low status, leader/follower*; (2) competence: *competent/incompetent, knowledgeable/unknowledgeable, capable/incapable*; and (3) considerateness: *considerate/inconsiderate, pleasant/unpleasant, likable/unlikable, cooperative/uncooperative*.⁵

On the post-Contrast Sensitivity test questionnaire, we asked participants to rate men and women on the semantic differential scales according to both most people’s and their own personal opinions. We focus on “most people’s” beliefs since such beliefs are perceived as consensual, a key feature of status beliefs (Correll and Ridgeway 2003), and have been shown to affect evaluations and behavior, even

⁵ While some status characteristics and expectation states research incorporates the competence dimension into status, confirmatory factor analyses in Ridgeway et al. (1998) shows that separating status and competence is better and more informative than combining them. For the purposes of our study, we believe it is useful to look at them separately to gain more information. We also included the “considerateness” dimension for two reasons. First, it has been found to be theoretically and empirically associated with status: that high-status actors tend to be more instrumental and agentic, and low-status actors tend to be more expressive and communal, traits similar to what the considerateness scales capture (Berger, Ridgeway, and Zelditch 2002; Conway, Pizzamiglio, and Mount 1996; Wagner and Berger 1997). Second, even though the considerateness dimension does not directly measure status, it is in itself relevant to gender beliefs because agency and communality are traits usually associated with men and women respectively (Eagly and Steffen 1984).

when they do not match personal beliefs (Sechrist and Stangor 2001). Scores were averaged to create three indexes measuring the status, competence, and considerateness dimensions of participants' explicit gender beliefs. A total of six indexes were created, three for most people's beliefs and three for participants' personal beliefs. These scales are used to indicate whether the policy intervention makes people more likely to explicitly express greater differences between women and men. We performed a reliability test on these indexes for most people's and personal beliefs about both men and women and obtained reasonably high Cronbach's alphas ranging from .65 to .80.

Implicit beliefs. To account for possible differences between explicit and implicit beliefs, we also included an *automatic stereotyping measure*. The Implicit Association Test (IAT) used in this study was adopted from prior research that has used the IAT to measure implicit stereotypes (e.g., Blair, Ma, and Lenton 2001; Rudman, Greenwald, and McGhee 2001).⁶ In the IAT, the participant moves through five rounds in which he is asked to rapidly and accurately sort words that appear in the middle of the computer screen into one of four categories to which they belong. The four categories represent two sets of binary distinctions: gender (male versus female) and status (high versus low). Figure 1 shows screen shots and the words used from rounds of the IAT. In the first round, every "gender" word flashes on the screen and participants are instructed to press the left "d" key if the word is associated with males and the right "k" key if the word is associated with females. In the next round, participants complete the same task with all of the "status" words. In the third, *gender-stereotypical* round, all of the gender and status words flash in the middle of the screen and participants press the left key when the word is either "male" or "high status" and the right key when the word is either "female" or "low status". In the fourth round, participants repeat

Round 1 with the "male" category switched to the right and "female" moved to the left. Finally, in the fifth, *counter-stereotypical* round, all of the gender and status words flash in the middle of the screen and participants press the left key when the word is either "female" or "high status" and the right key when the word is either "male" or "low status."

When participants make an error by miscategorizing the word (e.g., matching "brother" to the category "female or high status"), they are alerted to the error and instructed to correct the mistake. The response time includes the time it takes to correct the error while the error rate is the percentage of times the participant makes a mistake. The IAT effect is the difference in response time between the gender-stereotypical (female—low status) and counter-stereotypical (female—high status) blocks of words (Greenwald et al. 1998). A faster response when matching a stereotypical pairing of gender and status (e.g., matching "brother" to the category "male or high status") than when matching a counter-stereotypical pairing (e.g., matching "brother" to the category "male or low status") indicates that the participant unconsciously associated that pair more strongly than the alternative matching, displaying unconscious beliefs that affirm male dominance. Previous research indicates that gender stereotyping can be implicit (Banaji and Hardin 1996), and this implicit stereotyping can be affected by context (Blair, Ma, and Lenton 2001; Rudman, Ashmore, and Gary 2001). While the Implicit Association Test is difficult for the participant to manipulate, it is also difficult to affect experimentally (Blair 2002). As a result, differences in scores across conditions would be particularly convincing evidence that the intervention affects gender beliefs.

Predictions

For both the explicit and automatic stereotyping measures of gender beliefs, if sexual harassment policies work directly to weaken male-advantaged gender beliefs (Hypothesis 1A), then the gender beliefs of participants in the baseline condition should advantage males

⁶ For a demonstration of the Implicit Association Test, go to <http://implicit.harvard.edu>.

Gender Distinction Round		Status Distinction Round	
(press 'd') MALE	(press 'k') FEMALE	(press 'd') high status	(press 'k') low status
BROTHER (correct answer is d)		submissive (correct answer is k)	
Gender-Stereotypical Round		Counter-Stereotypical Round	
(press 'd') MALE or high status	(press 'k') FEMALE or low status	(press 'd') FEMALE or high status	(press 'k') MALE or low status
submissive (correct answer is k)		BROTHER (correct answer is k)	

Delivered by Ingenta to :
Stanford University
Wed, 09 Jan 2008 06:48:19

Words used for the gender distinction

FEMALE: *woman, wife, female, girl, she, sister, daughter, mother, aunt, grandma, her, hers.*

MALE: *man, male, him, boy, brother, son, husband, father, he, uncle, grandpa, his.*

Words used for the status distinction

LOW STATUS: *submissive, amateur, mediocre, weak, inexperienced, dependent, compliant, obedient.*

HIGH STATUS: *resourceful, expert, proficient, strong, experienced, independent, authoritative, prestigious, famous, dominant.*

Figure 1. Example Screen Shots Showing One Trial from Each of Four Rounds of the IAT

more than those in the policy intervention condition. If sexual harassment policies strengthen male-advantaged gender beliefs rather than weakening them (Hypothesis 1B), then the gender beliefs of participants in the policy intervention condition should advantage males more than those in the baseline condition.

RESULTS

Our discussion of results focuses on contrasting the policy intervention condition with the baseline condition. When appropriate, we

include comparisons with the male-advantaged condition.

Explicit Gender Beliefs

We analyzed explicit gender beliefs using repeated measures analyses of variance (ANOVA) that compare the policy intervention condition to the baseline condition, treating condition as a between-subjects factor and evaluations of men versus women as the two levels of a within-subjects factor. Analyses were performed separately for "most people's" and participants' personal beliefs. As expect-

ed, participants in both conditions thought most people would evaluate men as higher status ($p < .01$), more competent ($p < .01$), and less considerate ($p < .01$) than women (see Table 1, within-subjects factor). Participants' personal beliefs about status and considerateness agreed with their assessments of most people's beliefs ($p < .01$ for both scales), but there is no evidence that they personally believed men's and women's competence differed.

The interaction between the within-subject and between-subject effects provides a test of our competing hypotheses about whether policy condition participants' explicit beliefs favor males over females more than baseline condition participants. Because differences between participants' ratings of men and their ratings of women represent unequal

gender beliefs, the hypotheses predict that there should be variation in these differences across conditions; in other words, the hypotheses predict interaction effects. Results show no significant differences by condition in the comparison of beliefs about women and those about men (see Table 1). This finding provides support for neither rival hypothesis.

Although the between-subjects effect of condition does not directly test our hypotheses because it does not address gender differences in ratings, it reveals unexpected and interesting findings. This effect shows that participants' perceptions of most people's evaluations of both men and women differed by condition for status ($p < .05$), competence ($p < .10$), and considerateness ($p < .05$). In other words, compared to participants in the baseline condition, participants in the policy inter-

Table 1. Explicit Gender Beliefs: Most People's and Personal Evaluations (Semantic Differential Scales)

Most People's Evaluations

	Status		Competence		Considerateness	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Condition Means (Standard Deviations), with <i>t</i> -tests comparing [A] to [B] within each gender						
[A] Policy Intervention	5.49* (.68)	3.61 (.75)	4.89 (.66)	4.26 (.87)	3.49 (.63)	5.52* (.46)
[B] Baseline	5.90 (.68)	3.89 (.80)	5.17 (1.04)	4.65 (.65)	3.70 (.80)	5.88 (.75)
[C] Male-Advantaged	5.65 (.70)	3.69 (.81)	5.15 (.71)	4.26 (.86)	3.72 (.57)	5.44 (.58)
Repeated Measures ANOVA <i>F</i> -values, comparing [A] to [B]						
Within-Subject	132.10***		11.59***		173.35***	
Between-Subject	5.50**		3.21*		4.77**	
Interaction	.17		.11		.18	

Personal Evaluations

	Status		Competence		Considerateness	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Condition Means (Standard Deviations), with <i>t</i> -tests comparing [A] to [B] within each gender						
[A] Policy Intervention	5.13 (.67)	4.27 (.75)	4.90* (.87)	4.90 (.75)	4.35 (.83)	5.30 (.58)
[B] Baseline	5.38 (.83)	4.60 (.86)	5.39 (.74)	5.12 (.99)	4.39 (.92)	5.59 (.82)
[C] Male-Advantaged	5.11 (.71)	4.32 (.70)	5.15 (.79)	5.03 (.83)	4.40 (.94)	5.40 (.74)
Repeated Measures ANOVA <i>F</i> -values, comparing [A] to [B]						
Within-Subject	21.30***		.84		44.40***	
Between-Subject	3.15*		2.81		.84	
Interaction	.06		.84		.61	

Notes: Based on scales from 1 to 7. $N = 21$ for the policy condition (one participant did not complete the explicit beliefs measures), and $N = 22$ for the other two conditions.

*** $p < .01$; ** $p < .05$; * $p < .10$

vention condition believed that most people think both men and women are lower status, less competent, and less considerate. In terms of participants' personal beliefs, the only significant difference was that participants in the policy intervention condition thought everybody was lower in status compared to participants in the baseline condition ($p < .10$).

Simple effects tests comparing means for status, competence, and considerateness by gender provide more information about these differences (see Table 1). Participants in the policy intervention condition, compared to those in the baseline condition, reported significantly lower ratings of most people's evaluations about *men's status* ($t = -1.978$; $p < .10$) and *women's considerateness* ($t = -1.838$; $p < .10$), and lower personal evaluations of *men's competence* ($t = -1.990$; $p < .10$). Caution is required in interpreting these test results because they are weak and we do not wish to capitalize on chance, but they may reflect participants' negative perceptions of sexual harassment policies' effects in society: that they lower men's status and "bring out the worst" in women.

Implicit Gender Beliefs

Implicit beliefs were measured using the *IAT effect*, which is the difference in response time between the gender-stereotypical word matching (female—low status) and the counter-stereotypical matching (female—high status) blocks of words (Greenwald et al. 1998). A greater IAT effect indicates more entrenched male-advantaged gender beliefs. In all conditions, the IAT effects were positive, revealing that participants in all three conditions had implicit gender status beliefs favoring men. Repeated measures ANOVA tests comparing the policy condition to the baseline condition showed significant within-subjects effects for both the response times ($p < .01$) and error rates ($p < .01$) when comparing gender-stereotypical and counter-stereotypical word blocks (See Table 2).

The interaction between within-subjects and between-subjects effects was significant for response time ($p < .05$; the difference in average times between the counterstereotypical and stereotypical blocks was 236.7 milliseconds for the policy intervention condition and 136.4 milliseconds for the baseline condition), meaning that participants in the policy intervention condition displayed more

Table 2. Implicit Gender Beliefs: Implicit Association Test

	IAT Effect ^a	Response time		Error Rate	
		Gender-stereotypical Block	Counter-stereotypical Block	Gender-stereotypical Block	Counter-stereotypical Block
Condition Means (SDs), with <i>t</i> -tests comparing both [A] and [C] to [B] within each block					
[A] Policy Intervention	236.7** (191.6)	839.2 (145.7)	1075.9** (248.4)	.020 (.035)	.054 (.058)
[B] Baseline	136.4 (128.9)	793.3 (167.7)	929.7 (179.5)	.032 (.031)	.046 (.046)
[C] Male-Advantaged	171.7 (187.1)	938.4*** (208.1)	1110.1*** (229.2)	.018* (.021)	.024* (.028)
Oneway ANOVA and Repeated Measures ANOVA <i>F</i> -values, comparing [A] to [B]					
Within-Subject ^b	(N.A.)		57.41***		12.53***
Between-Subject	4.15**		3.48*		.02
Interaction	(N.A.)		4.15**		2.38

Notes: $N = 22$ for each condition.

^a IAT effect = Response time of counter-stereotypical block – Response time of gender-stereotypical block. Units are milliseconds. For the IAT effect, oneway ANOVA was used to compare [A] to [B].

^b Within-subjects effects are comparisons between the gender-stereotypical and counter-stereotypical blocks for response time and error rates.

*** $p < .01$; ** $p < .05$; * $p < .10$.

entrenched male-advantaged gender beliefs (i.e., a greater IAT effect) than participants in the baseline condition. This finding supports Hypothesis 1B, which states that exposure to sexual harassment policy activates more male-advantaged gender beliefs. Considering that automatic stereotypes are usually entrenched and difficult to change with a single stimulus, this small but significant effect of policy intervention speaks volumes about how sexual harassment policy can affect gender beliefs in ways of which people may not be aware.

When comparing the response times and error rates for the gender-stereotypical and counter-stereotypical rounds separately using simple effects tests, results show that participants in the policy intervention condition responded more slowly than the baseline condition only in the counter-stereotypical round ($t = 2.238$; $p < .05$), and their error rates in both rounds were not significantly different from the baseline condition. In contrast, t -tests comparing the male-advantaged condition to the baseline condition show that the former responded significantly more slowly in both the gender-stereotypical round ($t = 2.547$; $p < .01$) and counter-stereotypical round ($t = 2.906$; $p < .01$), and had lower error rates in both rounds (gender-stereotypical $t = 1.796$, $p < .05$; counter-stereotypical $t = 1.873$, $p < .05$). We interpret this as evidence that having been primed with stated male superiority in the Contrast Sensitivity task prior to the Implicit Association Test, participants in the male-advantaged condition were more sensitive to gender-related tasks; they consequently spent more effort trying to "beat the test" so as not to appear sexist.

In the policy intervention condition, on the other hand, participants did not seem to be expending as much effort consciously trying to "beat the test" since their response time in the gender-stereotypical round was the same as the baseline condition. In other words, the IAT effect in the policy intervention condition cannot be the result of self-presentation bias. Inferring from this finding and the results above, we conclude that exposure to sexual harassment policy affects men's gender beliefs in a subtle way. While explicit acknowledgment of male advantage may motivate men to

try consciously to fight their gender bias, exposure to sexual harassment policy seems to catch men "off guard," activating their traditional gender beliefs that women are of lower status than men.

Supplemental Analysis

In a supplemental analysis, we assessed implicit gender beliefs indirectly using behavior. One component of traditional gender beliefs is the expectation that men, who have higher status than women, are generally more competent than women. Expectation states research has shown that actors who consider their partners to have lower status are less likely to defer to their judgment in decision making (Pugh & Wahrman 1983; see also Correll and Ridgeway 2003 for a general review). Therefore, a measure of males' deference to a female partner's influence in a decision-making task likely reflects their implicit beliefs about the relative competence of women compared to men. We used such a measure, taken from the Contrast Sensitivity task, in a supplemental analysis. The deference measure calculates the proportion of trials in which the participant stayed with his initial choice in making a final choice, despite disagreement from his "partner." Greater deference to the female partner's judgment would indirectly suggest weaker male-advantaged gender beliefs (Hypothesis 1A), while low levels of deference could reflect more male-advantaged gender beliefs (Hypothesis 1B).

The mean proportion of Contrast Sensitivity trials in which participants stayed with their initial choice was identical between the policy intervention and baseline conditions (.57), but significantly higher in the male-advantaged condition (.68; $p < .05$). In other words, participants rejected their partner's influence more frequently only when they were explicitly told that men were usually better at the CS task, but not when the sexual harassment policy was read. Although gender was implicitly activated through the reading of the policy information, these findings reveal that the policy intervention does not affect deference behavior.

Summary

Overall, Hypothesis 1A, which states that exposure to the policy weakens male-advantaged gender beliefs, is not supported. The results provide support for the alternative Hypothesis 1B, that exposure to the policy strengthens male-advantaged gender beliefs, though only implicitly rather than explicitly. Results also show that compared to the baseline condition, participants in the policy intervention condition believe that most people perceive both women and men to be lower status, less competent, and less considerate.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study tests whether short-term exposure to sexual harassment policy can alter people's beliefs. We recognize that legal interventions may lead either to beliefs that are congruent with the policies or that run contrary to the laws' aims. We therefore tested rival hypotheses concerning the effects of exposure to sexual harassment policy on gender beliefs. We employed an experimental design that measured explicit and implicit gender beliefs across conditions, comparing the effect of the policy intervention to no intervention and to a condition that deliberately activated male-advantaged gender beliefs.

Results showed that the policy intervention's effect on explicit gender beliefs was complicated. While participants in the policy intervention condition did not have significant differences in male-advantaged beliefs compared to the baseline condition, they believed that most people perceive both women and men to be lower status, less competent, and less considerate. These unexpected findings suggest a possible backlash against sexual harassment policies. Results for implicit gender beliefs were more straightforward and also possibly indicative of a negative effect of the policy: The policy intervention activated automatic stereotypes favoring men that the baseline and explicitly male-advantaged conditions did not.

The disparate findings across dependent variables suggest the value of measuring both explicit and implicit gender beliefs. In particular, results suggest that participants are hold-

ing "dual attitudes" (Wilson et al. 2000): one conscious and controllable, and one unconscious and automatic. The dual attitudes model argues that attitudes develop through socialization and change over time such that new attitudes, instead of replacing old attitudes entirely, become explicit and older ones become implicit. Because implicit attitudes are activated automatically whereas explicit attitudes require greater cognitive motivation, implicit attitudes are likely to guide behavior unless people are in situations in which they have the capacity and motivation (e.g., to be "politically correct") to override the implicit attitude.

We believe that our findings are an example of "motivated overriding" (Wilson et al. 2000). Participants in all three conditions were aware of social norms underlying modern sexism, which proscribe statements advantaging males, and thus conformed to these norms in their explicit responses. With respect to implicit beliefs, policy participants' automatic stereotypes about gender difference were activated to a greater extent than the baseline participants' were. We believe that automatic stereotypes were similarly activated in both the male-advantaged and policy conditions, but the explicit focus on gender differences in competence in the male-advantaged condition made participants more motivated to override their automatic stereotypes than those in the policy condition. Written responses to an open-ended question about the Implicit Association Test at the end of the study support the "motivated overriding" interpretation.

Implicit measures may shed light on mechanisms that otherwise go undetected when studying the impact of sexual harassment interventions. Past research has shown that although implicit attitudes are not closely correlated with prejudice, they predict non-verbal behaviors such as blinking, visual contact, and physical distance during interactions with members of a stigmatized group (Dovidio et al. 1997; Sechrist and Stangor 2001). Research has also shown that in situations of stress and cognitive overload, people are more likely to rely on automatic stereotypes (e.g., DeDreu 2003). Because sexual harassment policies are aimed at reducing

subtle but potentially harmful behaviors in workplaces where stress and time pressure are often high, our finding that exposure to the policy engenders changes in implicit attitudes is especially important and warrants further study.

Several limitations of this study also suggest possibilities for future research. The participants were young men, but sexual harassment policies affect workers of all ages and both genders. In addition, the participants did not interact face to face with their female partners. Because sexual harassment policies prescribe rules for interaction, future research would benefit from a test of the effect of the policies on beliefs following face-to-face interaction. This study demonstrates that a sexual policy intervention does activate implicit gender beliefs, but we do not know the effects such implicit gender beliefs may have in the workplace. To what extent does the policy's activation of existing gender beliefs set back efforts at gender equality? A natural experiment in a workplace setting could begin to explore these questions and also compare the effects of various policy implementation strategies on explicit and implicit gender beliefs. Future research should also focus on identifying and documenting potential mechanisms by which Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action policies may indirectly affect status beliefs via norms and behaviors.

This study provides preliminary evidence that employers' inclusion of sexual harassment policy as a "one-shot learning" experience out of mere bureaucratic necessity actually has effects that run counter to the policy's equalizing aims. In particular, the policy strengthens male-advantaged gender beliefs and appears to provoke backlash. While this is a problematic consequence of the policy, we do not believe such policies are doomed to fail in the long run. The widespread diffusion of sexual harassment policies has created a new set of expectations in the workplace that discourage sexual harassment. For example, in this study most participants expressed support for the policy "training" when asked about it in the debriefing. Moreover, it is possible that sexual harassment policies do provide the cog-

nitive motivation for people to override implicit beliefs and behave according to explicit beliefs (which were unaffected by awareness of the sexual harassment policy in this study). Nevertheless, organizations would do well to incorporate the potential for backlash into policy implementation decisions. Future research should investigate the conditions under which organizations can effectively train employees about laws that potentially upset established patterns of interaction. When the frame by which employees learn about sexual harassment policies is one of legal threat rather than equal rights, as in this study, the effect of the law may be the opposite of what the law intends. However, it is possible that when policies are framed to correspond to organizational goals of equity, cooperation, and community, for example, the effects of the implementation may be quite different. There may also be an indirect equalizing effect of the policy on beliefs: diffusion of sexual harassment policies across organizations has led to changes in behaviors and norms in the workplace (Tinkler 2003; U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board 1995), which may alter beliefs. Evidence from research on racial desegregation supports this supposition (Pettigrew 1971).

Sociologists since Robert Merton have pointed to the analysis of unanticipated consequences as core to the discipline of sociology. This study highlights an unintended consequence of equalizing interventions, and should serve as a call to researchers and policymakers to further specify the social psychological mechanisms which promote and hinder laws and policies aimed at reducing inequality.

REFERENCES

- Allport, Gordon. 1954. *The Nature of Prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Banaji, Mazharin and Curtis Hardin. 1996. "Automatic Gender Stereotyping." *Psychological Science* 7:136-141.
- Berger, Joseph M., Hamit Fisek, Robert Norman, and Morris Zelditch. 1977. *Status Characteristics and Interaction*. New York: Elsevier.
- Berger, Joseph, Cecilia L. Ridgeway, and Morris Zelditch. 2002. "Construction of Status and

- Referential Structures." *Sociological Theory* 20:157–179.
- Bisom-Rapp, Susan. 2001. "An Ounce of Prevention is a Poor Substitute for a Pound of Cure: Confronting the Developing Jurisprudence of Education and Prevention in Employment Discrimination Law." *Berkeley Journal of Employment and Labor Law* 22:101–146.
- Blair, Irene V. 2002. "The Malleability of Automatic Stereotypes and Prejudice." *Personality & Social Psychology Review* 6:242–261.
- Blair, Irene V., Jennifer Ma, and Alison Lenton. 2001. "Imagining Stereotypes Away: The Moderation of Implicit Stereotypes through Mental Imagery." *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology* 81:828–841.
- Bobo, Lawrence. 1988. "Attitudes toward the Black Political Movement: Trends, Meaning, and Effects on Racial Policy Preferences." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 51:287–302.
- Brophy, Ira N. 1946. "The Luxury of Anti-Negro Prejudice." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 9: 456–466.
- Capasso, Jennifer. 2005. "Structure Versus Effect: Revealing The Unconstitutional Operation Of Title IX's Athletics Provisions." *Boston College Law Review* 46: 825–861.
- Cohen, E. G. 1982. "Expectation States and Interracial Interaction in School Settings." *Annual Review of Sociology* 8:209–235.
- Conway, Michael, M. Teresa Pizzamiglio, and Lauren Mount. 1996. "Status, Communitality, and Agency: Implications for Stereotypes of Gender and Other Groups." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 71:25–38.
- Correll, Shelley J. 2004. "Constraints into Preferences: Gender, Status and Emerging Career Aspirations." *American Sociological Review* 69:93–113.
- Correll, Shelley J. and Cecilia L. Ridgeway. 2003. "Expectation States Theory." Pp.29–51 in *Handbook of Social Psychology*, edited by John Delameter. New York: Kluwer/Plenum.
- DeDreu, Carsten. 2003. "Time Pressure and Closing of the Mind in Negotiation." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 91:280–205.
- Dobbin, Frank and Erin L. Kelly. 2007. "How to Stop Harassment: Professional Construction of Legal Compliance in Organizations." *American Journal of Sociology* 112:1203–43.
- Dovidio, John F., Kerry Kawakami, Craig Johnson, Brenda Johnson, and Adaiiah Howard. 1997. "On the Nature of Prejudice: Automatic and Controlled Processes." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 33:510–540.
- Eagly, Alice H. and Valerie J. Steffen. 1984. "Gender Stereotypes Stem From the Distribution of Women and Men into Social Roles." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 46:735–754.
- Epstein, Cynthia Fuchs, Robert Sauve, Bonnie Oglensky, and Martha Gever. 1995. "Glass Ceilings and Open Doors: Women's Advancement in the Legal Profession. A Report to the Committee on Women in the Profession, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York." *Fordham Law Review* 64: 291–449..
- Eyre, Linda. 2000. "The Discursive Framing of Sexual Harassment in a University Community." *Gender and Education* 12: 293–307.
- Faragher v. City of Boca Raton*, 524 U.S. 775 (1998).
- Farnham, Shelly. 1997. *The Farnham Implicit Association Test Software for Windows 95*. Retrieved September 2002 <http://hive-mind.com/shelly/IAT/>.
- Glick, P., and Susan T. Fiske. 1996. "The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating Hostile and Benevolent Sexism." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 70:491–512.
- Greenwald, Anthony. G., Debbie E. McGhee, and Jordan L. K. Schwartz. 1998. "Measuring Individual Differences in Implicit Cognition: The Implicit Association Test." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 74:1464–1480.
- Jacobson, Cardell K. 1978. "Desegregation Rulings and Public Attitude Changes: White Resistance or Resignation?" *American Journal of Sociology* 84:698–705.
- Jackman, Mary R. 1994. *The Velvet Glove: Paternalism and Conflict in Gender, Class, and Race Relations*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Jost, John. T. and Mahzarin R. Banaji. 1994. "The Role of Stereotyping in System-Justification and the Production of False-Consciousness." *British Journal of Social Psychology* 33:1–27.
- Jost, John T. and D. Burgess. 2000. "Attitudinal Ambivalence and the Conflict Between Group and System Justification Motives in Low Status Groups." *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin* 26:293–305.
- Moskos, Charles C. Jr. 1966. "Racial Integration in the Armed Forces." *American Journal of Sociology* 72: 132–148.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F. 1971. *Racially Separate or Together?* New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Pugh, Meredith D. and Ralph Wahrman. 1983. "Neutralizing Sexism in Mixed-Sex Groups: Do Women have to Be Better than Men?" *American Journal of Sociology* 88:746–762.
- Quinn, Beth. 2000. "The Paradox of Complaining: Law, Humor, and Harassment in the Everyday Work World." *Law and Social Inquiry* 25:1151–1185.
- Ridgeway, Cecilia L., Elizabeth H. Boyle, Kathy J. Kuipers, and Dawn T. Robinson. 1998. "How Do Status Beliefs Develop? The Role of Resources and Interactional Experience." *American Sociological Review* 63:331–350.

- Ridgeway, Cecilia L. and Kristan G. Erickson. 2000. "Creating and Spreading Status Beliefs." *American Journal of Sociology* 106:579–615.
- Rudman, Laurie, Richard Ashmore, & Melvin Gary. 2001. "Unlearning Automatic Biases: The Malleability of Implicit Stereotypes and Prejudice." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 81:856–868.
- Rudman, Laurie, Anthony Greenwald, and Debbie E. McGhee. 2001. "Implicit Self-Concept and Evaluative Implicit Gender Stereotypes: Self and Ingroup Share Desirable Traits." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 27:1164–1178.
- Schultz, Vicki. 2003. "The Sanitized Workplace." *Yale Law Journal* 112:2061–2194.
- Sechrist, Gretchen B. and Charles Stangor. 2001. "Perceived Consensus Influences Intergroup Behavior and Stereotype Accessibility." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 80:645–654.
- Sewell, William H. 1992. "A Theory of Structure: Duality, Agency, and Transformation." *American Journal of Sociology* 98:1–29.
- Steeh, Charlotte, and Howard Schuman. 1992. "Young White Adults: Did Racial Attitudes Change in the 1980s?" *American Journal of Sociology* 98:340–367.
- Swim, Janet K., Kathryn J. Aikin, Wayne S. Hall, and Barbara A. Hunter. 1995. "Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudices." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 68:199–214.
- Taylor, Marylee C. 1995. "White Backlash to Affirmative Action: Peril or Myth?" *Social Forces* 73:1385–1414.
- Tinkler, Justine E. 2003. "Defining Sexual Harassment: Ambiguity, Perceived Threat, and Knowledge." *Amici* 10:1–2.
- Tougas, F., R. Brown, A. M. Beaton, and S. Joly. 1995. "Neosexism: Plus ça Change, Plus c'est Pareil." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 21: 842–849.
- Troyer, Lisa and C. W. Younts. 1997. "Whose Expectations Matter? The Relative Power of First- and Second-order Expectations in Determining Social Influence." *American Journal of Sociology* 103:692–732.
- U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board. 1995. *Sexual Harassment in the Federal Workplace: Trends, Progress and Continuing Challenges*. Washington DC: U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board.
- Wagner, David G. and Joseph Berger. 1997. "Gender and Interpersonal Task Behaviors: Status Expectation Accounts." *Sociological Perspectives* 40:1–32.
- Wagner, David G. and Joseph Berger. 2002. "Expectation States Theory: An Evolving Research program" Pp. 41–76 in *New Directions in Contemporary Sociological Theory*, edited by Joseph Berger and Morris Zelditch Jr. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Webster, Murray Jr. and James E. Driskell, Jr. 1978. "Status Generalization: A Review and Some New Data." *American Sociological Review* 43:220–236.
- Wilson, Timothy D., Samuel Lindsey, and Tonya Y. Schooler. 2000. "A Model of Dual Attitudes." *Psychological Review* 107:101–126.

Justine Eatenson Tinkler received her PhD from the department of Sociology at Stanford University and is a postdoctoral researcher at the Michelle R. Clayman Institute for Gender Research at Stanford University. Her research focuses on how social psychological processes perpetuate macro-level inequality. Currently she is examining how cultural beliefs, privileges, and norms of interaction slow social change by provoking resistance to laws aimed at reducing race and gender inequality.

Yan E. Li is a PhD candidate in the department of Sociology at Stanford University. Her research combines theoretical inquiries into the social psychological foundations of social inequality and empirical examinations of how immigrants are affected by race and gender inequalities both socio-economically and ideologically. Her dissertation studies whether and how immigrants to the United States acquire dominant ideologies of social hierarchy in the forms of racial and gender stereotypes, beliefs about inequalities, and policy attitudes.

Stefanie Mollborn is Assistant Professor of Sociology and Faculty in the Health and Society Program of the Institute of Behavioral Science at the University of Colorado at Boulder. Her research focuses on social psychological approaches to understanding health behaviors and outcomes over the life course. Current projects include an analysis of the importance of resources for the early development of teenage parents' children and an examination of the antecedents and consequences of social norms about teenage pregnancy.