ISSN: 2959-6386 (Online), Vol. 2, Issue 3, December 2023

Journal of Knowledge Learning and Science Technology

journal homepage: https://jklst.org/index.php/home

Mutual representations of women and men in the workplace

SAFA BENNAMATE[1],AHMED EL BOUAZZAOUI[2],

(I am thankful to the director of founding father of the concept of mutual representations Dr. Philippe Castel and Dr. Marie-Françoise Lacassagne for their valuable guidance.)

[1]Doctoral researcher under the guidance of Professor Ahmed El Bouazzaoui within the research team in Social and Clinical Psychology and Work (PSCT) in Rabat, Morocco.

[2]Teaching researcher and director of the research team in Social and Clinical Psychology and Work (PSCT).

Abstract

This article aims to study gender relations in the workplace and the different strategies employed by both men and women through the theory of social categorization. In a patriarchal society like Morocco, where men outnumber women in the workforce, what identity strategies will women implement in the workplace? And what social categories will both genders align themselves with in order to gain a favorable position?

Following our study, we were able to validate our hypotheses that men would tend to align themselves with an expert-novice partition, positioning themselves as experts compared to women perceived as less competent. Meanwhile, women would align themselves more with an oppositional partition, in which they are seen as bearers of more positive values compared to men who are associated with negative values.

Keywords: Mutual representation, social categorization, social partitions

ArticleInformation:

Articlehistory:*Received:*10/09/2023 *Accepted:*25/10/2023 *Online:*21/11/2023 *Published*:20/12/2023

DOI:https://doi.org/10.60087/jklst.vol2.n3.p148

[i] **Correspondence author:** Safa Bennamate **Email:** safa.bennamate@gmail.com

Introduction.

Categorization is a process that simplifies the understanding of reality by observing everyday occurrences in a world governed by regularities. It is an inevitable process, meaning individuals categorize without even being

aware of it. This is manifested in individuals' ability to classify groups, people, and objects, distinguishing those that are similar from those that are not. This phenomenon was highlighted by Tajfel in 1959.

It was experimentally tested by the same author and Wilkes in 1963 in an experiment on the direct physical perception of objects, presenting subjects with 8 lines of varying sizes. Following this experiment, numerous studies demonstrated that social categorization is marked by a dual accentuation: the accentuation of intra-categorical similarities (assimilation effect) and the accentuation of inter-categorical differences (contrast effect). Moreover, it has been shown that the contrast effect is consistently present regardless of the object, while the assimilation effect is only present towards social stimuli (Eiser, 1971; Doise, Deschamps, and Meyer, 1979; Duflos and Lauvergeon, 1988; De La Haye and Duflos, 1993; McGarty and Turner, 1992). Furthermore, according to Tajfel (1972), individuals tend to identify not only based on their individual identity but also based on the groups to which they belong. Therefore, categorization plays a role in social identity.

According to Tajfel and Turner's Social Identity Theory, individuals have a social identity derived from their identification with a category. We define ourselves based on our group (in-group) but also in relation to groups to which we do not belong (out-group). Consequently, social categorization is a process involved in social identification. Additionally, the concept of social categorization is linked to that of social representation because, for the formation of a social category, individuals must develop representations of these categories. Many scientists, such as Denise Jodelet, define representation as 'a form of socially elaborated and shared knowledge, with a practical purpose and contributing to the construction of a common reality within a social group.' This concept helps better understand individuals and groups by analyzing how they perceive themselves, others, and the world.

According to Moscovici, a social representation has several dimensions. Firstly, there is an attitudinal dimension as a social representation expresses a general positive or negative orientation towards the represented object. Secondly, there is an informational dimension, where information refers to the sum and organization of knowledge about the represented object. This knowledge can be more or less extensive, varied, precise, or stereotyped. Finally, the last dimension to consider is the field of representation, meaning that when studying social representations, one must consider the cognitive and affective information of these representations.

According to Abric, social representations have four main functions. Firstly, they serve a knowledge function by enabling the understanding and explanation of reality, which is necessary for communication and social exchanges. They also have an orientation function, allowing individuals to anticipate, generate expectations, and determine what is possible in a particular social context. Furthermore, social representations have a justificatory function as they can be used to justify choices and attitudes, playing an essential role in maintaining or reinforcing social positions. Finally, the last function of social representations is an identity function, as social representations help define the social identity of each individual and preserve the specificity of social groups. This function is crucial and reflects the importance of social representations in socialization processes or social comparison.

The concept of social categorization gives rise to an underlying concept: that of social partitions. This

concept was introduced by Castel and Lacassagne in 2004 in the context of interethnic relations, demonstrating that there is not just one categorization but partitions established based on the nature of the relationship an in-group maintains with an out-group. There are three types of partitions: oppositional partitions, hierarchical partitions, and communal partitions. Oppositional partitions involve two parties that are opposites, while hierarchical partitions involve one party being dominant over the other. Finally, communal partitions involve one party belonging to a category from which the other is excluded. For example, there is a general category representing students at the Faculty of Arts and Humanities in Rabat, and within it, there are several characteristics such as chosen major, level of study, or gender, forming subcategories.

In light of these various studies, it is evident that the groups to which individuals belong have an effect on the representations they have of their in-group and out-group, as categorization and representation are concepts linked to each other. We propose to study this effect of social categorization on representations, using men and women in the professional world as the source of variation.

In the face of persisting inequalities in the workplace, men may be dominant compared to women. However, neither group may fully agree with this characterization, as identifying as 'dominated' places women in an unfavorable situation, and conversely, being 'dominant' would imply that men are so only due to the power conferred by the situation. Therefore, our interest lies in the different identity strategies that will be implemented by both groups.

The objective of the study is to examine the mutual representation The mutual representations that men and women hold of each other.

> H1 : *We propose the hypothesis that men would tend to align themselves with an expert-novice partition, positioning themselves as experts in comparison to women who are perceived as less competent. This would justify the power granted to men. Therefore, men should evaluate the characteristics attributed to men as more conducive to the proper functioning of a work structure than those attributed to women.*
>
> *On the other hand, women would tend to align themselves with an oppositional partition, in the sense that they would embody more positive values compared to men who would have negative values. Thus, women would evaluate the adjectives characterizing women as more positive in terms of valence than those characterizing men.*

Method.

Participants.

We opted for a RepMut questionnaire, which we administered to 501 men and 511 women online. We

retained only those who answered all the questions and had at least one prior experience in the workforce, whether in the private or public sector. This included 38 men [Mean Age = 29.6, SD = 9.38] and 32 women [Mean Age = 27.06, SD = 4.31].

Materials and procedure.

We utilized a RepMut questionnaire adapted to the study's needs. The questionnaire was preceded by instructions stating that it was a study aimed at investigating gender relations in the professional world. Participants were informed that there were no 'right' or 'wrong' answers, only their opinions mattered, and their responses should be individual and spontaneous. They were assured that their responses would be anonymous and used solely for statistical purposes.

We had two questionnaire formats, one for women and one for men, each consisting of 11 sections. The first part focused on exo-representation, endo-representation, and media-representation. Each participant was required to provide 3 to 5 adjectives describing how they represent women, men, and work.

Exo-representation (how a member of one group represents the other group):

- Women's questionnaire: "List the 5 adjectives that, in your opinion, best characterize men: (They, Men) I think they are..."
- Men's questionnaire: "List the 5 adjectives that, in your opinion, best characterize women: (They, Women) I think they are..."

Endo-representation (how a member represents their own group):

- Women's questionnaire: "List the 5 adjectives that, in your opinion, best characterize women: (We, Women) I think we are..."
- Men's questionnaire: "List the 5 adjectives that, in your opinion, best characterize men: (We, Men) I think we are..."

Media-representation (how a member represents the represented object):

- Both questionnaires: "List the 5 adjectives that, in your opinion, best characterize work: (Work) I think it is..."

In the second part, participants were asked to assign a score on a scale from 0 to 100 to these adjectives concerning status. Additionally, participants were required to provide a valence score ranging from -100 to 100, reflecting the positive or negative aspect of the adjectives attributed to men, women, and work:

- Status: "Indicate to what extent each characteristic is related to social status (from 0 to 100)."
- Valence: "Indicate to what extent each characteristic is related to the appreciation of the person who possesses it (from -100 to +100)."

To test the hypothesis that men align themselves with an expert-novice partition, participants were asked to rate, on a scale from 0 to 100, how much the mentioned adjectives would contribute to the proper functioning of a work structure: "Indicate to what extent each of these characteristics could contribute to the proper functioning of a work structure."Next, we evaluated endo-representativity and exo-representativity. For endo-representativity, participants rated how much women or men possessed each characteristic. For exo-representativity, participants rated how much the adjectives corresponded to the representation of the other group.

Endo-representativity:

- Women's questionnaire: "Indicate to what extent women possess each of these characteristics."
- Men's questionnaire: "Indicate to what extent men possess each of these characteristics."

Exo-representativity:

- Women's questionnaire: "Indicate to what extent men possess each of these characteristics."
- Men's questionnaire: "Indicate to what extent women possess each of these characteristics."

Finally, participants were asked to rate how much the adjectives corresponded to their own characteristics (auto-representativity): "Indicate to what extent you personally possess each of these characteristics." Participants also provided information about their age, socio-professional categories, and origin and country of residence for individual differences comparison (socio-professional category, age). Due to difficulties some individuals encountered in responding to the online questionnaire and their inability to progress through the questions, we designed an Excel questionnaire that included all the previously mentioned sections, which we sent to the participants and later collected.

Results.

1. Status.

We observe different results for the status (see table below).

	Source Woman (N=32)	**Source Man (N=38)**	**Mean**	**p**
Woman	70.03	57.85	63.94	.032
Man	65.54	59.3	62.42	.15
Mean	67.785	58.575	63.18	.04
P	.26	.393		

In general, there is no significant difference between the adjectives attributed to women and men in terms of status (respectively M = 63.94 and M = 62.42, p = .428). More specifically, although the average scores attributed by women to men in terms of status are lower than those attributed to women, we observe a non-significant effect between the status judgment of adjectives characterizing the in-group and those characterizing the out-group among female sources (respectively M = 70.03 and M = 65.54, p = .26).

Similarly, men attribute a higher status to adjectives characterizing men (M = 57.85) than those characterizing women, although the effect is not significant (M = 59.3, p = .393). Thus, the average that women attribute to their in-group in terms of status is higher (M = 70.03) than that attributed by men to their own in-group (M = 59.3, p = .054). Similarly, the average attributed by women to their out-group in terms of status (M = 65.54) is higher than that attributed by men to their out-group (M = 57.85, p = .096).

We obtain a significant effect between the average attributed by female sources in terms of status for men and women (M = 67.785) and that attributed by men (M = 58.575, p = .04). Thus, women generally attribute a higher status. Regarding the represented object, we observe that women attribute a higher status to adjectives characterizing work (M = 75.74) compared to men (M = 55.52, p = .005), thus achieving a very significant effect.

2. Valence.

For our results, regarding valence (see table below), we observe that adjectives characterizing women are judged as more positively valued than adjectives characterizing men (respectively M = 21.625 and M = -7.3785, p = .002), obtaining a highly significant effect.

	Source Woman (N=32)	**Source Man (N=38)**	**Mean**	**p**
Woman	17.27	25.98	21.625	.271
Man	-20.80	6.043	-7.3785	.023
Mean	-3.53	16.0115	12.4815	.05
P	.012	.043		

More precisely, this difference is even more pronounced with female sources, judging a more positive valence for adjectives characterizing women (M = 17.27) than for adjectives characterizing men (M = -20.80, p = .012). As for male subjects, we observe a positive valence for adjectives attributed to women (M = 25.98) compared

to the valence of adjectives characterizing men (M = 6.043, p = .043). We also observe a difference between the valence attributed by female subjects who judge men and women more negatively (M = -3.53) than male subjects who attribute a more positive valence (M = 16.0115, p = .05).

Thus, adjectives characterizing women are judged less positively in terms of valence by female sources (M = 17.27) than by male sources (M = 25.98; p = .271). Similarly, adjectives characterizing men are judged much more negatively in terms of valence by female sources (M = -20.80) than by male sources (M = 6.043, p = .023). Regarding the represented object, we observe that women attribute a higher valence to adjectives characterizing work (M = 26.96) compared to men (M = 15.65, p = .055), thus achieving a trending effect.

3. Expertise.

The table below represents the results concerning expertise:

	Source Woman (N=32)	**Source Man (N=38)**	**Mean**	**p**
Woman	61.975	56.2381	59.10655	.011
Man	52.4933	64.5914	58.54235	.362
Mean	57.23415	60.41475	58.82445	
P	.131	.046		

We observe that there is no significant difference between the mean scores that subjects attribute to adjectives characterizing women and men in terms of expertise (respectively M = 59.10655 and M = 58.54235; p = .396). More specifically, adjectives characterizing men were judged as more contributing to the proper functioning of a work structure by men (M = 64.5914) than those characterizing women (M = 56.2381, p = .046), thus obtaining a significant effect.

On the other hand, women do not attribute more competence to men than to women, as there is no significant effect between the mean scores attributed to men and women (respectively M = 52.4933 and M = 61.975, p = .131). Thus, there is no significant effect between the mean scores that women attribute to their in-group in terms of expertise (M = 61.975) and that men attribute to their own in-group (M = 64.5914, p = .19). Similarly, there is no significant difference between the adjectives attributed by women to men (M = 52.4933) and those attributed by men to women (M = 56.2381, p = .10).

We obtain a trending effect between the mean attributed by female sources in terms of expertise for men and women (M = 57.23415) and that attributed by men (M = 60.41475, p = .074). Regarding the represented object, we observe that men give higher ratings to adjectives characterizing work in terms of expertise (M = 68.122) than women (M = 59.859, p = .0066), thus achieving a highly significant effect.

4. Self-representation.

As for self-representation, the table below shows the results obtained:

	Source Woman (N=32)	**Source Man (N=38)**	**Mean**	**p**
Woman	69.83	54.76	62.295	.017
Man	45.23	67.47	56.35	.0008
Mean	57.53	61.115	59.3225	.252
P	.0027	.012		

In general, there is no significant difference between the adjectives attributed to women and men in terms of self-representation (respectively M = 62.295 and M = 56.35, p = .398). Regarding female sources, there is a highly significant effect between the mean scores attributed to adjectives characterizing women (M = 69.83) and those characterizing men in terms of self-representation (M = 45.23, p = .002). We also observe a significant effect between the mean scores attributed to adjectives characterizing men (M = 67.47) and those characterizing women in male sources (M = 54.76, p = .012).

Similarly, female sources attribute higher scores to adjectives characterizing women in terms of self-representation than male sources (M = 69.83, p = .017). On their part, there is a highly significant difference between the judgment of adjectives characterizing men by female sources (M = 45.23) and male sources in terms of representativity (M = 67.47, p = .0008).

Thus, there is no significant effect between the mean scores attributed to women in terms of self-representation by female sources and the mean scores that men attribute to adjectives characterizing men (M = 69.89) than those that men attribute to their own in-group (M = 67.47, p = .358). On the other hand, the mean attributed by men to women in terms of self-representation (M = 65.54) is higher than that attributed by women to men (M = 45.23, p = .093), obtaining a trending effect.

We do not obtain a significant effect between the mean attributed by female sources in terms of self-

representation for men and women (M = 57.53) and that attributed by men (M = 61.115, p = .252). Regarding the represented object, we observe that women attribute higher scores in terms of self-representation to adjectives characterizing work (M = 65.27) compared to men (M = 60.93, p = .278), thus obtaining a highly significant effect

5. Intellectual domain.

As for intellectuality, the table below shows the results obtained:

	Source Woman (N=32)	**Source Man (N=38)**	**Mean**	**P**
Woman	59.9	54.32	57.11	.203
Man	55.21	54.94	55.075	.484
Mean	57.555	54.63	56.0925	.307
P	.312	.449		

We notice that there is no significant difference between the average scores assigned to adjectives characterizing women in terms of intellectuality and those characterizing men (respectively M = 57.11 and M = 55.075, p = .383). In detail, there is no significant effect between the average scores assigned to women and men for female sources, even though the former rate adjectives characterizing women (M = 59.9) as more corresponding to the intellectual domain than adjectives characterizing men (M = 55.21), p = .312.

Similarly, there is no significant effect between the average scores of adjectives characterizing men (M = 54.94) and those attributed to the characteristics of women in terms of intellectuality by male sources (M = 54.32, p = .449). We also do not observe a significant effect between male and female sources regarding the average attributed to the characteristics of women and men in general (respectively M = 57.555; M = 54.63, p = .307).

Thus, adjectives characterizing women are judged as more corresponding to the intellectual domain by female sources (M = 59.9) than by male sources (M = 54.32; p = .203), although the effect is not significant. Similarly, adjectives characterizing men are judged as more corresponding to the intellectual domain by female sources (M = 55.21) than by male sources (M = 54.94, p = .38). As for the object of representation, we notice that there is no significant difference between the average scores that women attribute to adjectives characterizing work in terms of intellectuality (M = 64) and those of men (M = 54.12, p = .109), thus obtaining a non-significant effect.

6. Relational domain.

Regarding the relational domain, the table below shows the results obtained:

	Source Woman (N=32)	Source Man (N=38)	Mean	p
Woman	63.64	65.27	64.455	.402
Man	64.99	57.96	61.475	.134
Mean	64.315	61.615	62.965	.327
P	.426	.097		

We notice that there is no significant difference in the average scores attributed to adjectives characterizing women in the relational domain and those characterizing men (respectively M = 64.455 and M = 61.475, p = .177). In detail, there is no significant effect between the average scores attributed to women and men by female sources regarding the relational domain (respectively M = 63.64 and M = 64.99, p = .426).

As for male sources, there is a trend between the average scores of adjectives characterizing men (M = 57.96) and those attributed to the characteristics of women in terms of relational domain (M = 65.27, p = .097). We also observe no significant effect between male and female sources regarding the average scores attributed to the characteristics of women and men in general (Respectively M = 64.315, p = .327).

Thus, there is no significant effect between adjectives characterizing women in the relational domain for male sources (M = 65.27) and female sources (M = 63.64, p = .402). Similarly, there is no significant effect between adjectives characterizing men in the relational domain for female sources (M = 64.99) and male sources (M = 57.96, p = .134). As for the object of representation, we notice a significant difference between the average scores that women attribute to adjectives characterizing work in the relational domain (M = 68.24) and those attributed by men (M = 50.24, p = .007), thus obtaining a very significant effect..

7. Pratical domain.

For the practical domain, we present the obtained results:

	Source Woman	Source Man	Mean	P

	(N=32)	(N=38)		
Woman	47.67	46.21	46.94	.434
Man	45.38	53.33	49.335	.194
Mean	46.525	49.77	48.1475	
P	.416	.17		

We observe that there is no significant difference between the mean scores assigned to adjectives characterizing women in practical terms and those characterizing men (M = 46.94 and M = 49.335, respectively; p = .278). Specifically, there is no significant effect between the mean scores assigned to women and men concerning female sources (M = 47.67 and M = 45.38, respectively; p = .416).Similarly, there is no significant effect between the mean scores of adjectives characterizing men (M = 53.33) and those attributed to the characteristics of women in practical terms by male sources (M = 46.21, p = .17).

We also do not observe a significant effect between male and female sources regarding the mean scores attributed to the characteristics of women and men in general (M = 49.77; M = 46.525, respectively; p = .35). Thus, there is no significant difference between the mean scores assigned to adjectives characterizing women in terms of practical skills by female sources (M = 47.67) and male sources (M = 46.21, p = .434). Similarly, there is no significant difference between the mean scores assigned to adjectives characterizing men by female sources (M = 45.38) and male sources (M = 53.33, p = .194).As for the object of representation, we notice that there is no significant difference between the mean scores that women attribute to adjectives characterizing work in terms of practical skills (M = 56.06) and those of men (M = 55.05, p = .447), thus obtaining a non-significant effect."

8. Causal dimension.

As for the causal dimension, the following table shows the results:

	Source Woman (N=32)	Source Man (N=38)	Mean	p
Woman	37.69	41.42	39.555	.219
Man	42.44	38.41	40.425	.229
Mean	40.065	39.915	39.99	.491
P	.318	.309		

We note that there is no significant difference in the average scores attributed to adjectives characterizing women in terms of causality and those characterizing men (respectively M = 39.555 and M = 40.425, p = .49). Thus, adjectives characterizing both men and women are perceived as related to internal causes. Specifically, there is no significant effect between the average scores attributed to women and men, particularly among female sources (respectively M = 37.69 and M = 42.44, p = .318).

Similarly, there is no significant effect between the average scores of adjectives characterizing men (M = 38.41) and those attributed to the characteristics of women in terms of causality by male sources (M = 41.42, p = .309). We also observe no significant effect between male and female sources regarding the average scores attributed to the characteristics of women and men in general (respectively M = 39.915; M = 40.065, p = .491).

Thus, there is no significant difference in the average scores attributed to adjectives characterizing women in terms of causality by female sources (M = 37.69) compared to male sources (M = 41.42; p = .219). Similarly, there is no significant difference in the average scores attributed to adjectives characterizing men by female sources (M = 42.44) compared to male sources (M = 38.41, p = .229). As for the object of representation, we notice that there is no significant difference in the average scores that women attribute to adjectives characterizing work in terms of causality (M = 55.41) compared to men (M = 52.82, p = .358), thus obtaining a non-significant effect.

9. Intrativity :

Regarding the results of intrativity:

	Source Woman (N = 32)	**Source Man (N = 38)**	**Mean**	**p**
Woman	76.07	43.71	59.89	.00002
Man	72.1	47.81	59.955	.00017
Mean	74.085	45.76	59.9225	.000000
P	.64	.391161		

In general, there is no significant difference between the adjectives attributed to women and men in terms of 'intrativité' (respectively M = 59.89 and M = 59.955, p = .417). Regarding female sources, there is no significant effect between the average scores attributed to adjectives characterizing women (M = 76.07) and those characterizing men in terms of 'intrativité' (M = 72.1, p = .64). We also do not observe a significant effect between the average scores of adjectives characterizing men (M = 47.81) and those characterizing women among male

sources (M = 43.71, p = .391).

However, female sources attribute higher scores to adjectives characterizing women in terms of 'intrativité' than male sources (respectively M = 76.07 and M = 43.71; p = .00002). On the other hand, there is a highly significant difference between the judgment of adjectives characterizing men by female sources (M = 72.1) and male sources in terms of 'intrativité' (M = 47.81, p = .00017).

Thus, there is a highly significant effect between the average scores attributed to women (M = 76.07) in terms of 'intrativité' by female sources and the average scores that men attribute to adjectives characterizing men (M = 47.81, p = .0001). The average attributed by men to women in terms of 'intrativité' (M = 43.71) is significantly lower than that attributed by women to men (M = 72.1, p = .000016). We also obtain a highly significant effect between the average attributed by female sources in terms of 'intrativité' for men and women (M = 74.085) and that attributed by men (M = 45.76, p = .000000).

10. Extrativity

In terms of extractivity, the following table represents the obtained results:

	Source Woman (N = 32)	**Source Man (N = 38)**	**Mean**	**P**
Woman	47.19	72.17	59.68	.001
Man	43.36	65.47	54.415	.003
Mean	45.275	68.82	57.04	.00001
P	.662838	.273877		

In general, there is no significant difference between the adjectives attributed to women and men in terms of extractivity (respectively M = 59.68 and M = 54.415, p = .307). Regarding female sources, there is no significant effect between the average scores attributed to adjectives characterizing women (M = 47.19) and those characterizing men in terms of extractivity (M = 43.36, p = .662838). We also do not observe a significant effect between the average scores attributed to adjectives characterizing men (M = 65.47) and those characterizing women by male sources (M = 72.17, p = .273877).

However, female sources attribute lower scores to adjectives characterizing women in terms of extractivity than male sources (respectively M = 47.19 and M = 72.17, p = .001). On their part, there is a very significant difference between the judgment of adjectives characterizing men by female sources (M = 43.36) and male sources in terms of extractivity (M = 65.47, p = .003).

Thus, there is a significant effect between the average scores attributed for women (M = 47.19) in terms of extractivity by female sources and the average scores that men attribute to adjectives characterizing men (M = 65.47, p = 0.015). The average attributed by men to women in terms of extractivity (M = 72.17) is much higher than that attributed by women to men (M = 43.36, p = .0002). We also obtain a very significant effect between the average attributed by female sources in terms of extractivity for men and women (M = 45.275) and that attributed by men (M = 68.82, p = .00001).

11. Diativity :

	Source Woman (N = 32)	**Source Man (N = 38)**	**Mean**	**p**
Woman	28.88	-28.46	0.21	.00001
Man	28,74	-17.66	5.54	.0002
Mean	28.81	-23.06	2.875	.0001
P	.78	.11		

In general, there is no significant difference between the adjectives attributed to women and men in terms of diativity (respectively M = 0.21 and M = 5.54, p = .109). Regarding female sources, there is no significant effect between the average scores attributed to adjectives characterizing women (M = 28.88) and those characterizing men in terms of diativity (M = 28.74, p = .78). We also do not observe a significant effect between the average scores attributed to adjectives characterizing men (M = -17.66) and those characterizing women by male sources (M = -28.46, p = .11).

However, female sources attribute lower scores to adjectives characterizing women in terms of diativity than male sources (respectively M = 28.88 and M = -28.46, p = .00001). On their part, there is a very significant difference between the judgment of adjectives characterizing men by female sources (M = 28.74) and male sources in terms of diativity (M = -17.66, p = .0002). We also obtain a very significant effect between the average attributed by female sources in terms of diativity for men and women (M = 28.81) and that attributed by men (M = -23.06, p = .0001).

Discussion.

The objective of our study is to explore the representations that women and men have of each other in the workplace and to examine the different identity strategies employed. In line with our problem statement, which suggests that men are dominant compared to women in the workplace, but neither group holds a socially advantageous position, women and men do not perceive themselves as having a higher status. However, women judge adjectives characterizing work as more associated with a high status, possibly due to their occupying high-responsibility positions.

Regarding our hypotheses, we predicted that women would align more with an oppositional partition, carrying more positive values compared to men who would have negative values. Consequently, women would evaluate adjectives characterizing women more positively in terms of valence than those characterizing men. Our hypotheses are validated concerning valence. Women indeed judge adjectives related to them as more positive in valence. That is, they perceive themselves more positively in terms of characteristics allowing for the appreciation of a person. Additionally, men also judge adjectives characterizing women as more positive.

This representation of women can be explained by the fact that they belong to a minority group. Consequently, they perceive themselves more positively than men to enhance their self-worth and achieve a positive social position. Men, on the other hand, belong to the majority group. There is no identity threat, and consequently, they do not need to discriminate against women to maintain a majority position in the workplace.

We also predicted that men would align more with an expert-novice partition, positioning themselves as experts compared to women who would be less competent. Therefore, men should evaluate characteristics attributed to men as more conducive to the proper functioning of a work structure than those attributed to women. Our hypotheses are also validated concerning expertise. Men indeed judge adjectives related to them as contributing more to the proper functioning of a work structure. In other words, they perceive themselves as more competent than women.

Regarding self-representation, we predicted that subjects should judge themselves as more similar to members of their in-group than with members of their out-group. We observe that both women and men judge adjectives from their in-group as representative of themselves. This suggests strong categorization into differentiated groups and a high level of identification with their in-group.

We also observe a homogeneity effect among female sources, both from the in-group and the out-group. However, contrary to the theory, men judge adjectives characterizing women as more corresponding to men and adjectives characterizing men as more corresponding to women. This would suggest that men perceive women as more masculine and men as more feminine. We can suggest the idea that men may encounter a greater number of exemplars, leading to a perceived greater variability, explaining the observed heterogeneity.

Finally, due to language barriers, we limited our questionnaire to subjects in high-responsibility positions

who are proficient in the French language. This may introduce effects into the subjects' representations. Therefore, it would be interesting to replicate this type of experiment using RepMut translated and adapted into the Arabic language to obtain a larger sample.

Conclusion.

The study aims to investigate how women and men perceive each other in the workplace and to analyze the identity strategies employed. Despite the assertion that men hold a dominant position in the workplace, both men and women do not consider themselves to have a socially advantageous status. However, women tend to evaluate work-related adjectives more positively, potentially influenced by their high-responsibility positions.

As for the hypotheses, it was anticipated that women would align with a more positive set of values compared to men, leading to a more positive evaluation of adjectives characterizing women in terms of valence. These hypotheses are confirmed, as women judge adjectives related to them more positively. This positive self-perception among women could be attributed to their belonging to a minority group, where enhancing self-worth becomes crucial. Conversely, men, belonging to the majority group, do not perceive a need to discriminate against women to maintain their majority status in the workplace.

The study also predicted that men would position themselves as experts compared to women, and this is validated in terms of expertise. Men judge adjectives related to them as contributing more to the proper functioning of a work structure, indicating a perception of greater competence.

Regarding self-representation, both women and men perceive adjectives from their in-group as representative of themselves, suggesting strong categorization and identification with their in-group. However, contrary to expectations, men perceive women as more masculine and men as more feminine, possibly influenced by encountering a greater variety of exemplars.

In conclusion, the study acknowledges the impact of language barriers and suggests the need for future experiments using RepMut translated and adapted into Arabic to broaden the sample and enhance cross-cultural understanding.

Reference.

Abric, J. C. (2003). Méthodes d'étude des représentations sociales. Erès.

Castel, P., & Lacassagne, M.F. (2011). Contrat de communication et partitions sociales. In P. Castel, E. Salès-Wuillemin & M.-F. Lacassagne. Psychologie sociale – Communication – Langage. Paris : De Boeck.

Dardenne, B., Delacollete, N., Grégoire, C., et Lecocq, D. (2006). Structure latente et validation de la version française de l'Ambivalent Sexism Inventory : l'échelle de sexisme ambivalent. L'année Psychologique, 196, 235-264.

Du Maroc, R., & PLAN, H. C. A. (2003). Activité, emploi et chômage. Premiers Résultats, Direction de la Statistique, Rabat.

De La Haye, A. M., & Duflos, A. (1993). The cognitive approach to social categorization. Studies on the self and social cognition, 231-247.

Doise, W. I. L. L. E. M., Deschamps, J. C., & Meyer, G. (1979). Accentuation des ressemblances intracatégorielles. Expériences entre groupes, (19), 281.

Duflos, A., & Lauvergeon, G. (1988). Variabilité comportementale, théorie de l'information et interaction sociale ou les us et abus d'un modèle. Revue Internationale de Psychologie Sociale, 1, 113-128.

Dumont, M., Sarlet, M., et Dardenne, B. (2010). Be too kind to a woman, she'll fell incompetent: Benevolent sexism shifts self-construal and autobiographical memories toward incompetence. Sex Roles,62, 545-533

Eiser, J. R. (1971). Enhancement of contrast in the absolute judgment of attitude statements. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 17(1), 1.

Jodelet, D. (2007). Place de l'expérience vécue dans le processus de formation des représentations sociales. J.-M. Tremblay.

Glick, P., et Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory : Differentiating Hostile and Benevolent Sexism. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70, 491-512.

Glick, P., et Fiske, S. T. (1999). The ambivalence toward Men Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent beliefs about men. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 23, 519-536

Glick, P., Fiske, S. T., Mladinic, A., Saiz, J. L., Abrams, D., Masser, B., ... & López, W. L. (2000). Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: hostile and benevolent sexism across cultures. Journal of personality and social psychology, 79(5), 763.

McGarty, C., & Turner, J. C. (1992). The effects of categorization on social judgement. British Journal of Social Psychology, 31(4), 253-268.

Moliner, P., & Guimelli, C. (2015). Les représentations sociales. Fondements historiques et développements récents. Grenoble (Presses universitaires de).

Moscovici, S. (1981). On social representations. Social cognition: Perspectives on everyday understanding, 8(12), 181-209.

Moscovici, S. (2001). Social representations: Essays in social psychology. Nyu Press.

Sarlet, M., & Dardenne, B. (2012). Le sexisme bienveillant comme processus de maintien des inégalités sociales entre les genres. LAnnee psychologique, 112(3), 435-463.

Tajfel, H. (1959). Quantitative judgement in social perception. British journal of psychology, 50(1), 16-29.

Tajfel, H. (1972). Some developments in European social psychology. European Journal of Social Psychology.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1978). Intergroup behavior. Introducing social psychology, 401, 466.