Proceedings of ICILLP 2025 Symposium: Property Law and Blockchain Applications in International Law and Legal Policy
DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.LD29034

The Anatomy of Psychological Harm: How Gender Stereotypes Impact Individuals in the Workplace

Haorong Li

Beijing No.80 High School, Beijing, China
lihaorong1005@outlook.com

Abstract. Though often dismissed as a trivial social phenomenon, workplace stereotyping can create deep and debilitating psychological damage. This study examines the mechanism by which gender stereotyping creates psychological damage to individuals in work situations. Using the illustrative example of a male kindergarten teacher, the study integrates established theories from psychology to develop a progressive three stage model of damage created. The damage evolves from the immediate environmental stress of Stereotype Threat, the result of which is performance anxiety. This stress is followed and converted to Social Identity Threat, creating an erosion in the individual's fundamental sense of belonging in his socially defined world. In the last stage, the internalization of the stereotype is reached, when the external social bias is woven into the warp and woof of the individual's self-concept, resulting in reduced self-esteem in the professional dimension and a dissociation from the occupation. By integrating these concepts into a unified framework, this paper argues that stereotyping is not a single event, but a corrosive process that insidiously harms an individual's psychological well-being.

Keywords: Stereotype Threat, Social Identity, Internalization, Gender Stereotypes, Psychological Harm

1. Introduction

In modern society, stereotyping in the workplace is both pervasive and vastly underestimated [1]. It is often dismissed casually as a harmless triviality when in fact, such stereotyping creates a difficult working environment for those who do not fit readily into traditional patterns of behaviour. This is especially true in the case of gender stereotyping, where men entering 'women's fields', or vice versa, experience a unique pattern of expectations and stereotyping applied to them [2]. It is important to understand the pattern of psychological injury so that we know where we are headed — from a harmless remark to lasting injury to the self-image of the person. How can a harmless stereotype become a serious psychological difficulty?

Let us illustrate with the example of Bobby, a male kindergarten teacher in a field in which nearly all of his associates are females. Bobby, with his training and success as a modern teacher, is continually subjected to the stereotyping which is general in this field. People are surprised to find that he is successful when the success is better than that of many female teachers. This surprise is effectually expressed by a stereotyped remark, such as, "Men do not have the tenderness and

© 2025 The Authors. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.LD29034

feelings necessary for good preschool teachers." As a result of this continual stereotyping of his profession, Bobby begins to doubt his own worth. He is under a great burden when parent-teacher evenings come on because he fears that if he makes one minor mistake it will be a complete confirmation of the prejudice which men are unfit for the post. The external war of preconceptions turns in upon itself. Bobby begins doubting his own ability, withholding his own creation and feeling a constant desire to express himself to himself and others. He is an example of the performers of the working out of the fact that the stereotypes without any hostility may also breed in themselves a form of psychological violence, resulting in considerable and unlooked for damage.

Bobby's is an example showing the working of the psychological harm done by stereotyping. This paper will argue that this damage in not a one-stroke affair but a cumulative one. It will analyze the process involved in the following three closely knit ideas in the process, (1) Stereotype Threat, (2) Social Identity Threat and (3) Internalization, these jointly resulting in harm to the self-feeling and a sense of social belonging.

2. Literature review

To comprehend how stereotypes harm us, we must turn to the basic psychological systems which give rise to the above effect. For many years the academic community was concerned with proving that "stereotypes were harmful" but is now engaged in the more important task of deciding just how this harm occurs.

The basic principle of this area is naturally stereotype threat which was first introduced by Steele and Aaronson [3] in their work in 1995. That is there is the knowledge that a negative stereotype exists about the group to which one belongs, and this fact alone shows that there will be a situational threat created which will decrease the person's performance in any stereotyped area. The real difficulty does not necessarily lie in accepting the stereotype but in the exhausting fear of climbing into its slough [3, 4]. Now what the subsequent studies have shown us is that this threat is brought about by using up some of the valuable cognitive forces, for the brain is so intensely engaged in watching the possible failure which exists and against which the anxiety works, that it can devote less energy to the task at hand [5, 6]. As Schmader, Johns and Forbes state in their later Integrated Model, the threat of stereotype produces a stressful situation which in turn results in cognitive depletion and, in a paradoxical way, the very under performance which the subject is anxious to avoid [7]. But what can happen besides these situational, immediate effects, when they are not simply absent?

This is where social identity theory becomes crucial for our understanding of the long-term, relational harm [8]. Originally developed by Tajfel and Turner, this theory posits that a significant part of how we see ourselves comes from our membership in social groups [8, 9]. So, when an individual's group is consistently devalued in a particular context—such as a male teacher in a female-dominated field—they experience a "social identity threat." This threat is a direct attack on their sense of belonging, which has been identified as a fundamental human need [10]. It is not surprising, then, that research shows a diminished sense of belonging is a key predictor of disengagement and can lead individuals to exit unwelcoming environments entirely [11, 12].

Arguably, the deepest and most insidious level of harm occurs through the process of Internalization. Scholars like Major and O'Brien define Internalization as the process where individuals subjected to persistent negative group stereotypes eventually incorporate those beliefs into their self-concept [13]. This can happen whether the stereotyping is inadvertent or deliberate. It is this internalization that leads to objective harmful consequences such as (1) the loss of self-esteem, and (2) lower self-efficacy [14, 15]. It is the vital transition from a fight against an exterior

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.LD29034

impression to the fight against an interior and personal belief. This paper will attempt to synthesize these three general pillars: 1. stereotype threat, 2. social identity threat, and 3. internalization in order to apply an all-encompassing approach towards the psychological damage.

3. The process of harm: a three-stage analysis

The full scope of the psychological damage is best understood as a developmental process. It begins with an external, situational threat and can progress to a deeply internalized belief.

3.1. Stage 1: situational pressure - stereotype threat

The initial impact of stereotyping often manifests as a situational pressure defined by psychologists as Stereotype Threat. Stereotype Threat is a psychological phenomenon where individuals underperform or experience anxiety in situations where they fear confirming a negative stereotype about their social group (e.g., race, gender, age, or academic ability) [3, 4]. This stress can impair performance, even if the person does not personally believe the stereotype.

This is precisely what Bobby experiences before his parent-teacher meetings. As seen with Bobby, the mere awareness of a negative stereotype in a relevant context induces chronic anxiety and cognitive depletion. Bobby constantly has the fear that if he makes a mistake, it will reflect on all male childcare teachers. This heightened state of stress is not momentary; it becomes a persistent background condition in stereotype-relevant domains (like his work), leading to burnout, impaired concentration, and ironically, an increased likelihood of performance decrements – the very outcome feared [7].

3.2. Stage 2: social alienation - social identity threat

When situational threats persist, they evolve into a more constant sense of social and identity-based risk. Psychological Harm refers to negative emotional or mental effects caused by experiences such as trauma, discrimination, manipulation, or prolonged stress. When Bobby feels his ability of caring for children is less valued, this signals that he is not a full member of the preschool teacher community. This causes individuals to question whether they truly belong in the community, eroding their sense of belonging. Humans have a fundamental need to belong [10]. Stereotyping thwarts this need, fostering feelings of alienation, isolation, and distrust. This deeper feeling of not belonging is the core of social identity threat [9, 11].

3.3. Stage 3: self-doubt - the internalization of harm

The most profound stage of psychological harm occurs when the target begins to absorb the external stereotype into their own self-concept. This process is called Internalization, in which persons confronted with negative stereotypes about their group may come to believe that these stereotypes are true of them, and incorporate them into their self-concept [13]. This leads to lower self-esteem and self-efficacy [14].

Bobby's case shows how the cumulative effects of stereotype threat, lower self-esteem and a lesser degree of belonging create a psychologically damaging environment. His anxiety, self-doubt and withdrawal are not perceived as personal failures on his part, but rather predictable psychological effects of the bad psychological environment which is created by stereotyping. When he "starts to wonder whether he is capable" and "the withdrawal from cooperating in the creative idea realm", he is not only battling an external stereotype, but he is engaging in a battle against an

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.LD29034

internalized stereotype, which has begun to do its work of damaging his self-confidence from within.

4. Discussion and counterarguments

The psychological trauma in question (and of anxiety and uncertainties) may, the critic would say, be traced not to these stereotypes, but to individual nervousness, or personal frailty. Bobby's anxiety, they might say, is his own affair, and not the necessary result of the actions of his associates.

But this point of view is unsound for two reasons—flatly contradicting a large body of scientific evidence and opening up an inconceivably large number of ethical questions.

To begin with, however, the evidence on the good side of the hypothesis is very bad. Decades of scientific study show uniformly that to put a crowd or an individual under the weight of a bad stereotype wherewith to judge himself, it interferes with his performance in that activity and increases his anxiety, among all races and in all fields of activity [16]. It is childish to attribute the injury exclusively to the individual tendency (to individual "sensitivity"), when all the onus of scientific consensus rests upon the other side of the hypothesis, which gives the "bother or threat" to the individual. The bother lies in the situation arising from the stereotype [3, 7].

In the second place, the objection is ethically bad; it is shifting the responsibility for the bad effect on the wrong side from the doers of the stereotype to the recipient. To call such a condition "individual fragility" or lack of toughness is simply to cover the obvious criminality of an act that brings the results under discussion. To come back to the question of effect, it is necessary to change the harmful characteristic in the action of the stereotype itself, and along this line the states of affairs that permit its action, instead of telling the targets that they need to become tougher. While criteria such as toughness or sureness are not undesirable qualifications for surviving the malicious effects of social bias, neither are they the first or most likely bulwark against a factor so deep-seated and ubiquitous as social bias.

5. Conclusion

In sum, Bobby's story illustrates that stereotyping is not a simple act, but a malignant condition which develops in stages. It begins with situational anxiety, develops into social alienation, and can end in chronic self-doubt. It eats away at the self-esteem of the individual, causes chronic anxiety, and alienates them from those communities whose membership ought to be broad enough to include them. Stereotyping is not merely a social nuisance, but a psychological injury which has a definite and measurable effect. To close, honest working men, like Bobby, are worn out and underestimated, because the limiting stories society tells of them go unchallenged.

References

[1] Eagly, A.H. and Karau, S.J. (2002) Role Congruity Theory of Prejudice toward Female Leaders. Psychological Review, 109, 573.
[2] Williams, C.L. (1992) The Glass Escalator: Hidden Advantages for Men in the “Female” Professions. Social Problems, 39, 253-267.
[3] Steele, C.M. and Aronson, J. (1995) Stereotype Threat and the Intellectual Test Performance of African Americans. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69, 797.
[4] Inzlicht, M. and Schmader, T. (Eds.) (2012) Stereotype Threat: Theory, Process, and Application. Oxford University Press.
[5] Schmader, T. and Johns, M. (2003) Converging Evidence That Stereotype Threat Reduces Working Memory Capacity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85, 440.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.LD29034

[6] Croizet, J.C., Després, G., Gauzins, M.E., Huguet, P., Leyens, J.P. and Méot, A. (2004) Stereotype Threat Undermines Intellectual Performance by Triggering a Disruptive Mental Load. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30, 721-731.
[7] Schmader, T., Johns, M. and Forbes, C. (2008) An Integrated Process Model of Stereotype Threat Effects on Performance. Psychological Review, 115, 336.
[8] Tajfel, H., Turner, J., Austin, W.G. and Worchel, S. (2001) An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict. In: Intergroup Relations: Essential Readings, 94-109.
[9] Ellemers, N., Spears, R. and Doosje, B. (2002) Self and Social Identity. Annual Review of Psychology, 53, 161-186.
[10] Baumeister, R.F. and Leary, M.R. (2017) The Need to Belong: Desire for Interpersonal Attachments as a Fundamental Human Motivation. In: Interpersonal Development, 57-89.
[11] Walton, G.M. and Cohen, G.L. (2007) A Question of Belonging: Race, Social Fit, and Achievement. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92, 82.
[12] Pittman, L.D. and Richmond, A. (2008) University Belonging, Friendship Quality, and Psychological Adjustment during the Transition to College. The Journal of Experimental Education, 76, 343-362.
[13] Major, B. and O'brien, L.T. (2005) The Social Psychology of Stigma. Annual Review of Psychology, 56, 393-421.
[14] Crocker, J. and Major, B. (1989) Social Stigma and Self-Esteem: The Self-Protective Properties of Stigma. Psychological Review, 96, 608.
[15] Locke, E.A. (1997) Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control. Personnel Psychology, 50, 801.
[16] Nguyen, H.H.D. and Ryan, A.M. (2008) Does Stereotype Threat Affect Test Performance of Minorities and Women? A Meta-Analysis of Experimental Evidence. Journal of Applied Psychology, 93, 1314.