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A review of literature is an account of the literature pertinent to a particular field or topic. It gives an overview of what has been said, who the key writers are, what are the established theories and hypotheses, what questions are being asked, and what methods and methodologies are appropriate and useful. As such, it is not in itself primary research, but rather it reports on other findings. "A literature review uses as its database reports of primary or original scholarship, and does not report new primary scholarship itself. The primary reports used in the literature may be verbal, but in the vast majority of cases reports are written documents. The types of scholarship may be empirical, theoretical, critical/analytic, or methodological in nature. Second a literature review seeks to describe, summarise, evaluate, clarify and/or integrate the content of primary reports" Cooper (1988).

By reading many different studies, the researcher gains ideas regarding the important aspect of his topic of research. The researcher identifies the secondary data sources used by earlier researchers and becomes familiar with the technical words and style of writing in the area s/he is working on. The comprehensive review of the literature is important because it identifies the methods used in previous research on the topic and helps you to work out how to answer the questions and indeed, what questions need to be asked.

A literature review may be purely descriptive, as in an annotated bibliography, or it may provide a critical assessment of the literature in a particular field, stating where the weaknesses and gaps are, contrasting the views of particular authors, or raising questions. The purpose of a literature review is to establish a theoretical framework for
your topic / subject area; define key terms, definitions and terminology; identify studies, models, case studies etc supporting your topic; and define / establish your area of study (Source: dlsweb.rmit.edu.au).

2.1 SEX AND GENDER

2.1.1 Sex

The first thing that usually comes to mind while considering how females and males differ, is sex, the biological characteristics that distinguish males and females. Primary sex characteristics consist of organs related to reproduction. Secondary sex characteristics are the physical distinctions between males and females that are not directly connected with reproduction. They become clearly apparent at puberty when males develop more muscles and heaviness in voice, and gain more body hair and height, while females form more fatty tissue and broader hips, and develop breasts (Henslin 2000).

2.1.2 Gender

Gender, in contrast, is a social, not a biological trait. Gender consists of whatever behaviours and attitudes a group considers proper for its males and females. Consequently, gender varies from one society to another. Whereas sex refers to male or female, gender refers to masculinity or femininity. In short, you inherit your sex, but you learn your gender as you are socialized into the behaviours and attitudes your culture asserts are appropriate for your sex (Beynon 2002).
Gender is one of the central analytic categories in marketing and consumer behaviour research (e.g. segmentation); and marketing managers often assume that sex and gender are isomorphic. They base their segmentation and advertising strategies upon the belief that masculine products will appeal to males, and feminine products will appeal to females (Alreck, Settle, and Belch 1982, cited in Worth, Smith, and Mackie 1992).

Although sex and gender are inter-related (Deaux 1985), gender is not fully determined by sex because not all men are masculine and not all women are feminine (Bem 1974).

Gender is an increasingly ‘blurred’ construct, with a fluid quality that shifts and changes in different contexts at different times (Kacen 2000). There are a variety of subject positions from which individuals can choose, across a range of masculinities and femininities.

The mass media and the general public are captivated by findings of gender differences. John Gray’s (1992) *Men are from Mars, Women are from Venus*, which argued for enormous psychological differences between women and men (Gray, 2005). Deborah Tannen’s (1991) *You Just Don’t Understand: Women and Men in Conversation* argued for the different cultures hypothesis: that men’s and women’s patterns of speaking are so primarily different that men and women essentially belong to different linguistic communities or cultures. Both of these works, and dozens of others like them, have argued for the differences hypothesis: that males and females are, psychologically, vastly different.

The gender similarities hypothesis holds that males and females are similar on most, but not all, psychological variables. That is, men and women, as well as boys and girls, are
more alike than they are different. In terms of effect sizes, the gender similarities hypothesis states that most psychological gender differences are in the close-to-zero in the moderate range, and very few are large or very large (Hyde 2005).

Although the fascination with psychological gender differences has been present from the dawn of formalized psychology around 1879 (Shields, 1975), a few early researchers highlighted gender similarities. Thorndike (1914), for example, believed that psychological gender differences were too small, compared with within-gender variation, to be important. Leta Stetter Hollingworth (1918) reviewed available research on gender differences in mental traits and found little evidence of gender differences.

Reviews of research on psychological gender differences began with Woolley’s (1914) and Hollingworth’s (1918) and extended through Maccoby and Jacklin’s (1974) watershed book *The Psychology of Sex Differences*, in which they reviewed more than 2,000 studies of gender differences in a wide variety of domains, including abilities, personality, social behaviour, and memory. Maccoby and Jacklin dismissed as unfounded many popular beliefs in psychological gender differences, including beliefs that girls are more “social” than boys; that girls are more suggestible; that girls have lower self-esteem; that girls are better at rote learning and simple tasks, whereas boys are better at higher level cognitive processing; and that girls lack achievement motivation. Maccoby and Jacklin concluded that gender differences were well established in only four areas: verbal ability, visual-spatial ability, mathematical ability, and aggression. Overall, then, they found much evidence for gender similarities. Secondary reports of their findings in textbooks and other sources, however, focused
almost exclusively on their conclusions about gender differences (e.g., Gleitman, 1981; Lefrancois, 1990).

2.2 THE GENDER IDENTITY

Gender identity is an individual’s sense of themselves as a man or a woman (Gould 1996). Since gender identity and biological sex are not necessarily congruent (Bem 1974), gender identity has been used to explain within-sex differences in terms of consumer behaviour in previous research studies. However, there have been mixed results about the significance of gender identity for consumer behaviour, some studies have found gender identity to have an influence on symbolic consumption; for instance, masculine males were more likely to smoke masculine image cigarettes and feminine females were more likely to smoke cigarettes with a feminine image (Vitz and Johnson 1965).

However, other studies have not found gender identity to be a significant predictor of consumer behaviour. For example, Allison et al.’s study (1980) explored the relationship between a person’s gender identity and their product gender perception, and they found that biological sex was a more significant influence on product gender perception formation than gender identity was. Palan (2001) suggests that many previous studies did not produce significant findings with regard to gender identity either because of conceptualisation problems or because gender identity was not salient.

Gender identity is defined as the "basic, existential sense of one’s maleness or femaleness" (Spence 1985). In view of the fact that gender is culturally consequential,
gender identity is similarly rooted in cultural understandings of what it means to be masculine or feminine (Firat 1991). For many years, sex and gender were thought to be always together that is, men were masculine and women were feminine. But what consumer behaviour researchers, along with others, recognized was that some men were more feminine than masculine while some women were more masculine than feminine. In the postmodern culture in which we now live, this division of gender from sex is even more evident (Lerner 1986).

Consumer researchers have been examining the force of gender identity—the degree to which an individual identifies with masculine and feminine personality traits—on various consumer variables for nearly four decades. However, significant gender identity findings in consumer research have been rare, perhaps because of (1) operationalisation problems (Palan, Kiecker, and Areni 1999), (2) inappropriate interpretation and application of gender identity to consumer variables (Gould 1996), or (3) blurring gender categories (Firat 1993). This paper presents a thorough review, grounded in theoretical models of gender identity, of consumer behaviour studies in the marketing literature that have examined gender identity. Based on the literature review, the paper evaluates whether gender identity research is still warranted, and proposes specific research questions to guide future research.

The process of consumption has long been associated with sex and gender, thus, it comes as no surprise that consumer researchers often examine the effects of these variables on consumer behaviours. It also comes as no surprise that much is known about sex and gender and how they impact buying and consuming activities. Yet there is
one gender-related variable, gender identity that has both intrigued and perplexed consumer behaviour researchers for over four decades (Costa, 1994).

Early gender identity research hypothesized a single bipolar dimension of masculinity/femininity; that is, masculinity and femininity were opposites on one continuum (Terman and Miles 1936). Further, gender identity was believed to be correlated with biological sex and constrained by societal stereotypes of appropriate masculine and feminine behaviours (Constantinople 1973). As societal stereotypes changed, however, the assumptions of the one-dimensional model were challenged. This led to the development of a two-dimensional gender identity model, in which masculinity and femininity were conceptualized as two separate, orthogonal dimensions, coexisting in varying degrees within an individual (Gill et al. 1987); this conceptualization of masculinity and femininity remains the accepted standard today.

By the 1930s, straightening out of the complex threads of masculinity and femininity began, as the first appraisal of gender identity was endeavoured (Terman and Miles 1936). However, the gender identities made its first presence felt in consumer related researches by 1960s (Aiken 1963; Vitz and Johnston 1965), and with the surfaced of fresh conceptualizations of gender identity in the mid-1970s (e.g., Bem 1974; Spence, Helmreich, 1978), the study of gender identity in consumer research stepped up, continuing into the 1980s and 1990s. They have been exploring the impact of gender identity—the extent to which a person identifies with masculine and feminine personality traits—on various consumer variables.
The tag *female* and *male* carries powerful associations. Marketers utilize the information the tags deliver to guide their behaviour toward other people and to interpret their behaviour toward themselves. Sex or gender stereotypes are socially shared beliefs that certain qualities can be assigned to individuals based on their membership in the female or male half of the human race (*Lips, 2005*).

Masculine and feminine personality traits, upon which gender identity is based, are associated with instrumental/agentic and communal/expressive tendencies, respectively (*Parsons and Shils 1952*). Instrumental/agentic tendencies are defined as "concern with the attainment of goals external to the interaction process (*Gill et al. 1987, p. 379*). Personality traits such as independence, assertiveness, reason, rationality, competitiveness, and focus on individual goals are the hallmarks of masculinity (*Cross and Markus 1993; Easlea 1986; Keller 1983; Meyers-Levy 1988; Weinreich-Haste 1986*). A liking toward communal/expressive tendencies "gives primacy to facilitating the interaction process itself (*Gill et al. 1987, p. 380*).

Expressiveness involves understanding and dealing with emotions in self and others, although it is not “being emotional” rather, it concerns personality traits focused on being actively interdependent and relational. Understanding, caring, nurturance, responsibility, considerateness, sensitivity, intuition, passion, and focus on communal goals are traits associated with femininity (*Cross and Markus 1993; Easlea 1986; Keller 1983; Meyers-Levy 1988; Weinreich-Haste 1986*). Thus, men are expected to fulfil the masculine gender role that reflects agentic qualities and women are expected to fulfil the feminine gender role that reflects communal qualities (*Wood & Eagly, 2002*).
Several different expressions have been used over the path of gender identity research to imply gender identity. For example, sex-role identity (*Kahle and Homer 1985*), sex-role orientation (*Gentry and Doering 1979*), and sex-role self-concept (*Stern 1988*) are all terms referring to the measurement of gendered personality traits in men and women that have been used in consumer research. It was not until the 1990s that the term gender identity saw more consistent use (*Fischer and Arnold 1994; Gainer 1993; Kempf, Palan, and Laczniak 1997; Palan, Areni, and Kiecker 1999, 2001*).

Contributing to the contradictory use of terms is the fact that the term "gender" is often treated in both academic discussion and in the media as interchangeable with "sex." *Deaux (1985)* acknowledged that this debate was still developing in the field of psychology, though it was becoming more standard to use "sex" to refer to an individual’s biological sex and "gender" to refer to psychological features associated with biological sex that are socially constructed. That is the convention adopted in this literature review. Thus, "sex" refers to an individual’s biological sex, whether one is a woman (female) or a man (male). Most human beings are born as either male or female and by about two or three years of age, children become aware of their biological sex (*Money and Ehrhardt 1972*).

In disparity, "gender is the cultural definition of behaviour defined as appropriate to the sexes in a given society at a given time. Gender is a set of cultural roles" (*Lerner 1986*). About the same time that children become aware of their biological sex, they also have an awareness of culturally-derived gender norms; for example, children know positive stereotypes of their own sex and negative stereotypes about the other sex (*Kuhn, Nash,
and Brucken 1978). Thus, at a very early age, children begin to develop a belief system with respect to cultural gender roles. According to Spence (1985), "gender is one of the earliest and most central components of the self-concept and serves as an organizing principle through which many experiences and perceptions of self and other are filtered."

As children continue to become culturally socialized, they add to their belief system regarding gender, developing cognitive networks of associations to biological sex. One type of association that children learn is the culturally defined personality traits linked to being male (masculine traits) or female (feminine traits). The extent to which an individual identifies or thinks of him- or herself as masculine or feminine is what we now refer to, in consumer behaviour research, as gender identity (Fischer and Arnold 1994).

Two other concepts, gender role and gender role attitudes, have at various times been mistaken to be synonymous with gender identity in consumer behaviour studies (Fischer and Arnold 1994), when, in fact, they are not. Gender role refers to the culturally-derived behaviours and activities associated with masculinity or femininity that individuals choose to adopt. Gender role attitudes refer to an individual’s beliefs about the roles, rights, and responsibilities of men and women.

While gender identity is certainly related to both gender roles and gender role attitudes, it does not necessarily have to be congruent with gender role or gender role attitudes (Deaux 1985; Fischer and Arnold 1994). For example, it would not be unusual for a woman to report a more favourable attitude toward egalitarian gender roles in the home.
than toward traditional gender roles, but at the same time be engaging in behaviours associated with a traditional feminine gender role; empirical measurement of that same woman’s gender identity might show that she identified equally with masculine and feminine personality traits.

Gender identity is considered to be a two-dimensional model, with masculine traits comprising one dimension, and feminine traits the other. Psychologists believe that varying degrees of these traits coexist within an individual (Gill et al. 1987). Two instruments, created in the mid-1970s, have dominated gender identity research, the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) and the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ). With either instrument, individuals can be categorized according to which set of gendered traits they primarily identify with.

There are two competing gender identity theories impacting the conceptualization of consumer research. Bem’s (1981a) Gender Schema Theory hypothesizes that individuals acquire and display traits, attitudes, and behaviours consistent with their gender identity, so gender identity is predictive of broad gender-related constructs. Spence (1984) posits that gender identity is multi-factorial with gendered traits constituting but one factor; therefore, gender identity is predictive only of situations in which gendered traits are likely to have impact. If one wants to understand other gender constructs, e.g., gender role attitudes, a measure specific to that construct would have to be used.

31 consumer behaviour studies empirically examining gender identities have been conducted and reported in the past 38 years, beginning in 1963. Other than the two studies conducted in the 1960s and the one study reported to date in the 2000s, each
decade has seen an almost equal share of studies, with eight conducted in the 1970s, 11 during the 1980s, and nine during the 1990s. The pattern of these studies suggests a steady and persistent interest in gender identity, despite the criticisms of gender identity instruments and despite the often non-significant outcomes of gender identity research (Annexure 1). Related to these theories is gender salience, the idea that a gender-related self-concept has to be activated in order for gender identity to be meaningful in a particular context.

2.3 GENDER PERSONALITY TRAIT DIMENSIONS

Masculine and feminine personality traits, upon which gender identity is based, are related with instrumental/agentic and communal/expressive tendencies, respectively (Parsons and Shils 1952), in Western societies. Instrumental/agentic tendencies are defined as "concern with the attainment of goals external to the interaction process" (Gill et al. 1987, p. 379). Personality traits such as independence, assertiveness, reason, rationality, competitiveness, and focus on individual goals are the hallmarks of masculinity (Cross and Markus 1993; Easlea 1986; Keller 1983; Meyers-Levy 1988; Weinreich-Haste 1986).

A proclivity toward communal/expressive tendencies, however, "gives primacy to facilitating the interaction process itself" (Gill et al. 1987, p. 380). Expressiveness involves understanding and dealing with emotions in self and others, although it is not "being emotional"; rather, it concerns personality traits focused on being actively interdependent and relational. Understanding, caring, nurturance, responsibility, considerateness, sensitivity, intuition, passion, and focus on communal goals are traits

Two instruments incorporating the multidimensional conceptualization of masculinity and femininity have dominated gender identity research (Deaux 1985)—the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) and the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ). The development of these instruments preceded gender identity theory development, yet, because the researchers associated with gender identity theory were also the same researchers who developed the BSRI and the PAQ, measuring masculine and feminine personality traits came to be synonymous (either rightly or wrongly) with measuring gender identity.

The BSRI and the PAQ were developed in the mid-1970s as indexes of self-reported instrumental/agentic and communal/expressive traits (Bem 1974; Spence et al. 1975). Both instruments categorize individuals, using median splits on masculinity and femininity scores, as either being sex-typed (males report themselves as identifying primarily with masculine traits, females report themselves as identifying primarily with feminine traits), cross sex-typed (males report themselves as identifying primarily with feminine traits, females report themselves as identifying primarily with masculine traits), androgynous (either males or females who report themselves as high on both masculine and feminine traits), or undifferentiated (either males or females who report themselves low on both masculine and feminine traits). There are variations on this categorization system; for example, some researchers prefer to categorize individuals as either being masculine schematic (either males or females who report themselves as primarily
masculine) or feminine schematic (either males or females who report themselves as primarily feminine) (Markus et al. 1986).

The original development of both the BSRI and the PAQ was not based on the theoretical distinctions between masculinity and femininity; instead, reliance was given to college students’ assessments of stereotypically desirable masculine and feminine personality traits (Bem 1974; Spence et al. 1975). Thus, for the BSRI, Bem (1974) classified 20 traits judged to be significantly more desirable for men than for women (using t-tests) as reflecting masculinity. Similarly, 20 traits were chosen to reflect femininity. The BSRI also contains 20 traits judged to be neutral, i.e., neither more desirable nor undesirable for men or women. Spence et al. (1975), in a slightly different manner, developed the PAQ by classifying personality traits judged as socially desirable for both sexes but believed to occur to a greater degree in males as masculine, whereas traits deemed to be socially desirable for both sexes but more frequently occurring in females were classified as feminine. In addition, the PAQ includes a third scale composed of traits deemed to be socially desirable for one sex group, but not the other. Justification of item classification on the PAQ was based by inspecting item content (Spence and Helmreich 1978).

Use of the BSRI and PAQ in consumer behaviour research has often resulted in non-significant findings (see, e.g., Roberts 1984; Palan et al. 1999). A possible explanation for these findings is the criticism that the masculine and feminine scales of the BSRI and the PAQ are not internally consistent (Collins, Waters, and Waters 1979; Feather 1978;
Gaa, Liberman, and Edwards 1979), suggesting the presence of dimensions other than instrumentality and expressiveness.

Indeed, a study conducted by Myers and Gonda (1982) asked almost a thousand subjects to define masculine and feminine with open-ended responses; over 86% of the responses were not represented on the BSRI. This is consistent with research by Palan et al. (1999) that noted the presence of four dimensions in addition to expressiveness and instrumentality in the PAQ. These findings may be related to concerns that the gender identity measurement scales were linked to theory post-hoc, giving rise to the possibility that neither instrument accurately measures instrumental/agentic and communal/expressive traits (Gill et al. 1987; Myers and Gonda 1982; Palan et al. 1999).

For example, although expressiveness is associated with being actively interdependent, the BSRI includes dependent as a femininity trait; likewise, the PAQ includes independent as a masculine trait, yet instrumentality is more about objectivity and manipulation than independence (Gill et al. 1987).

Gender identity theories were developed and connected to the measurement of gendered personality traits post-hoc. Two competing gender identity theories, Gender Schema Theory and Multi-factorial Gender Identity Theory, have dominated the psychology literature. Both of these theories have impacted the conceptualization of consumer behaviour studies.

Bem’s (1981a) gender schema theory suggests that individuals acquire and display traits, attitudes, and behaviours consistent with their gender identity. Moreover, according to Bem (1981a), gender identity serves as an organizing principle through which
individuals’ process information about themselves and the world around them, although the ability of gender identity to have such an effect varies depending on whether or not an individual is sex-typed. Thus, a sex-typed (or gender schematic) male or female is more likely to be influenced by his or her gender identity than are non-sex-typed men and women (or gender aschematics).

A notable aspect of Bem's work is that her development of the BSRI was the first to treat masculinity and femininity as independent dimensions, thus allowing for an individual to be androgynous, someone who is characterized by high degrees of both masculinity and femininity. Sex typing with the BSRI requires the researcher to calculate an androgyny score, the difference between an individual's masculinity and femininity scores (Bem 1974). Although Bem had not yet put forth her gender schema theory when the BSRI was introduced, she later posited that the androgyny score, as a representation of an individual's total sex role, was diagnostic and predictive of broad gender-related constructs - all kinds of attributes, attitudes, and behaviours that society prescribes for each sex are tied to masculinity/femininity, gender identity, and gender schema (Spence 1985).

Using the BSRI as diagnostic of a wide variety of gender-related constructs, however, has been criticized by those who favour the multi-factorial gender identity theory. Specifically, many researchers believe that masculine and feminine personality traits have a much narrower diagnostic capability than that purported by Bem, and if used to indicate broader concepts may result in meaningless data. This criticism is revisited when individual consumer research articles are examined later in this literature review.
Contradicting Bem’s theories is the belief that gender-related phenomena are multifactorial in nature with desirable gendered personality traits constituting but one factor (Feather 1984; Spence 1984, 1991; Taylor and Hall 1982). Accordingly, masculinity and femininity are conceptually distinct from gender role expectations, attitudes, preferences, and behaviours, and the use of the BSRI and the PAQ, which measure masculine and feminine traits, should be limited to studies measuring variables relevant to instrumentality and expressiveness. This is consistent with Spence who maintains that neither the PAQ (1984, 1991, and 1993) nor the BSRI (1993) is appropriate as an indicator of global gender-related constructs.

The underlying assumption of multi-factorial gender identity theory is that gender identity is a combination of gender-related phenomena, associated in varying degrees with each other, such as gender-related attitudes, interests, and role behaviours, and gendered personality traits. Not only is gender identity multi-factorial, but each gender-differentiating factor has a different developmental history that varies across individuals because the factors are impacted by multiple variables that are not necessarily gender-related (Spence 1993). Consequently, the specific array of gender-congruent qualities that people display can be quite variable within each sex (Spence 1993), although both men and women do develop gender identities and a sense of belongingness to their sex that is maintained throughout the life span (Green 1974).

Not all researchers agree on what specific factors comprise gender identity. For example, four critical domains of gender-related phenomena have been identified by Spence and Sawin (1985) including: (1) an individual’s global self-concept of his/her
masculinity or femininity; (2) gendered personality traits; (3) gender-related interests, role behaviours, and attitudes; and (4) sexual orientation. Ashmore (1990), on the other hand, maintains that the multiple facets of gender identity include two general constructs, sex stereotypes and gender attitudes, and five areas of self-content (i.e., where the self is the referent): (1) personal-social attributes; (2) social relationships; (3) interests and abilities; (4) symbolic and stylistic behaviours; and (5) biological and physical attributes. Regardless of which specific facets or factors one associates with the multi-factorial concept of gender, it is important to note that gender identity, as defined in multi-factorial theory, is a term that encompasses several different aspects of gender, of which gendered personality traits is just one aspect.

Thus, the differentiating feature of multi-factorial gender identity theory from gender schema theory is that, in multi-factorial theory, the measurement of gender identity requires measuring several different factors (i.e., personality traits, gender attitudes, gender role behaviours, etc.); if only one factor, such as gendered traits, is measured, then the applicability of that factor is limited to situations where only that one factor is relevant. Gender schema theory, on the other hand, maintains that it is the measurement of only one facet, masculine and feminine personality traits, that are needed to indicate multiple gender-related concepts. Many consumer behaviour studies have embraced gender schema theory. Others have acknowledged the need to limit the use of gender identity measures to situations in which masculinity and femininity are relevant, consistent with multi-factorial gender identity theory.
For the purposes of this study we regard sex as a biological concept. This allows us to distinguish males and females on the basis of their physiological differences (*Bristor and Fischer 1993*). Gender is taken to be "a broad concept which addresses the perspective one takes on one’s own sex as well as incorporating a whole host of psychosocial variables which relate to it in a reciprocal way" (*Gould 1996, p478*). Recent studies have suggested that, firstly, people’s gender identity, (their own perception of themselves in terms of gender) may offer a more refined tool for exploring the impact of gender on consumer behaviour (*Worth et al. 1992*); and secondly "how gender is activated and made salient in different contexts" needs further examination (*Moore 2004; Palan 2001*). *Gould (1996)* also argues that research into gender identity should focus on the effects of situation-induced gender salience.

### 2.4 Gender Salience

Given that the distinction between gender schema theory and multi-factorial gender identity theory impacts conceptualized relationships between gendered personality traits, additional gender constructs, and other consumer variables, another important theoretical issue that emerges in gender identity research is gender salience. Indeed, another possible explanation for the plethora of disappointing findings with respect to gender identity in consumer behaviour research may be that the extent to which an individual’s gender schema is activated, and, thus, the extent to which individuals engage in gender-related behaviours is likely dependent on how important gender is in a given context. That is, individuals have several different possible schemata that can be activated and
influential in a given situation—a working self-concept (Deaux and Major 1987; Markus and Kunda 1986).

While an individual is not likely to change the essence of his/her gender identity, in a situation where a gender-related working self-concept is activated, beliefs and behaviours will be gender-based because of the salience of gender in that situation. Consequently, the gender-relevant characteristics that men and women possess and display and the gender roles they choose to occupy may vary in different contexts (Spence and Sawin 1985). Moreover, the measurement of gender identity may produce different results in a situation where an individual’s gender-related working self-concept has been activated (making gender more salient in the situation) relative to a situation where the same individual’s gender-related working self-concept has not been activated (making gender less salient in the situation) (Gould 1996).

Gender salience proposes that a gender-related self-concept has to be activated in order for gender identity to have a significant influence in a particular context (Palan 2001). Although everyone has a gender identity, the salience of this identity varies between people and across situations (Howard and Hollander 1997). Many studies have failed to recognize the importance of gender salience. Gould’s (1996) typology captures how consumer behaviour can vary according to the differential intersection of gender identity and gender salience.
1. A **High Gender Attribution/Response** in which a person with high gender identification, placed in a situation of high gender salience, would tend to make many gendered attributions and responses (*Gould 1996*).

2. An **Identity-Based Gendered Response** where a person with a high gender identification is in a situation of low gender salience, but would still make some gendered responses since their identity centres on gender (*Gould 1996*).

3. **Situation-Based Gender Attribution** where a person with a low gender identification is placed in a situation of high gender salience, and so would make some gendered attributions according to the situation (*Gould 1996*).

4. **Low Gender Attribution/Response** in which a person with low gender identification is placed in a situation with low gender salience and thus would make few or no gendered attributions or responses (*Gould 1996*).

The typology only indicates when there is likely to be a gendered attribution or response, not what its content is (*Gould 1996*). *Gould* (1996) argues that gender may not...
be relevant at all in some situations, since not everything is seen in gendered terms. This suggests, in turn, that the relevance of gendered symbolic consumption may vary according to the situation, reflecting Bearden and Etzel’s (1982) findings about the differential impact of public and private contexts on the symbolic consumption of luxuries and necessities.

Deaux and Major (1987, p. 375-376) suggest that a gender-related working self-concept is likely to be activated when (1) "gender is a central, well-differentiated component of the self-concept," (2) a gender-related working self-concept has been recently or frequently activated, (3) "immediate situational cues make gender schemata salient" (e.g., the gender of a word-of-mouth communicator is incongruent with the situation), or (4) another individual’s actions make gender schemata salient (e.g., an individual overhears a conversation where a man asks a woman for her opinion about a product). Though gender salience research related to consumer behaviour has been very limited, significant results have been reported in three studies when situational cues related to gender (e.g., male/female make-up of groups) have been present (Abrams, Thomas, and Hogg 1990; Considine and Gould 1991; Gould and Weil 1991).

2.5 GENDER ROLES IN ADVERTISING IN MARKETING

Advertising is considered a marketing tool, a social actor and a cultural artefact (Dyer, 1982; Frith, 1995; Leiss et al., 1990). As a social actor advertising transforms cultural symbols and ideas, and bonds together images of individuals and products (Leiss et al., 1990). One of the major issues challenging this social actor and cultural artefact is how to portray men and women in advertising (Whipple and Courtney, 1985) since every
culture has accepted norms and behaviours of men and women which are clearly
distinguishable and there is also a social pressure to maintain these differences (Leiss et al., 1990). Gender role has become such a dominant feature of modern advertising that it is "used most" by advertisers for transmitting cultural norms in a ritualized format (Jhally, 1987).

Depiction of gender role is an important basis for market segmentation. Portrayals of gender role in advertisements in both print and television act as one of the ways of gauging society’s attitudes towards gender as well (Milner and Higgs, 2004). In today’s global economy gender has also become an important component of cultural identity (Collier, 2000) but a “cultural gap” may exist between advertising’s gender role portrayals in different nations (Cooper-Chen, 1995; O’Toole, 1982).

The gender similarities hypothesis holds that males and females are similar on most, but not all, psychological variables. That is, men and women, as well as boys and girls, are more alike than they are different. In terms of effect sizes, the gender similarities hypothesis states that most psychological gender differences are in the close-to zero or small range, a few are in the moderate range, and very few are large or very large. Although the fascination with psychological gender differences has been present from the dawn of formalized psychology around 1879 (Shields, 1975), a few early researchers highlighted gender similarities. Thorndike (1914), for example, believed that psychological gender differences were too small, compared with within-gender variation, to be important. Leta Stetter Hollingworth (1918) reviewed available research on gender differences in mental traits and found little evidence of gender differences.
Another important reviewer of gender research in the early 1900s, Helen Thompson Woolley (1914), lamented the gap between the data and scientists’ views on the question: The general discussions of the psychology of sex, whether by psychologists or by sociologists show such a wide diversity of points of view that one feels that the truest thing to be said at present is that scientific evidence plays very little part in producing convictions.

Reviews of research on psychological gender differences began with Woolley’s (1914) and Hollingworth’s (1918) and extended through Maccoby and Jacklin’s (1974) watershed book *The Psychology of Sex Differences*, in which they reviewed more than 2,000 studies of gender differences in a wide variety of domains, including abilities, personality, social behaviour, and memory. Maccoby and Jacklin dismissed as unfounded many popular beliefs in psychological gender differences, including beliefs that girls are more “social” than boys; that girls are more suggestible; that girls have lower self-esteem; that girls are better at rote learning and simple tasks, whereas boys are better at higher level cognitive processing; and that girls lack achievement motivation. Maccoby and Jacklin concluded that gender differences were well established in only four areas: verbal ability, visual-spatial ability, mathematical ability, and aggression. Overall, then, they found much evidence for gender similarities. Secondary reports of their findings in textbooks and other sources, however, focused almost exclusively on their conclusions about gender differences (e.g., Gleitman, 1981; Lefrançois, 1990).
The literature review on gender roles depiction in advertising is extensive and exhaustive. One of the initial studies on gender roles was undertaken by Gilly (1988). She found consistency in the traditional notion of women being portrayed as wife, mother, bride, waitress, actress and dancer. Men are portrayed in independent roles and women are portrayed in relational roles across these three countries. Robbins and Paksoy (1989) found that German advertisements were more prone to show women in either in business or personal roles, whereas US advertisements were more likely to portray them in a social role.

A study by Wiles and Tjernlund (1991) found that in US women are shown in decorative roles within the non-working role category whereas Swedish magazine advertisers were more likely to portray them in recreational and family roles. The results of the subsequent study by Wiles et al. (1995) suggested that the roles of men and women in magazine advertisements of Sweden and USA showed cultural biases and stereotypes. For example, in both countries were far more likely to show men rather than women in working roles in their magazine advertisements. Biswas et.al. (1992) found that sex appeal was used more often in French than in US advertisements.

Ford et al. (1994) found in their sample of adult women from New Zealand, USA and Thailand that women from New Zealand were very critical of their role portrayed in advertising, women from USA were also critical but to a slightly lesser degree and women from Thailand were the least critical. Those women in different cultures with higher levels of self-declared female autonomy were more critical of company image
and were less inclined to purchase a company's products which appeared in “offensive” advertisements.

_Cutler et al._ (1995) study on people’s role portrayal in the Korean and USA in magazine advertisements found that although females were depicted in stereotypical ways in Korean magazine advertisements, they were also less likely to be shown as sex objects and less likely to appear in advertisements for durable goods than men.

_Sengupta_ (1995) examined the influence of culture on portrayals of women in television advertisements in Japan and USA and found that the commercials of the two countries generally reflected their respective cultural values.

A socio-cultural comparison of gender-roles portrayal in Chinese and US television commercials was undertaken by _Cheng_ (1997). The results indicated that commercials in both countries depicted more men in occupational roles and more women in non-occupational roles, and showed more men in recreational activities and more women in decorative situations. Chinese commercials were found to reinforce more stereotypes than US commercials.

_Al-Olayan and Karande_ (2000) content analyzed magazine advertisements from USA and Arab World (e.g. Algeria, Bahrain, Egypt, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Oman, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates). Their study found that people were depicted less frequently in Arabic magazine advertisements. When advertisements had pictures of men and/or women, men and women were portrayed to the same degree in USA and Arab world. However, the depiction of women differed. The advertisements of Arab
world showed women wearing long dresses, and appeared in those advertisements in which their presence was related to the product being advertised (e.g. cosmetics, personal care products, household products, medicines).

A study by Milner and Collins (2000) of gender-role portrayals in television commercials in Japan, Russia, Sweden and USA that used Hofstede's framework, which suggests that countries may be described along a continuum from masculine to feminine, found that television commercials from feminine countries (e.g. Russia and Sweden) showed more depictions of relationships between both male and female characters than did masculine countries (e.g. Japan and USA).

Thus, a number of studies have examined the portrayals of gender role in advertisements across time and countries e.g. Das, 2000; Ford et al., 1998; Furnham and Farragher, 2000; Furnham and Voli, 1989; Milner and Collins, 1998; Milner and Higgs, 2004; Zhou and Chen, 1997 and others and some have been done cross-culturally e.g. Biswas et al., 1992; Cheng, 1997; Furnham and Mak, 1999; Gilly, 1988; Griffin et al., 1994; Sengupta, 1995; Wiles and Tjernlund, 1991; Wiles et al., 1995 and others.

2.6 Gender Roles in Indian Advertising in Marketing

India as one of the Asian nations represents Eastern cultural values which are significantly different from those of western countries like USA, Canada and Britain (Hofstede, 1980). Thus, it is likely that portrayals of the role of men and women in Indian advertisements could differ from those found in western countries like USA. Portrayals of gender role in advertising is seen by researchers as a form of transmitting
cultural norms of a given society and as an important segmentation variable (Cutler, et al., 1995). Therefore, an investigation of the portrayals of men and women role in Indian and US advertisements can enrich our knowledge of this socio-cultural artefact by shedding light on how men and women are depicted in different societies and also how they should be depicted in order to develop effective advertising strategy. Thus, the study offers practical implications to international marketers.

Furthermore, in the last 15 years India has been recognized as a big emerging market (BEM), the second fastest growing world market after China. India’s steady economic growth, the increase in a middle-class that has a high propensity to spend, coupled with a highly skilled labour force that is English-speaking have influenced several leading multinational corporations and foreign institutional investors to expand their presence in India. Thus, India provides an excellent example for examining portrayals of gender roles within both a BEM context and Eastern culture. The study is also timely since no recent cross-cultural studies with the exception of a 1994 study by Griffin et al. have examined portrayals of gender role with regards to the growing Indian market.

Das (2000) in their study on the role of men and women in Indian advertisement concluded that the portrayal of women in Indian magazine differs from those found in other nations. Two major differences in female role portrayals were;

1. The common stereo typical portrayals seem less prevalent in Indian; women were portrayed in neutral ways and less likely as sex objects in Indian advertisement. They were also portrayed as less dependent as compared to advertisements in
Britain. The results of Indian advertisements were in sync with the Japanese and Korean advertisements.

2. In India, the trend of portrayal of woman has been non-traditional and this can be attributed to the changes in the Indian society.

Women often play a submissive role to men in Indian culture, a role well defined in ancient and sacred literature as the “traditional” role of Indian women. Women are expected to perform the role of being caring and dutiful wives, mothers and daughter-in-laws, and proving themselves to be morally virtuous and standing by their men when it comes to bringing about familial harmony. Indian men are considered as providers of economic security (Blackwell, 2004; Goldstein, 1972; Nayar, 2003; Reddy, 2003). The sex ratio is particularly favourable to males than to females. Parents favour boys for a number of security reasons (Blackwell, 2004; Culturegrams, 1997-1998; Heitzman and Worden, 1996; Reddy, 2003).

Several legislative interventions, from eighteenth century laws passed under the British rule, the Indian Constitution, written in 1948 to present-day Indian acts, and several women's and other movements, have sought to improve the status of the women by expanding their rights and freedom, and by guaranteeing them certain legal/constitutional protections. However, in reality they often do not enjoy these privileges to which they are entitled. The rise of Hindu nationalism in the 1990s have called for women to be “traditional” homemakers has also contributed to this issue (Malhotra and Rogers, 2000; Reddy, 2003). Marriage is considered essential and sacred
for practically everyone in India. For both males and females free association with the opposite sex and dating are not looked upon favourably (Reddy, 2003).

The roles of wife and mother are the two dominant traditional roles an Indian woman plays. As a wife, she is devoted and obedient, subordinate and dutiful. As a mother, she combines her nurturing and loving self with the powerful one. The Vedas state that "mother is God". These ancient texts state that women must be honoured and adorned, and any house in which the women are not honoured, will perish and be destroyed. Yet, the son is the preferred child and there is no rejoicing when a daughter is born. A daughter is a source of misery, while the son is the saviour of the family. He plays an important role in the rituals and traditions of a family, while she is considered a burden to the family - who will never contribute economically and will be an expense at the time of marriage. These dichotomous views are deeply ingrained in the psyche of Indians - male and female - and contribute to a cultural devaluation of females which in turn leads to feelings of worthlessness and inferiority (Kakar, 1988).

Changes during the decade of the seventies included a growing awareness of women's expanding roles in society. More women are participating in the labor force than ever before, and society has begun to reexamine the value of women's contributions. This growing sensitivity to the roles of women in society is also producing a number of criticisms regarding various commonly accepted practices. Some of these criticisms revolve around the stereotypical sex-role portrayal of women in the mass media (Butler and Paisley, 1980).
Dwivedy et al., (2009) examined the role portrayals of men and women appeared in India’s most popular men’s, women’s and general interest magazines during October 2006 to April 2007. Advertisements were content analyse to identify the role portrayal patterns of male and female across magazine types. It was revealed that male and female are portrayed in traditional roles. Men’s magazines depict men and women in very traditional role while women’s and general interest magazines depict women in more modern roles.

A decade wise assessment of gender portrayal research indicates a similar pattern of gender stereotyping (Ref. Table 2.1 page 71).

During early 1970’s it was found that men and women are depicted in highly stereotypical roles. It was hoped that advertisements of 1980’s would depict men and women in more contemporary and non-traditional roles. But the studies conducted during 80’s contradicted the forecast made by researches in the last decade. Both male and female continued to be represented in stereotypical role. In studies conducted in 1990’s the researches were almost consistent with the findings of previous research and noted very slight changes in the way male and female were depicted in the advertisements. Most of the researches in 2000 continued to analyse gender representations and found some slight changes in the representation of gender. These research analyses were again consistent with the findings of previous year’s researches only few researches observed slight changes in gender stereotyping particularly in case of women.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>Representation of male and female were stereotypical. It was predicted that 1980’s would see more advertisements in contemporary &amp; non-traditional role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>Male and Female were continued to be in stereotypical role and contradicted the assessments made in previous research on gender representation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>Researches in this period were almost consistent with the findings of previous research and noted very slight changes in the way male and female were depicted in the advertisements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000s</td>
<td>Most of the researches continued to analyse gender representations and found some slight changes in the representation of gender in advertisements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: Decade wise Gender Role Portrayal Assessment in Advertising  
(Source: Kumari & Shivani, 2012)