1989

The relationship between masculinity, femininity, self-esteem, and real estate sales performance

John, 1949- Christensen
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Christensen, John, 1949-, "The relationship between masculinity, femininity, self-esteem, and real estate sales performance" (1989). *Master's Theses*. 3180.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.am2n-jtyj>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/3180

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 1339606

**The relationship between masculinity, femininity, self-esteem,
and real estate sales performance**

Christensen, John Barton, M.A.

San Jose State University, 1989

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MASCULINITY,
FEMININITY, SELF-ESTEEM, AND REAL ESTATE SALES PERFORMANCE

A Thesis

Presented to
the Faculty of the Department of Psychology
San Jose State University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
John Christensen

June, 1989

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

Dr. Frank Payne (Thesis Chairperson)

Dr. John Kelly (Committee Member)

Dr. Norman Egger (Committee Member)

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	2
METHOD	9
Subjects	9
Procedure	9
Measures	10
RESULTS	13
Discussion	24
APPENDIX A	34
APPENDIX B	42
REFERENCES	43

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Eigenvalues and Percentage of Variance for Unrotated Principal Components Analysis	14
2. Oblique Factor Pattern Matrix After Rotation with Kaiser Normalization	16
3. Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations Among Measures For All Subjects	17
4. Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations Among Measures Separately For Males & Females .	19
5. Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations Among Measures For All Residential Subjects . .	21
6. Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations Among Measures for All Residential Subjects For Males & Females	22
7. Individual Items From Questionnaire That Correlate Significantly With One or More Performance Scores	23
8. Male and Female Norms on the Short Bem Sex-Role Inventory for Various Samples of Adults	25

The Relationship Between Masculinity,
Femininity, Self-Esteem, and Real Estate Sales Performance

John Barton Christensen

San Jose State University

Running Head: SALES PERFORMANCE

Requests for reprints should be sent to John Christensen,
Department of Psychology, San Jose State University, San Jose,
California 95129.

Abstract

This research explored the relationship between masculinity, femininity, self-esteem, and real estate sales performance. Questionnaires from 103 residential and commercial real estate salespeople required subjects to rank themselves on four measures of sales performance. The questionnaire also contained the Masculinity and Femininity Scales of the Short Bem Sex-Role Inventory (SBSRI) and the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ), along with the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES) and the Self-Esteem Scale from the Jackson Personality Inventory (SES). Results from a factor analysis did not support the first hypothesis, which predicted that one factor would emerge from each of the two measures of masculinity, femininity, and self-esteem. The Masculinity and Femininity Scales of the SBSRI loaded on factor one, the PAQ Masculinity Scales and the RSES loaded on factor two, and the two measures of femininity weakly loaded on factor three. As expected, in the second hypothesis, the PAQ Masculinity Scales and measures of self-esteem were positively correlated with many of the performance scores, but, contrary to expectations, the SBSRI Masculinity Scale was not. The third hypothesis, which predicted that femininity scores would be positively correlated with

performance scores for residential subjects was not supported, and a pattern of nonsignificant negative correlations was obtained. A profile of self-esteem, masculinity, and femininity scores for successful salespeople was discussed.

The Relationship Between Masculinity,
Femininity, Self-Esteem,
and Real Estate Sales Performance

Each year real estate professionals spend thousands of dollars on training and attempts to motivate their sales staffs. Although many personality factors, such as self-esteem and assertiveness, are discussed in this training, few if any of the courses are based on scientific data. In an attempt to initiate research in this area, this study considered three important aspects of personality: self-esteem, masculinity, and femininity. The research focused on the relationship between each of these aspects and sales performance.

Of the limited research previously conducted, some studies have linked occupational performance to self-esteem directly, and several have found it to be a moderating factor between job satisfaction and performance. One survey identified self-esteem as a key determinant of sales performance (Waite, 1981). Another identified self-esteem as ninth on a list of desirable attributes for salespeople (Moine, 1984). Crook, Healy, and O'Shea (1984) found that self-esteem was positively correlated with mature career attitudes and work achievement. Using a managerial self-

concept report developed for their study, Waetjen, Schuerger, and Schwartz (1979) found that unsuccessful female managers reported the highest self-concept score, followed by the more predictable self-concept ordering of successful males, successful females, and unsuccessful males. Sense of competence, which in this case is defined as a set of psychological feelings of confidence an individual has about his or her ability to master the external environment, was positively related to managerial performance by Morse (1976). Using a Self-Assurance Scale, correlations between expectancies and job performance were higher for high self-esteem groups than low self-esteem groups, but only at a near significant level (Gavin, 1973).

Several studies have shown self-esteem to moderate the relationship between job satisfaction and performance. Lopez (1982) found support for her hypothesis that among high self-esteem persons there was a significant positive correlation between job satisfaction and performance, and among low self-esteem persons there was a nonsignificant correlation between the two. Rosman and Burke (1980) found that a good fit between valued self and job competencies was related to work satisfaction. On the basis of Korman's (1970) consistency theory of work motivation, Inkson (1978)

hypothesized that job performance was correlated with work satisfaction for workers high in self-esteem, but not for those low in self-esteem. A sample of 93 meat-processing workers was subdivided on the basis of self-esteem, and supervisory ratings of performance were correlated with measures of job satisfaction. As predicted, self-esteem exercised a significant moderating effect on correlations between performance and intrinsic satisfaction. Self-esteem was not significantly related to performance or satisfaction in a study by Klimoski and London (1975), but some support was found for self-esteem as a moderator of the relationship between performance and satisfaction.

Antill and Cunningham (1980) administered a battery of instruments measuring masculinity, femininity, and self-esteem to 237 undergraduates. They found that self-esteem generally increased from the feminine to the masculine categories, with masculine persons higher in self-esteem than androgynous subjects in almost every case. For both sexes, masculinity was also significantly positively correlated with self-esteem. Correlations with femininity were nominal or slightly negative. Erdwins, Small, and Gross (1980) investigated the relationship between the Bem Sex-Role Inventory Masculinity and Femininity Scales and

self-concept (Tennessee Self-Concept Scale) in 136 undergraduates. Subjects who rated themselves low in both masculine and feminine attributes had significantly poorer self-concepts than both androgynous and masculine subjects.

With the real estate industry's training relying on inadequately supported assumptions about salesperson performance, additional research is called for. Furthermore, there are shortcomings in the limited research that is available. One problem is that usually only one self-esteem or masculinity-femininity inventory is utilized to measure a construct, thus violating the necessary conditions for establishing construct validity (Garner, Erickson, & Hake, 1956; Cronbach & Meehl, 1955; Tharenou, 1979; Wylie, 1974).

In addition, research has demonstrated that supervisory ratings (a common measure of performance) are often more highly related to social desirability than actual performance. In fact, Tharenou (1979) states that managerial ratings may be linked foremost to social acumen, and this variable has gone largely unexplored in the literature.

The purpose of the present study was to investigate the relationship between multiple measures of masculinity,

femininity, self-esteem, and quantitative measures of salesperson performance. Both commercial and residential salespeople were considered. The following hypotheses were proposed:

Hypothesis 1. Measures of masculinity will form one factor, indices of femininity will form a second factor, and measures of global self-esteem and social self-esteem will form a third factor. This hypothesis was based on previous research and a pilot study conducted by the researcher.

Hypothesis 2. Masculinity and self-esteem scores will be correlated in a positive direction with sales performance scores in the total sample of real estate salespeople. This hypothesis was indicated from prior research that indicates positive correlations between self-esteem measures and various types of occupational performance.

Hypothesis 3. Femininity scores will be correlated in a positive direction with sales performance scores for residential real estate salespeople. This hypothesis was developed from interviews with residential salespeople who indicated that empathy for clients and interpersonal sensitivity contribute to sales performance. Current femininity scales appear to assess empathy and interpersonal sensitivity.

METHOD

Subjects

Full-time residential and commercial realtors with at least two years experience were recruited from a number of firms in Santa Clara County. Volunteers were solicited until roughly 150 subjects responded. The salespeople were asked to participate by cooperative sales managers and by the researcher. They were also told by the researcher that the results of the study could potentially benefit their industry. The 22 subjects whose answer sheets were filled out improperly and the 31 subjects who reported extenuating circumstances, as indicated in question number 81 on the questionnaire, were excluded from the analysis. The number of subjects considered in the final analysis was 103; of these 85 were residential salespeople and 18 were commercial.

Procedure

Subjects received a package containing a questionnaire, an instruction sheet, a number-two pencil, an answer sheet, and a stamped envelope addressed to the researcher. Approximately 390 packages were distributed by the researcher to the subjects at their offices, at open houses, and at association meetings. The researcher, a white male

graduate student in psychology at San Jose State University, assured subjects of their complete anonymity. Further references to anonymity were contained in the package. The questionnaire consisted of two measures of masculinity and femininity, two self-esteem measures, and performance questions as described below. The order of the measures was reversed on one half of the questionnaires. Subjects were guided by instructions on the questionnaire to answer the questions properly and mail the answer sheet and questionnaire. Reported completion time was about 20 minutes. Nineteen of the 108 respondents, all of whom worked for the same broker, were additionally rated by their sales manager on a ten-point scale for performance over the preceding two years. This was accomplished by having the manager collect the sealed envelopes containing the questionnaires and writing a number from one to ten on the envelope. The envelopes were then mailed (still sealed) to the researcher.

Measures

Global self-esteem was measured by the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES) (Rosenberg, 1965). High self-esteem is described as a feeling of self-respect and self-worth (Rosenberg, 1965, p. 32). The Rosenberg Scale consists of

10 statements presented with positive and negative items alternately ordered to reduce the effects of response set. Although it was originally constructed using Guttman-scaling techniques, it is currently scored using simple Likert-type response choices. Each item requires one of four weighted responses indicating the degree of item endorsement. Reliabilities from .85 to .92 have been reported for the RSES along with high validities by Wylie (1974).

Social self-esteem was measured by the Self-Esteem Scale (SES) of the Jackson Personality Inventory (JPI) (Jackson, 1976). The JPI was developed to measure a variety of personality constructs considered important for a person's functioning. The scale was intended to reflect a person's self-confidence in interpersonal situations, rather than a more generalized sense of self-esteem. It consists of 20 statements that are evenly divided between true and false keyed items. Jackson (1977) has reported reliabilities from .91 to .95 for the scale.

Masculinity and femininity were measured by the Short Bem Sex-Role Inventory (SBSRI), without its usual 10 filler items (Bem, 1981). The adjectives utilized on the SBSRI were derived from the original 60-adjective Bem Sex-Role Inventory (Bem, 1974). The items on the SBSRI were selected

using item-total correlations and factor analysis, and the short scales are psychometrically superior to the original longer ones. The SBSRI consists of 10 masculine adjectives, 10 feminine adjectives, and 10 filler items. Subjects are asked to rate themselves on a seven-point scale for each adjective. The inventory may be scored to yield four distinct groups: feminine, masculine, androgynous, and undifferentiated. Coefficient alphas for the SBSRI have been reported between .84 and .87 by Antill and Russell (1980).

Masculinity and femininity were also assessed by the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ). The current PAQ was constructed by Spence and Helmreich (1978) from the original 55-item scale and consists of 24 items, including eight masculine, eight feminine, and eight filler items. Subjects are asked to rate themselves on a 5-point bipolar scale (e.g., "very gentle to not at all gentle"). Spence and Helmreich refer to masculinity as instrumentality and femininity as expressiveness. Coefficient alphas of .85 for the instrumentality scale and .82 for the expressiveness scale have been reported by Spence and Helmreich (1978).

Sales performance was measured by self-report items (see items 77 through 80 in Appendix A). Responses were

sought for gross commissions, number of sales and listing transactions, ranking within the firm, and ranking compared to industry peers. Questions pertained to transactions over the last 2 years. Subjects were provided with a space on the answer sheet to comment on any extenuating circumstances that would have significantly changed their performance (e.g., illness).

RESULTS

To test the first hypothesis, which dealt with the factor structure of the six measures, a maximum likelihood factor analysis was performed on the correlations among the six measures. As shown in Table 1, the first three unrotated factors accounted for 73.0% of the variance. The first factor had an eigenvalue of 2.11 and accounted for 35.2% of the variance. The second factor had an eigenvalue of 1.33 and accounted for 22.2% of the variance. The third factor had an eigenvalue of .93 and accounted for 15.5% of the variance. Although Factor 3 had an eigenvalue of less than one, a two-factor solution only accounted for 57.5% of the variance, and the rotated solution improperly contained a correlation greater than one for the first factor. It was

Table 1.

Eigenvalues and Percentage of Variance for Unrotated
Principal Components Analysis

Factor	Eigenvalue	Percentage of Variance	Cumulative Percentage of Variance
1	2.11340	35.2	35.2
2	1.33432	22.2	57.5
3	.93247	15.5	73.0
4	.82430	13.7	86.7
5	.55563	9.3	96.0
6	.23988	4.0	100.0

decided therefore that three factors should be rotated to orthogonal simple structure with Kaiser normalization. Table 2 shows the factor pattern matrix for the three factors with the SBSRI masculinity and femininity indices forming Factor 1. The RSES and PAQ Masculinity had the two highest loadings on the second factor, followed by a weak loading from the SES. The two indices of femininity loaded highly on the third factor. Thus the exploratory factor analysis did not support the first hypothesis, since only the third factor, marked by the two Femininity Scales, behaved as expected.

To investigate the second hypothesis (which stated that the Masculinity and self-esteem scales would correlate with sales performance), means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations among the measures of self-esteem, masculinity, femininity, and performance were calculated and are shown in Table 3. The performance scores included managerial ratings and the standardized sum of the five performance scores as additional indices of sales performance. As predicted, there was a significant positive correlation between the PAQ masculinity scores and all measures of performance. Unfortunately, however, the SBSRI Masculinity Scale failed to display a similar pattern.

Table 2

Oblique Factor Pattern Marix After Rotation With Kaiser
Normalization

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
RSES	-.08484	.60842	.16898
SES	.10201	.31312	.01466
BEMMASC	.90831	.22373	-.06359
BEMFEM	.57252	-.18137	.63588
PAQMASC	.05016	.76298	-.13408
PAQFEM	.04804	.08134	.52612

Note. RSES = Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale; SES = Self-Esteem Scale, Jackson Personality Inventory; BEMMASC = Masculinity Scale, Short BEM Sex Role Inventory; BEMFEM = Femininity Scale, Short BEM Sex Role Inventory; PAQMASC = Masculinity Scale, Personal Attributes Questionnaire; PAQFEM = Femininity Scale, Personal Attributes Questionnaire.

Table 3.
Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations Among Measures For All Subjects

MEASURE	SELF ESTEEM RSES	BEM SEX ROLE MASC FEM	PER. ATT. QUES. MASC FEM	PERFORMANCE			MEAN	STD DEV
				OFFRANK	CORANK	TRANS		
RSES							2.660	2.99
SES	.2120*						1.311	2.91
BEMASC	.2160*	.2547**					5.290	11.31
BEMFEM	.1066	.0781	.5891***				5.270	12.02
PAQMASC	.4448***	.2451**	.3617***	-.0314			2.425	3.78
PAQFEM	.1560	.0845	.0894	.3680***	.0408		2.397	3.98
OFFRANK	.1493*	.1785*	.1052	-.0609	.3018***	.0461	.766	2.28
CORANK	.1313	.1410*	.1197	-.1229	.3117***	-.0379	.686	2.18
TRANS	.1642*	.0125	-.0283	-.1539	.2013*	-.0286	.687	1.75
INCOME	.1812*	-.0079	-.0597	-.1683*	.2110*	-.0282	.575	2.15
MERRATZ	-.0752	-.2453	.0802	-.3095	.3149	.0680	.694	2.36
ZPERFEM	.1029	.0073	-.0063	-.1608	.2849**	-.0494	.038	5.31

Note. RSES = Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale; SES = Self-Esteem Scale, Jackson Personality Inventory; BEMASC = Masculinity Scale, Short BEM Sex Role Inventory; BEMFEM = Femininity Scale, Short BEM Sex Role Inventory; PAQMASC = Masculinity Scale, Personal Attributes Questionnaire; PAQFEM = Femininity Scale, Personal Attributes Questionnaire; OFFRANK (Office Rank) = Self-rating compared with others in office; CORANK (County Rank) = Self-rating compared with others in county; TRANS (Transactions) = Number of transactions in last 2 years; INCOME = Total income during last 2 years; MERRATE (Manager Rating) = Managerial Performance Rating; ZPERFEM = The sum of standardized performance scores. Number of female subjects = 57, number of male subjects = 51, number of subjects rated by manager = 19.

* $p < .05$
 ** $p < .01$
 *** $p < .001$

The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale was significantly correlated with performance scores, but with only three of the performance measures, and the correlations were much weaker than those for the PAQ Masculinity Scale. The Jackson Personality Inventory Self-Esteem Scale was weakly correlated with two of the sales performance questions (self-rating of performance as compared to others in the office and compared to others in the county), but not to any of the other performance measures. Thus, Hypothesis 2 was at best supported only weakly and inconsistently.

To investigate the possibility that the pattern of correlations differed for men and women, Table 4 shows the intercorrelations among the measures, separately for men and women. As can be seen from the table, there were significant positive correlations between the measures of masculinity and performance question #77, (self-rating compared to others in their offices) for the 57 female subjects. The women's scores on the Jackson Personality Inventory Self-Esteem Scale were significantly correlated in the negative direction with questions #79 and #80 (self-rating of total transactions and income). For men, the correlations followed a pattern that was similar in strength to those for men and women combined, except that the

Table 4.
Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations Among Measures Separately for Males & Females

MEASURE	SELF ESTEEM RSES	BEM SEX ROLE MASC	PER. ATT. QUES. MASC	FEM	PERFORMANCE				MCRRATE	ZPERFSM	MEAN	STD DEV
					OFFFRANK	CORANK	TRANS	INCOME				
RSES	.3287*	.2853*	.4475***	.0144	.2802*	.3186*	.1653	.2244*	.0153	.1324	2.626	3.08
SES	.1164	.1919	.0564	.1744	.3961**	.2043	.1891	.1882	.1439	.0467	1.333	3.11
BEMASC	.1303	.3384	.6122***	-.0819	.0327	.0265	-.1583	-.1445	-.2708	-.0689	5.120	12.06
BEMFEM	.0791	.1360	.3463***	.3077	-.0931	-.1340	-.3448**	-.3302*	-.0315	-.2136	5.048	12.51
PAQFASC	.4922***	.2738*	.4019***	.0490	.4683***	.3913**	.2639	.3066*	-.0064	.3430*	2.502	3.68
PAQFEM	.2417*	.0336	.1938	.3663**	.2047	.7796***	.6793***	.6033***	.6753*	.8770***	.775	2.31
OFFFRANK	.0484	-.0152	.1605	-.0225	.1738	.5911***	.5949***	.7545***	.8100**	.6126***	.722	2.20
CORANK	.0168	.1067	.2603*	-.0357	.2347*	.6716***	.4892***	.5503***	.7288**	.3054*	.673	1.97
TRANS	.1526	-.1711	.0937	.0072	.1791	.5736***	.5608***	.7603***	.7873**	.5906***	.595	2.31
INCOME	.1522	-.2549*	.0390	.0200	.1022	.9312***	.8000**	.9311***	.8229**	.8456***	.740	2.41
MCRRATE	-.1159	-.8033**	.7139*	-.8481**	.6560*	.8508***	.7900***	.8635***	.8557***	.8981***	.109	7.17
ZPERFSM	.1077	-.0949	.1673	-.0100	.2068	.0752	.2463	.398	.554	.644	-.016	
MEAN	2.684	1.289	5.417	5.619	2.363	2.30	2.10	1.58	1.99	2.35	3.19	
STD DEV	2.93	2.76	10.71	11.19	3.81	3.98						

Note. Coefficients for males appear above the diagonal and those for females appear below the diagonal. RSES = Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale; SES = Self-Esteem Scale; Jackson Personality Inventory; BEMASC = Masculinity Scale, Short BEM Sex Role Inventory; BEMFEM = Femininity Scale, Short BEM Sex Role Inventory; PAQFASC = Masculinity Scale, Personal Attributes Questionnaire; PAQFEM = Femininity Scale, Personal Attributes Questionnaire; OFFFRANK (Office Rank) = Self-rating compared with others in office; CORANK (County Rank) = Self-rating compared with others in county; TRANS (Transactions) = Number of transactions in last 2 years; INCOME = Total income during last 2 years; MCRRATE (Manager Rating) = Managerial Performance rating; ZPERFSM = The sum of standardized performance scores. Number of female subjects = 57, number of male subjects = 51, number of subjects rated by manager = 19.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$

correlations with the performance measures were stronger.

To deal with Hypothesis 3 (which predicted a positive correlation between Femininity Scales and sales performance for residential real estate agents) Table 5 shows the same intercorrelations for the 85 residential subjects (the intercorrelations for the 18 commercial subjects are displayed in Appendix B for the interested reader). As is evident in Table 5, there is no evidence of significant positive correlations between the Femininity Scales and sales performance. Table 6 shows the same intercorrelations for residential subjects separated by men and women. Again, Hypothesis 3 received no support; in fact, there were negative correlations between the BSRI Femininity Scale and all of the performance scores.

To gain additional insight into the relationships between the measures and performance scores, a correlation matrix was generated that dealt with individual items from the questionnaire and the four self-report performance measures and managerial ratings (question #77--self-rating of sales performance compared to others in office, #78--compared to others in county, #79--number of transactions, #80--total income). Table 7 presents the 26 significant

Table 5.
Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations Among Measures For All Residential Subjects

MEASURE	SELF ESTEEM RSES	SES	BEM SEX ROLE		PER. ATT. MASC	QUES. FEH	OFFRANK	CORANK	PERFORMANCE		MEAN	STD DEV
			MASC	FEH					TRANS	INCOME		
RSES											2.672	3.04
SES	.1377										1.309	2.86
BEMASC	.2104*	.2595**									5.325	10.81
BEMFEH	.1110	.1079	.5419***								5.471	10.81
PAOMASC	.4907***	.2388*	.3554***	-.0637							2.404	3.66
PAOFFEH	.1500	.0673	.0753	.4029***	-.0115						2.417	4.36
OFFRANK	.1596	.1906*	.0662	-.1196	.2152*	.0332					.758	2.33
CORANK	.1587	.1644	.1161	-.1190	.2056*	-.0289	.6701				.671	2.15
TRANS	.2655**	.1143	.0286	-.1487	.2521**	-.0264	.7451***	.6097***			.689	1.77
INCOME	.3192***	-.0031	.0119	-.0594	.1676	.0464	.6380***	.6582***	.7702***		.530	1.99
MGRATE	.0687	-.1863	.0044	-.3697	.2341	.0328	.7958***	.7697***	.8278***	.8377***	.676	2.38
ZPERFSH	.2567**	.1358	.0645	-.1292	.2419*	.0063	.8791***	.8414***	.8966***	.8731***	-.029	3.44

Note: RSES = Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale; SES = Self-Esteem Scale, Jackson Personality Inventory; BEMASC = Masculinity Scale, Short BEM Sex Role Inventory; BEMFEH = Femininity Scale, Short BEM Sex Role Inventory; PAOMASC = Masculinity Scale, Personal Attributes Questionnaire; PAOFFEH = Femininity Scale, Personal Attributes Questionnaire; OFFRANK (Office Rank) = Self-rating compared with others in office; CORANK (County Rank) = Self-rating compared with others in county; TRANS (Transactions) = Number of transactions in last 2 years; INCOME = Total income during last 2 years; MGRATE (Manager Rating) = Managerial performance rating; ZPERFSH = The sum of standardized performance scores. Number of female subjects = 57, number of male subjects = 51, number of subjects rated by manager = 19.

* $p < .05$
 ** $p < .01$
 *** $p < .001$

Table 6.
Means, Standard Deviations and Intercorrelations Among Measures for All Residential Subjects for Males & Females

MEASURE	SELF ESTEEM		SEX ROLE		PER. ATT.		QUES.	PERFORMANCE					STD	
	RSES	SES	MASC	FEM	MASC	FEM		OFFRANK	CORANK	TRANS	INCOME	MCRAIT		ZPERFSH
RSES		.2559	.3661*	.1237	.5759***	-.0174	.3061*	.4347**	.3780*	.5478***	.2233	.4498**	2.641	3.21
SES	.0631		.2011	.0606	.2388	.1590	.4395**	.3103*	.4453**	.3962*	.3220	.4376**	1.335	3.17
BEPMASC	.1119	.3146**		.4727**	.3534*	-.2074	-.1360	-.0993	-.1124	-.0883	-.4784	-.1202	5.174	10.15
BEFMFEM	.0877	.1602	.5618***		-.2971*	.4241**	-.3282*	-.3043*	-.4648**	-.3277*	-.1699	-.3951*	5.203	9.10
PAQMASC	.4783	.2320	.3885**	.0626	-.3825*	.2386	.2386	.1995	.3592*	.3360*	-.2082	.3168*	2.474	3.28
PAQFEM	.2383*	.0281	.2021	.3656**	.2181	.0779	-.0308	-.1140	-.2130	-.0733	.3223	-.1230	2.316	4.23
OFFRANK	.0726	.0229	.1774	-.0244	.1944	.0779	.7577***	.8313***	.7748***	.6800*	.9226***	.764	2.36	
CORANK	-.0112	.0590	.2436*	-.0248	.2042	.0359	.6181***	.5366***	.7274***	.8150**	.8380**	.8920***	.683	2.22
TRANS	.1707	-.1574	.1103	-.0031	.2182*	.0872	.6983***	.5868***	.7792***	.7733***	.7048*	.9203***	.670	2.05
INCOME	.1771	-.2473*	.0433	.0203	.1195	.0811	.9743***	.8000**	.9311***	.8229**	.8564**	.9120***	.500	1.93
MCGRATE	-.1159	-.8033**	.7159*	-.8481**	.6560*	-.0887	.9312***	.8000**	.9311***	.8229**	.8564**	.9120***	.500	1.93
ZPERFSH	.1178	-.0901	.1711	-.0100	.2166	.0826	.8560***	.8088***	.8803***	.8981***		.8336**	.712	2.53
MEAN	2.690	1.294	5.412	5.625	2.364	2.475	.755	.664	.700	.548	.644	-.020		
STD DEV	2.96	2.69	10.89	11.48	3.83	4.05	2.34	2.12	1.60	2.02	2.35	3.27		

Note. Coefficients for males appear above the diagonal and those for females appear below the diagonal. RSES = Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale; SES = Self-Esteem Scale, Jackson Personality Inventory; BEPMASC = Masculinity Scale, Short BEH Sex Role Inventory; BEFMFEM = Femininity Scale, Short BEH Sex Role Inventory; PAQMASC = Masculinity Scale, Personal Attributes Questionnaire; PAQFEM = Femininity Scale, Personal Attributes Questionnaire; OFFRANK (Office Rank) = Self-rating compared with others in office; CORANK (County Rank) = Self-rating compared with others in county; TRANS (Transactions) = Number of transactions in last 2 years; INCOME = Total income during last 2 years; MCGRATE (Manager Rating) = Managerial Performance rating; ZPERFSH = The sum of standardized performance scores. Number of female subjects = 57, number of male subjects = 51, number of subjects rated by manager = 19.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$

Table 7.

Individual Items From Questionnaire That Correlated Significantly With One or More Performance Scores

Question	OFFRANK	CORANK	TRANS	INCOME	MGRRATE
RSES 3 "NOT FAILURE"		.1776**	.1330*	.2178***	
RSES 4 "DO THINGS WELL"		.2230**	.1610**	.1737**	
BEMFEM 4 "SYMPATHETIC"		.2218***	-.1664**	-.2109**	
BEMMASC 8 "UNDERSTANDING"		-.1760**	-.1367**	-.1936**	
BEMMASC 36 "FORCEFUL"	.2065**	.1815**			
BEMFEM 37 "COMPASSIONATE"		-.1719**	-.1765**	-.2440***	
BEMFEM 39 "EAGER TO SOOTHE"			-.1836**		
BEMFEM 43 "TENDER"			-.1814**	-.1855**	-.4104**
PAQ 48 (MASC) "AGGRESSIVE"	.2418***	.3271***	.1979**	.2409***	.4450**
PAQ 49 (MASC) "INDEPENDENT"		.1782**			
PAQ 51 (MASC) "DOMINANT"		.1953**			
PAQ 53 (MASC) "ACTIVE"	.1612**	.2003**	.2272**	.2235***	.4785**
PAQ 57 (MASC) "COMPETITIVE"	.2379***	.1826**	.1727**	.2125***	
PAQ 59 (FEM) "KINDNESS"		-.1909**	-.1671**		-.3565
PAQ 60 (FEM) "NEEDS APPROVAL"	-.1396**				-.4324
PAQ 62 (MASC) "MAKES DECISIONS"	.1955**	.1572**			
PAQ 63 (MASC) "CAN MAKE DECISIONS"	.1980**				
PAQ 64 (MASC) "NEVER GIVES UP"	.1887**	.1610**	.1382**	.1302**	
PAQ 66 (MASC) "SELF CONFIDENT"		.2220***			
PAQ 65 (MASC) "SUPERIOR"	.1305**				
PAQ 70 (FEM) "NEED FOR SECURITY"	-.2563***	-.1662**	-.1304**	-.2234***	-.3350**
PAQ 71 (MASC) "STANDS UP WELL UNDER PRESSURE"	.2494***	.2110**			.3956**

Note. RSES = Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale; SES = Self-Esteem Scales, Jackson Personality Inventory; BEMMASC = Masculinity Scale, Short BEM Sex Role Inventory; BEMFEM = Femininity Scale, Short BEM Sex Role Inventory; PAQMASC = Masculinity Scale, Personal Attributes Questionnaire; PAQFEM = Femininity Scale, Personal Attributes Questionnaire; OFFRANK (Office Rank) = Self-rating compared with others in office; CORANK (County Rank) = Self-rating compared with others in county; TRANS (Transactions) = Number of transactions in last 2 years; INCOME (Income) = Total income during last 2 years; MGRRATE (Manager Rating) = Managerial Performance rating.

* $p < .10$
 ** $p < .05$
 *** $p \leq .01$

correlations (out of 71) from the matrix. Fifty-eight percent of the items came from the PAQ (63% of its items), while the other measures only contributed 12-25% of their items. Indices of aggressiveness and activity level correlated most strongly in the positive direction and with all five of the performance indices. In the negative direction, question #70 (asking subjects to rate their need for security) correlated with all five performance measures.

Discussion

The three factors that emerged from the factor analysis were considerably different from those predicted in the first hypothesis. The only measures that loaded as expected were the two femininity measures, which formed factor three, and they only accounted for 15.5% of the variance.

Of the first two factors, the most difficult to explain is the first, which involved both the Masculinity and Femininity Scales of the SBSRI. To understand this factor, it may be useful to look at the subject's mean scores. As shown in Table 8, the male subjects' SBSRI mean scores for masculinity were higher and for femininity lower (but not significantly), than the adult norms (ages 31-65) for the SBSRI normative sample. Means for the female subjects'

Table 8.

Male and Female Norms on the Short Bem Sex-Role Inventory
for Various Samples of Adults.

	Females			Males	
	Fem	Masc		Fem	Masc
<hr/>					
1978 Stanford					
Normative Sample					
Mean (n=340)	5.57	4.78	(n=476)	5.19	4.88
Std. Dev.	.76	.81		.78	.79
 <u>Adults</u>					
Ages 20-30 ^b					
Mean (n=112)	5.50	4.50	(n=108)	5.06	4.90
Std. Dev.	.75	.78		.74	.88
 Ages 31-65 ^b					
Mean (n=59)	5.76	4.71	(n=55)	5.25	4.99
Std. Dev.	.62	.95		.63	.76
 Ages over 62 ^c					
Mean (n=98)	5.79	4.46	(n=60)	5.38	4.65
Std. Dev.	.99	1.20		.72	.88
 Present Sample					
(from Table 4)					
Mean (n=103)	5.61	5.41	(n=103)	5.05	5.12
Std. Dev.	1.12	1.07		1.25	1.20

^b These data were provided by S. Shirley Feldman, Department of Psychology, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305. (Abrahams, B., Feldman, S.S., and Nash, S.G. "Sex-role self-concept and sex-role attitudes: Enduring personality characteristics or adaptations to changing life situations?" *Developmental Psychology*, 1978, 14, 393-400).

^c These data were provided by Carol Winters Wish, Department of Psychology, Alfred University, Alfred, New York 14802. (Wish, C.W. "The relationship of sex role stereotyping to life satisfaction in older persons." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1976.)

Masculinity Scores were significantly higher ($t = 4.31$ $p < .001$) than the SBSRI norms, and their mean femininity scores were slightly lower than the femininity norms (ages 31-65). While these data don't clearly explain the stronger than expected relationship between the Masculinity and Femininity Scales of the SBSRI, they do suggest the possibility that the correlation might be due to the higher than average level of masculinity in this subject group.

Although the major loadings on factor 2 were not the measures that were hypothesized, it is understandable that the PAQ masculinity scores and the RESES scores were correlated highly with each other. The strong positive relationship between masculinity and self-esteem is in line with the findings of Antill and Cunningham (1980) and a host of others, and two questions on the PAQ Masculinity Scale address general self-esteem more directly than items on the SBSRI Masculinity Scale (i.e., question 66--not at all self-confident to very self-confident, and question 77--feels very inferior to feels very superior).

The results lend qualified support for the hypothesized positive relationship between Masculinity and Self-esteem scales and sales performance. Three of the four measures (PAQ Masculinity, RSES, SES) were positively associated with

at least two of the performance items. The SBSRI masculinity scores, however, did not correlate with any of the performance measures. The positive correlations between the two self-esteem measures and several performance measures indicate that self-esteem may be a contributory factor in sales performance, although the correlational natures of the present study does nothing to establish such a causal relationship. Moreover, the relationships are quite weak and highly variable.

When the data were analyzed separately for males and females, the correlations between the RSES, SES, PAQ Masculinity and performance indices were stronger for males than for females. Thus, Hypothesis 2 received its greatest support for males. The female subjects' scores, however, did not at all support the hypothesis. In contrast to the male subjects, there were only two scales that produced correlations in the hypothesized direction (these were between the two measures of masculinity and subjects' rating of themselves in comparison to others in the county). Although much weaker than expected, the pattern of correlations between masculinity and performance for women was at least in the expected direction. What is not explainable was the negative pattern of correlations between

the SES and sales performance (especially the significant negative correlation between the SES and question 80--total income).

It is difficult to judge how Hypothesis 2 results relate to previous research. In regard to masculinity, this author knows of no research that has investigated the correlation between masculinity and any type of occupational performance. For self-esteem, the previous research that has linked self-esteem directly to some type of job performance has been less than convincing. Some researchers, such as Waetjen, Schuerger, and Schwartz, (1973), have found that unsuccessful female managers actually had the highest self-esteem. Others, such as Waite (1981), have argued that self-esteem is a "key determinant" in job performance, but they do not report a significant positive correlation between the two. The present female group's results support a portion of Klimoski and London's (1975) study, which found that self-esteem was not significantly related to performance. In fact, Klimoski and London, as well as others, have found that self-esteem is only a moderator of job performance. Since this study was designed to seek only a direct relationship between self-esteem and sales performance, it does not produce any

information that either supports or contradicts this view.

The results clearly do not support Hypothesis 3. In fact, rather than femininity scores being positively correlated with performance scores, 10 out of the 12 possible correlations were negative. Although only one of the negative correlations was significant, the results clearly indicate that in comparison to self-esteem and masculinity, femininity is not positively associated with sales performance scores. In addition, for the female residential subjects, the results show that masculinity was positively correlated with favorable ratings from the manager who participated in the research. This same pattern existed for the sales performance index dealing with ranking oneself relative to others in the county.

For the 31 male residential subjects, the negative correlations between the two measures of femininity and performance score were stronger than for the 51 female subjects. Like the female subjects, the male's performance scores were positively correlated with PAQ masculinity, thus presenting a strong case against femininity or androgyny as a factor associated with real estate sales performance.

In an attempt to develop a profile for the "successful" real estate agent from the questions presented in this research, it is valuable to look at the relationships between sales performance and individual items from the questionnaire. These findings revealed positive correlations for the self-esteem and masculinity items, and negative correlations for the femininity items. The fact that there were no conflicting patterns with these correlations further supports Hypothesis 2 and again demonstrates that Hypothesis 3 is totally incorrect.

From these data it appears that successful real estate salespeople considered themselves aggressive, active, competitive, and tenacious. They viewed themselves as successful and doing things well. Furthermore, they feel they are decisive, independent, dominant, stand up well under pressure, and are forceful. Successful real estate salespeople, on the other hand, indicated that they were not security seeking, sympathetic, understanding, compassionate, tender, or kind. To a lesser extent, they reported that they did not need other's approval, they were not home-oriented, and they were not eager to soothe hurt feelings.

These findings concur with the data in Table 8 that show a higher than normal level of masculinity for the

subjects. What is still unknown is whether these salespeople entered the field with a strong orientation towards masculinity, or if they developed these traits to become more "successful."

Although there was a strong positive correlation between being a commercial real estate broker and total income from commissions, $r = .46$, $p < .001$, there were no significant correlations between any of the other items in Section V of the questionnaire on any performance scores. These items, which included sex, number of years of experience, age, size of office, and passing a broker's examination, do not seem to be part of a profile for a high performance salesperson.

In reviewing the design of this research, three main points emerged, two positive and one negative. First, the very high positive correlations between managerial ratings and self-report sales performance lend credibility to the use of self-report as an adequate measure of sales performance. Second, in many questionnaire-based studies, it can be argued that subjects who take the time to respond to the questionnaire are substantially different from those who do not in terms of cooperativeness and overall attitude. In this research, a very high percentage of the

questionnaires were filled out and mailed back to the researcher by the subjects. Additionally, large groups of realtors in sales offices all participated in completing the questionnaire during sales meetings, thus providing a 100% sample of subjects from those offices. Many other subjects, who might not ordinarily volunteer for such a study, filled out the questionnaire during a slow open house. Unfortunately, whatever gains were achieved in developing a good subject response may have been overshadowed by the third point: The salespeople surveyed all worked in a difficult market (high prices and low demand) during a "post boom" era. Furthermore, they all had been working full time in this market for at least two years. The design of the questionnaire, which called for only salespeople who had been working full time for at least two years, was structured to provide performance scores that would be controlled for experience and amount of time worked. In retrospect, this approach did not provide an accurate portrayal of all the real estate salespeople in the area. Since real estate sales is a very easy field to enter and exit, those whose performance is low either give up quickly or choose to work part-time in offices that will accept them. Thus the respondents to the questionnaire were all

(by meeting the prerequisite of two years full-time work)
"successful."

One implication for future research is to look at stability and consistency of work through the years as a measure of performance in itself and sales and income measures secondarily, especially since many novices will make a few transactions with friends and relatives initially and then drop out of the field. The study could be further improved by obtaining additional assessments from peers, clients, and family members.

One can only speculate what other factors might be more strongly related to sales performance than the ones researched in this study. Intelligence, work and time management habits, education, and appearance are all possible factors.

APPENDIX A

REAL ESTATE

SALESPERSON QUESTIONNAIRE

*FOR FULL TIME SALES PEOPLE WITH AT LEAST 2 YEARS EXPERIENCE

Thank you for taking part in this study. It should only take a short amount of your time, and your responses could potentially be very beneficial to the real estate industry. Please be assured of your complete anonymity. In fact, you will be mailing your answers without your name or return address, so there is no possibility of your identity being revealed.

INSTRUCTIONS

Please mark your answers on the computer answer sheet with the included #2 pencil. YOU NEED NOT FILL IN YOUR NAME, DATE, OR IDENTIFICATION NUMBER ON THE ANSWER SHEET! When you have finished, please place the answer sheet in the enclosed envelope and mail it promptly.

PLEASE NOTE:

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

These consist of pages:

35-41

U·M·I

APPENDIX B

Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations among Measures for Commercial Subjects

MEASURE	SELF ESTEEM RSES	RSEN SEX ROLE MASC	PER. ATT. QUES. MASC	FEM	OFFFRANK	CORANK	PERFORMANCE		MEAT	2PERFSH	STD DEV
							TRANS	INCOME			
RSES											2.800 2.70
SES	.6006**										1.322 3.22
BDPMASC	.2288	.2300									5.122 14.37
BDPFEM	.0284	.0104	.7024***								4.894 16.11
PAQMASC	.3350	.2380	.4321*	.1422							2.522 4.29
PAQFEM	.1272	.2192	.1330	.2182							2.300 2.91
OFFFRANK	.1427	.1086	.3111	.2229	.7222***	.2345					.805 2.04
CORANK	.0869	.0386	.1884	-.0396	.6794***	-.1344	.5952**				.755 2.25
TRANS	-.4357*	-.4515	-.2535	-.2173	.0072	-.0713	.2009	.1108			.677 1.69
INCOME	-.2278	-.0700	-.2450	-.2746	.2459	-.1586	.4173*	.4282	.4198*		.788 1.52
2PERFSH	-.0376	-.2007	-.0489	-.1132	.3603	-.0934	.7588***	.4510*	-.0908	.3665	.363 9.86

Notes. RSES = Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale; SES = Self-Esteem Scale, Jackson Personality Inventory; BDPMASC = Masculinity Scale, Short BDH Sex Role Inventory; BDPFEM = Femininity Scale, Short BDH Sex Role Inventory; PAQMASC = Masculinity Scale, Personal Attributes Questionnaire; PAQFEM = Femininity Scale, Personal Attributes Questionnaire; OFFFRANK (Office Rank) = Self-ratings compared with others in office; CORANK (County Rank) = Self-ratings compared with others in county; TRANS (Transactions) = Number of transactions in last 2 years; INCOME = Total income during last 2 years; MORALE (Manager Rating) = Managerial Performance rating; 2PERFSH = The sum of the five standardized sales performance scores. Number of female subjects = 57, number of male subjects = 51, number of subjects rated by manager = 19.

* $p < .05$
 ** $p < .01$
 *** $p < .001$

REFERENCES

- Antill, J. K., & Cunningham, J. D. (1979). Self-esteem as a function of masculinity in both sexes. Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 47, 783-785.
- Antill, J. K., & Cunningham, J. D. (1980). The relationship of masculinity, femininity, and androgyny to self-esteem. Australian Journal of Psychology, 32, 195-207.
- Antill, J. K., & Russell, G. (1980). A preliminary comparison between two forms of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. Australian Psychologist, 15, 427-435.
- Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42, 155-162.
- Bem, S. L. (1977). On the utility of alternative procedures for assessing psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45, 196-205.
- Bem, S. L. (1981). Bem Sex-Role Inventory Professional Manual. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Cronbach, L. J., & Meehl, P.E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. Psychological Bulletin, 52, 281-302.
- Crook, R. H., Healy, C., & O'Shea. (1984). The linkage of work achievement to self-esteem, career maturity, and college achievement. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 25, 70-79.
- Erdwins, D., Small, A. C., & Gross, R. (1980). The relationship of sex role to self-concept. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 36, 111-115.
- Garner, W. R., Erickson, C. W., & Hake, H. W. (1956). Operationism and the concept of perception. Psychological Review, 63, 149-159.
- Gavin, J. F. (1973). Self-esteem as moderator of the relationship between expectancies and job performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 58, 83-88.

- Inkson, J. K. (1978). Self-esteem as a moderator of the relationship between job performance and job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 63, 243-247.
- Jackson, D. N. (1976). Jackson Personality Inventory. Port Huron: Research Psychologist Press.
- Jacobs, R., & Solomon, T. (1977). Strategies for enhancing the prediction of job performance from job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 62, 417-421.
- Klimoski, R. J., & London, M. (1975). Self-esteem and job complexity as moderators of performance and satisfaction. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 6, 293-304.
- Korman, A. K. (1970). Toward an hypothesis of work behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 54, 31-41.
- Lopez, E. M. (1982). A test of the self-consistency theory of the job performance-job satisfaction relationship. Academy of Management Journal, 25, 335-348.
- Moine, D. J., & Friedenreich, K. (1984). What makes a sales super star? Industrial Distribution, 73, 84-85.
- Morse, J. J. (1976). Sense of competence and individual managerial performance. Psychological Reports, 38, 1195-1198.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). Society and the adolescent self image. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Rosman, P., & Burke, R. J. (1980). Job Satisfaction, self-esteem, and the fit between perceived self and job on valued competencies. Journal of Psychology, 105, 259-269.
- Sappenfeld, B. R. & Harris, C. L. (1975). Self-reported masculinity-femininity as related to self-esteem. Psychological Reports, 37, 669-670.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1978). Masculinity and Femininity: Their Psychological Dimensions, correlate, & Antecedents. Austin: University of Texas Press.

- Tharenou, P. (1979). Employee self-esteem: A review of the literature. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 15, 159-177.
- Waite, D. (1981). Sales communications: Let your sales force speak up! Sales and Marketing Management, 126, 50-52.
- Waetjen, W. B., Schuerger, J. M., & Schwartz, E. B. (1979). Male and female managers: Self-concept, success, and failure. Journal of Psychology, 103, 87-94.
- Wylie, R. C. (1974). The Self Concept. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.