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Abstract
Purpose – Even though researchers have discussed gender stereotype change, only a few studies have specifically projected outcomes or consequences. Hence, the main purpose of this study is to examine the impact of gender stereotype change concerning the different outcomes.
Design/methodology/approach – In achieving the purpose, the authors searched and reviewed current empirical knowledge on the outcomes of gender stereotype change in the Scopus and EBSCOhost databases from 1970 to 2020. The entire process was conducted through a systematic literature review methodology. The article selection criteria were executed using the PRISMA article selection flowchart steps, and 15 articles were included for the review.
Findings – The findings reveal that the outcomes from gender stereotype change research can be categorized mainly under the themes of “family and children,” “marriage” and “equality and women’s employment.”
Research limitations/implications – The co-occurrence network visualization map reveals gaps in the existing literature. There may be more possible outcomes relating to the current realities, and more cross-cultural research is needed.
Practical implications – These outcomes provide some implications for policymakers.
Originality/value – Even though researchers have discussed gender stereotype change on its various outcomes or consequences, research is less. Hence, this study provides a synthesis of consequences and addresses the gaps in the area.
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Introduction

A society’s beliefs about the appropriate roles for men and women are gender role attitudes, gender ideology (Davis and Greenstein, 2009) or gender stereotypes (Attanapola, 2004; Berridge et al., 2009; Bosak et al., 2018; Charlesworth and Banaji, 2021; De Silva and Priyashantha, 2014; Eagly et al., 2020; Lopez-Zafra and Garcia-Retamero, 2021). Such beliefs are formed from the peoples’ observations of the behavior of men and women in different social roles (Priyashantha et al., 2021b). Particularly, when women or men demonstrate certain behavior more typical to different social roles more often than the opposite sex, such behaviors are believed to be the common traits relevant to men or women (Eagly et al., 2020; Eagly and Karau, 2002). Hence, men are believed to be assertive, independent, rational and decisive, while women are believed to be showing concern for others, warmth, helpfulness and nurturance (Hoyt et al., 2009). These attributes concerning men and women are referred to as agentic (masculine) and communal (feminine), respectively (Abele, 2003). This agency and communion are then perceived as the fundamental motivators in men’s and women’s behaviors (Bakan, 1966). However, researchers argue that these perceptions have changed in the contemporary world of work, which has been promoted by females’ income-generating activities (Eagly et al., 2020). Social and economic developments took place, and United Nations initiatives (e.g. human rights, gender equality, nondiscrimination against women, women in development programs) (Bener/C19ıa et al., 2015) have backed this females’ income generation in the mid-20th century in most countries (Attapnola, 2004; Boehnke, 2011; Zosuls et al., 2011). These female income generation activities have, in turn, resulted in changes in social role distribution where both men and women are now in multiple roles as parents, employees, employers, volunteers, friends, spouses, siblings, etc. (Najeema, 2010; Perrigino et al., 2021). Thus, peoples’ various roles include women’s work in men’s roles and vice versa (Blau and Kahn, 2006; Mergaert, 2012) while playing their traditional roles (Eagly et al., 2020). This trend has evolved the traditional gender role stereotypes into changing gender stereotypes during the last 50 years (Blau and Kahn, 2006; Mergaert, 2012; Priyashantha et al., 2021b).

Even though it has been almost 50 years for research into changing gender stereotypes, there are scholarly arguments for the prevalence of traditional gender stereotypes (Haines et al., 2016; Rudman et al., 2012; Rudman and Glick, 2001). Some theoretical bases and the prevalence of some cultures that value gender stereotyping further support these scholarly arguments. Meanwhile, there is an opinion that gender stereotyping violates human rights (Tabassum and Nayak, 2021). Such an opinion is justified by the fact that gender stereotyping limits the capacity of women and men to develop their attributes or professional skills and make decisions about their lives and plans (Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, 2014). Therefore, researchers have been highly interested in finding whether gender stereotypes have changed or not in societies (Bosak et al., 2018; Eagly et al., 2020; Haines et al., 2016; Lopez-Zafra and Garcia-Retamero, 2012, 2021; Twenge, 1997a, b; Ugwu, 2021). Instead, it is reported that there are more gender gaps in employment participation in some countries. If the gender stereotypes have changed, theoretically, there should be no such gender gap. Researching this question, the researchers have also been interested in how gender stereotypes change cross-culturally (Boehnke, 2011; Constantin and Voicu, 2015; Diekmann et al., 2005; Diekman and Eagly, 2000; Lopez-Zafra and Garcia-Retamero, 2011). Accordingly, they have found that gender stereotypes have changed in Europe (Berkeley et al., 2013; Boehnke, 2011; Garcia-Retamero et al., 2011; Lopez-Zafra and Garcia-Retamero, 2012) and America (Alfieri et al., 1996; Beere et al., 1984; Bem, 1974; Broverman et al., 1970; Deaux and Lewis, 1984; Gill et al., 1987; Lueptow et al., 1995; Parelus, 1975; Spence and Hahn, 2016; Twenge, 1997a; Twenge et al., 2012; Zosuls et al., 2011). In addition to that, researchers have found that the gender stereotype change has taken place in East Asia (Boehnke, 2011), Africa (Bosak et al., 2018) and the Arab World (Sikdar and Mitra, 2012) as well. Some global level
studies also confirm that gender stereotype change has occurred in most countries with minor exceptions (Brown, 1991; Charlesworth and Banaji, 2021; Constantin and Voicu, 2015; Williams and Best, 1990). We know that if something happened, this could have various outcomes related to the incident. Accordingly, as the gender stereotype change has also taken place, there could be multiple outcomes associated with it. However, to the best of our knowledge, there is minimal research on this subject matter (Priyashantha et al., 2021c).

Therefore, with the expectation of finding the outcomes of gender stereotype change, we positioned the central question of the current study as, what is the impact of gender stereotype change? Thus, the present study systematically and quantitatively analyzes selected literature in the last 50 years to identify the outcomes of gender stereotypes and gaps in the prevailing knowledge.

Methodology
This article is positioned as Systematic Literature Review (SLR). The SLRs require a prior protocol to be developed to document the inclusion and exclusion of studies and analysis methods (Pahlevan-Sharif et al., 2019). We did a comprehensive literature search for this study, and a protocol was designed before the article search. There is a standard way of reporting the SLR known as Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA-Liberati et al., 2009), which is highly recommended in Medicine. However, as there is no such framework in social sciences, authors who intend to conduct the SLR tend to use the narrative and arbitrary guidelines (Pahlevan-Sharif et al., 2019; Petticrew and Roberts, 2006). Instead, in this study, for the article selection process to be objective and systematic, we followed the PRISMA article selection flow chart steps to select the articles.

The PRISMA article selection flow diagram has four steps: identification, screening, eligibility and included, and we followed them in the article selection. The identifications stage includes database, search terms and search criteria. The databases were Scopus and EBSCOhost for searching the articles. The search terms were “gender stereotype change” and “outcomes.” The search criteria or algorithm was developed by combining the terms with AND operative, and each search term was given similar words combined with OR operative. Accordingly, we retrieved 56 articles from Scopus and 68 Articles from EBSCOhost databases. Subsequently, the retrieved list containing the title, abstract, keywords, authors’ names and affiliations, journal name, cited numbers and year, etc., was exported to a Microsoft Excel sheet. The duplicates were then searched and removed.

The screening stage includes eliminating the articles when their titles and abstracts do not meet the inclusion criteria (Meline, 2006). The inclusion criteria for the current study were the “empirical studies” published in “academic journals” in “English” on “gender stereotype change” during the “1970–2020” period. Thus, the reason for selecting 1970 as the entry point was that gender stereotype change started in 1970, and it was extended to 2020 to include more studies for the review. Each author of the current research independently went through each title and abstract and eliminated the studies that did not meet the inclusion criteria. Notably, if there was any disagreement about elimination was resolved through discussion and consensus. Hence, we excluded 73 articles that were based on “review,” “qualitative,” “books,” “book chapters,” “magazines,” “conference papers,” “non-English” and “non-relevance to the current study’s scope.” Then, the remaining 50 articles’ full-text versions were retrieved for assessing their eligibility, which is the next step of the PRISMA flow diagram.

Since the articles have already been screened out up to this stage, evaluating their methodological reporting for eligibility checking is much better (Meline, 2006). It is justifiable as we had taken an inclusion criterion as “empirical studies.” Thus, the evaluation areas may be the population, methodology, methods, design, context, etc., and can find the reasons for
excluding the articles as “ambiguous methods” and “required original information from the author,” etc. (Meline, 2006). Accordingly, we independently evaluated each article on such grounds. We identified some studies based on qualitative reviews, perspectives, ambiguous methods and some sought original information about the methodology from the authors. They all were excluded through our discussion and consensus. In total, we identified 35 papers as irrelevant at this stage, and finally, we selected 15 articles for the review. They are shown in Table 1, and the process we followed for article selection is shown in Figure 1.

The Microsoft Excel sheet was then modified, and the data in it were fed into the VOSviewer Software to run the keyword co-occurrence and term co-occurrence network visualization maps. That was to identify the core themes in the selected studies scientifically. Notably, the keyword co-occurrence is to identify the main areas touched from the keywords of the studies as the keywords of a research article denote its primary content on a particular field of investigation. Moreover, the term co-occurrence analysis is to identify more about studies than the keywords co-occurrence as it searches key terms reflected in the titles and abstracts of each article.

Results and analysis
This section is mainly organized to present the results of the SLR and analyze them. It primarily consists of two sections: descriptive analysis and literature classification.

Descriptive analysis
The year-wise article distribution is shown in Figure 2. Even the 50 years considered for the review, the empirical studies reported on outcomes of gender stereotype change since 1998.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blom and Hewitt (2020)</td>
<td>Becoming a female-breadwinner household in Australia: Changes in relationship satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perez-Quintana et al. (2017)</td>
<td>The influence of sex and gender-role orientation in the decision to become an entrepreneur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fong et al. (2015)</td>
<td>How exposure to literary genres relates to attitudes toward gender roles and sexual behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrigall and Konrad (2007)</td>
<td>Gender role attitudes and careers: A longitudinal study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barber and Axinn (1998)</td>
<td>Gender role attitudes and marriage among young women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalnijn (2005)</td>
<td>Attitude alignment in marriage and cohabitation: The case of sex-role attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawson et al. (2016)</td>
<td>Associations between parental gendered attitudes and behaviours and children’s gender development across middle childhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmitt et al. (2017)</td>
<td>Personality and gender differences in global perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onozaka and Hafzi (2019)</td>
<td>Household production in an egalitarian society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyness and Judiesch (2014)</td>
<td>Gender egalitarianism and work-life balance for managers: Multisource perspectives in 36 countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood and Ramirez (2018)</td>
<td>Exploring the microfoundations of the gender equality peace hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He and Zhou (2018)</td>
<td>Gender difference in early occupational attainment: The roles of study field, gender norms, and gender attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duxbury et al. (2018)</td>
<td>Too much to do, too little time: Role overload and stress in a multi-role environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunningham et al. (2005)</td>
<td>Reciprocal relationships between attitudes about gender and social contexts during young adulthood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Included articles for the review

Source(s): Authors created (2021)
Figure 2 shows that at least one empirical study has been conducted for each year during the 1998–2020 period. Moreover, there is a high frequency of studies in 2005, 2017 and 2018 years. Table 2 shows the methodological reporting of the studies. It reveals that studies have been conducted based on large samples drawn on panel surveys. The information ensures the validity of the selected studies for the review, as we had an inclusion criterion for selecting papers as “empirical studies.” Concerning the context under which studies were conducted (Figure 3), the USA takes the led by having seven empirical studies published (1970–2020). Canada is in the second position having two studies during the period. Australia, China, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain and United Kingdom have conducted one study each.

**Note(s):** Search algorithm: “gender role egalitarianism” OR “gender stereotype change” OR androgynous OR “gender role ideology change” OR “gender role transitions” OR “gender role attitude change” AND outcomes OR consequences

**Source(s):** Authors Construct, 2021

**Figure 1.** PRISMA article selection flow diagram

**Figure 2.** Year-wise research article distribution

**Source(s):** Authors created, 2021
The classification of results is critical in finding out actual work done on the objective set for the research (Jabeen et al., 2020; Priyashantha et al., 2021a). Since the main research objective of the current study was to identify the outcomes of the gender stereotype change, this section mainly classifies the results relating to that. As the keyword co-occurrence network analysis is suitable for identifying the critical areas on a particular investigation, we used it for our study to answer the study’s central question. Figure 4 shows the output of it.

The size of the node denotes the number of occurrences in a keyword co-occurrences visualization map. Hence, the higher the number of occurrences, the larger the node’s size. Thus, our analysis of the keyword co-occurrences found that “gender,” “employment” and “longitudinal research” denoted in larger nodes in the map (Figure 4). It reveals that they are the keywords that have frequently occurred in studies. We know that “gender” is highly associated with gender stereotypes. It may be a justifiable reason why it happens so often in studies. “Employment” opportunities are also justifiable since it has been proven that employment opportunities have been a significant cause for gender stereotypes changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Analysis techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blom and Hewitt (2020)</td>
<td>General Panel Survey</td>
<td>11,986</td>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perez-Quintana et al. (2017)</td>
<td>Graduate Student Sample</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>Regression and Correlations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fong et al. (2015)</td>
<td>General Panel Survey</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>Regression and Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotter et al. (2011)</td>
<td>General Panel Survey</td>
<td>22,770</td>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrigall and Konrad (2007)</td>
<td>Graduate Student Panel Survey</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barber and Axinn (1998)</td>
<td>General Panel Survey</td>
<td>15,668</td>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalmijn (2005)</td>
<td>General Panel Survey</td>
<td>1,416</td>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawson et al. (2016)</td>
<td>College Student Panel Survey</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmitt et al. (2017)</td>
<td>Cross-Cultural Study</td>
<td>55 Nations</td>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onozaka and Hafzi (2019)</td>
<td>General Panel Survey</td>
<td>14,884</td>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyness and Judiesch (2014)</td>
<td>Cross-Cultural Study</td>
<td>36 Nations</td>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood and Ramirez (2018)</td>
<td>General Panel Survey</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He and Zhou (2018)</td>
<td>College Student Panel Survey</td>
<td>4,759</td>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duxbury et al. (2018)</td>
<td>General Panel Survey</td>
<td>4,947</td>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunningham et al. (2005)</td>
<td>General Panel Survey</td>
<td>1,113</td>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source(s): Authors Created (2021)
Moreover, as almost all the studies in the sample have adopted the "longitudinal research" design, the keyword "longitudinal research" has also fallen to the frequently occurring category. It demonstrates the methods used by the selected articles and their suitability to the current study.

Additionally, Figure 4 shows four main clusters denoted in different colors containing different keywords in each cluster. More specifically, Table 3 shows the number of terms in each cluster, indicating that changing gender stereotype outcomes varied by different areas of investigations. Grouping the keywords into one cluster is regarded as the keywords’ likelihood to reflect similar topics. Hence, clusters one and two (as stated in Table 3) have the highest number of keywords and suggest that the topics highlighted in those are the centralized fields in gender stereotype change and outcome research. Thus, the central areas highlighted are “attitudes,” “cohabitation,” “fertility,” “life course,” “living arrangements,” “marriage,” “couples,” “employment,” “family economics,” “gender roles,” “longitudinal research” and “marital quality.”

Moreover, the term co-occurrence network visualization map created by the VOSviewer software (Figure 5) is treated as more detailed than the keyword co-occurrence analysis. It provides an analysis that goes beyond the keywords as it further investigates the areas focused on in the title and abstracts of the studies. Hence, creating this type of map further identified the areas frequently investigated on gender stereotypes change outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>No of items</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Attitudes, cohabitation, fertility, life course, living arrangements, marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Couples, employment, family economics, gender roles, longitudinal research, marital quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Gender, multi-role environment, role overload, stress, work, and family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Career outcomes, gender attitudes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Clusters of keywords
Accordingly, Figure 5 categorized the terms into three clusters in Blue, Red and Green. In the Blue cluster, there are two terms as “family” and “child.” A common theme can be formed for them as family and child-related outcomes. As we did a detailed search for the outcomes in each article, we could summarize them in Table 4. Hence, we could extract different family and children-related outcomes from Table 4. They are; “Family Role Overload and Stress” (Duxbury et al., 2018), “Subsequent School Enrollment” (Cunningham et al., 2005), “Fewer Children” (Barber and Axinn, 1998), “Delay in Marital Parenthood” (Cunningham et al., 2005) and “Children’s Convergence of Egalitarian Attitudes” (Dawson et al., 2016).

Concerning the family and children-related outcomes, Duxbury et al. (2018) have found that the “family role overload” of both husbands and wives was consequent in changing gender stereotype contexts. The sense of family role overload then becomes a strong predictor of couples’ “perceived stress” (Duxbury et al., 2018). The perceived stress can undermine the health and well-being of people. The literature confirms that “psychological strains” and “disorders” (Hébert et al., 2017), “adverse impacts on the immune system” (Barry et al., 2020; Cohen et al., 1999), “low quality of life,” “insomnia,” “burnout” (Ribeiro et al., 2018) and “family distress” (Aryee et al., 1999) resultant from the stress. When the stress becomes to distress level, there is a high possibility of causing chronic diseases and mortality (Barry et al., 2020). Therefore, these findings provide more implications for the policymakers to emphasize reducing those negative outcomes.

Apart from this, young adults’ biases toward changing gender role attitudes can cause “subsequent school enrolments” (Ciabattari, 2001; Cunningham et al., 2005). It is severe, particularly among women, as they need to acquire knowledge to upgrade their employment status (Cunningham et al., 2005) and be independent (Goldscheider and Goldscheider, 1993). However, later school enrollment may hinder performing family roles of adults as intensive time is devoted to education (Marini, 1978). Moreover, women with changing attitudes toward gender roles are “less likely to have children” (Barber and Axinn, 1998) and “delay in marital parenthood” (Cunningham et al., 2005). As a result, the future society could go into a severe crisis regarding population growth (Barber and Axinn, 1998). It could be challenging to find people for growth prospects in economies. Therefore, the policymakers need to consider this seriously and try to overcome that. In the meantime, scholars need to focus on further research on this outcome to confirm this viewpoint further.
The last outcome of the family and children-related category is the “children’s convergence of egalitarian attitudes” (Dawson et al., 2016). It indicates that gender stereotype changes could evolve over the generations and possibly consequent the different outcomes of gender stereotype change. It implies that more research on this area is required to find more associated outcomes.

The cluster in Red (Figure 5) has categorized the terms as; “Role Attitude,” “Attitudes,” “Cohabitation,” “Marriage” and “Consequences.” Out of them, the “role attitudes,” “attitudes” and “consequences” are the general search terms related to the concept of gender stereotype
change outcomes, and hence, we ignored them for review. However, the remaining two terms, “marriage” and “cohabitation,” were considered for the review. Since these terms are related to marriage, we themed them as “marriage-related.” Hence, marriage-related outcomes we found were “Increased Cohabitation, Low Marriage Rate” (Barber and Axinn, 1998), “Delay in Marriage” (Cunningham et al., 2005), “Low Satisfaction,” “Low Relationship Quality,” “Low Stability in Marital Relationships” (Blom and Hewitt, 2020) and “Attitude Convergence in Marriage” (Kalmijn, 2005).

The “increased cohabitation,” “low marriage rate” (Barber and Axinn, 1998) and “delay in marriage” (Cunningham et al., 2005) can subsequently impact the population growth negatively (Barber and Axinn, 1998). If such outcomes exist over time, it could be a barrier to the progression of societies. However, another finding reveals that gender stereotype change increases childbirth to single parents in recent decades (Cunningham et al., 2005). Therefore, it is difficult to directly conclude that such outcomes negatively affect population growth or societal progression. More research is needed to find the associated outcomes of these consequences so that reasonable judgments can be made whether such outcomes generate more negative or positive effects on the population, society or any other.

Moreover, in marital relationships, Australian-related research has found that “low satisfaction,” “low relationship quality” and “low stability” (Blom and Hewitt, 2020) were consequent from the gender stereotype changes. All of which resemble negative outcomes by their surface nature. However, another finding reveals that “attitude convergence in marriage” (Kalmijn, 2005) occurred due to gender stereotype changes. It is contrary to the previous finding, which is a positive outcome by its surface nature.

Most importantly, for these types of outcomes, positivity or negativity is dependent on cultural values. The negative outcomes as “low satisfaction,” “low relationship quality” and “low stability” may be very accurate for the cultures which value male breadwinner family structures (Blom and Hewitt, 2020). However, more opposing consequences, like “attitude convergence in marriage” (Kalmijn, 2005), can be found in cultures with more egalitarian values like Nordic countries (Vitali and Arpino, 2016). Hence, in total, the positivity or negativity of outcomes is a matter of societal and cultural values. Therefore, generalizing interpretations about the positivity or negativity of each outcome is suitable with more cross-cultural research. Similarly, further research is needed regarding the associated outcomes of each of these outcomes.

Finally, the Green cluster has the terms as; “Outcomes,” “Gender Differences,” “Gender Egalitarianism,” “Work” and “Women.” As in other clusters, we had a common search term, “outcome,” in this cluster, and we ignored it. Except that, the terms “gender difference” and “gender egalitarianism” seem to represent a common theme of “equality.” The remaining terms “work” and “women” are merged, and a theme can be given as “women’s employment.” Thus, this cluster is then characterized by the theme of “equality and women employments.” Specifically, under this cluster, we found the outcomes of “Reduction of Gender Role Stereotyping” (Dawson et al., 2016), “Egalitarian Essentialism” ( Cotter et al., 2011), “Non-Difference in Men or Women for Work-Life” (Lyness and Judiesch, 2014) and “Gender Differences in Personality Cross-Culturally” (Schmitt et al., 2017), and they can be related to the equality. Similarly, the “Women’s Full-Time Employment,” “Women’s Independent Living” (Cunningham et al., 2005), “More Working Hours” and “More Income for Women” ( Corrigall and Konrad, 2007) and “Increased Entrepreneurial Intention of Women” (Perez-Quintana et al., 2017) were found, and they can be categorized under the theme of women’s employment. Moreover, the outcomes of the “Reduction of the Women’s Disadvantage in Entering Male-Dominated Occupations” (He and Zhou, 2018) and “Economic Rationality of Females” (Onozaka and Hafzi, 2019) are also categorized to the theme of “women’s employment.”

Thus, the “equality” related outcomes in the “equality and women’s employment,” the “reduction of traditional gender role stereotyping” (Dawson et al., 2016), “egalitarian
essentialism” (Cotter et al., 2011) and “non-difference in men or women for work-life” (Lyness and Judiesch, 2014) may change in different cultural contexts. As we have various cultural contexts that value either traditional gender norms or gender stereotype change, more cross-cultural research is needed to interpret such outcomes. Moreover, one cross-cultural study found that a “gender difference in personality” is consequenced even though people’s gender stereotype attitudes have already changed (Schmitt et al., 2017). Therefore, this finding confirms the overall behavioral diversity of people, including diversity in gender role behaviors, although the equality of gender roles is emphasized.

Concerning women’s employment-related outcomes, such as increases in “women’s full-time employment opportunities” (Cunningham et al., 2005), “reduction of women’s disadvantage in entering male-dominated occupations” (He and Zhou, 2018), “more working hours and more income for women” (Corrigall and Konrad, 2007) and “their increased entrepreneurial intention” (Perez-Quintana et al., 2017), women’s “economic rationality” (Onozaka and Hafzi, 2019) reveals the women’s improved economic status. Moreover, the findings like increased “women’s independent living” (Cunningham et al., 2005) represent their independent decision-making. The positive side of these is that they reduce the gender gap in employment participation and the ultimate contribution to economic growth. However, since we have different cultures worldwide, more cross-cultural research is needed to generalize this. As discussed under “family and children” related outcomes, the negative side of women’s employment-related outcomes is the missing family responsibilities or adverse health effects and low reproductivity. Therefore, this provides an implication for policymakers to avoid those harmful effects. In the meantime, as the socialization forces are diverse over time (Brown and Stone, 2016), researchers can further test whether these types of outcomes exist over time.

In the network visualization map in Figure 5, the circles’ size denotes the number of occurrences. It suggests that the higher the number of occurrences, the larger the circle’s size. Accordingly, the term “women” is then considered to be the frequently used term. It implies that the women-related outcomes should have been investigated repeatedly. However, even the term “women” has been found to be co-occurred many times in this study, our detailed analysis of each article found that the different women-related outcomes have been investigated only once. Instead, the other outcomes related to terms represented by the nodes in Figure 5 have not been co-occurred or tested frequently in the studies. Hence, overall, more research is needed to be a well-established knowledge on each outcome of stereotype change found in this study.

Conclusion
Gender stereotype change has been given scholarly attention since the 1970s. Traditional gender stereotypes have evolved into gender stereotype change or egalitarian gender stereotypes with females’ participation in employment (Brandth et al., 2017; Mergaert et al., 2013). This gender stereotype change has created various outcomes in various areas. This SLR studied the outcomes of gender stereotype change in the literature during the 1970–2020 period. The literature search was conducted using the Scopus and EBSCOhost databases. Empirical studies were mainly focused on selecting the articles. Initially, we extracted 124 articles for screening. After assessing their eligibility, we finally selected 15 articles for the review. They were subjected to the keyword and term co-occurrence analysis for finding the themes of gender stereotypes change outcomes.

The findings reveal that outcomes of gender stereotypes change are under the main themes of “family and children,” “marriage” and “equality and women’s employment.” There are very few studies found relating to the “family and children” related outcomes. They are “Family Role Overload and Stress” (Duxbury et al., 2018), “Fewer Children”
(Barber and Axinn, 1998), “Later School Enrollment” (Cunningham et al., 2005) and “Children’s Convergence of Egalitarian Attitudes” (Dawson et al., 2016). Of these results, it was found that all other results, except for the convergence of children’s egalitarian attitudes (Dawson et al., 2016), had some adverse effects, such as neglect of family responsibilities and negative effects on health and female fertility. They provide implications to policymakers to avoid those harmful effects. Moreover, more research is needed to test whether these outcomes exist over time since the socialization forces are diverse (Brown and Stone, 2016).

Compared to the “family and children” related outcomes, more outcomes have found “marriage” associated outcomes. They are “Increase Cohabitation,” “Low Marriage Rate” (Barber and Axinn, 1998), “Delay in Marriage” (Cunningham et al., 2005), “Attitude Convergence in Marriage” (Kalmijn, 2005), “Low Satisfaction,” “Lower Relationship Quality” and “Low Stability in Marital Relationships” (Blom and Hewitt, 2020). “The Increase in Cohabitation,” “Low Marriage Rate” (Barber and Axinn, 1998) and “Delay in Marriage” (Cunningham et al., 2005) can further negatively impact the population growth (Barber and Axinn, 1998). However, more research is needed regarding these outcomes and their associated outcomes to generalize whether they generate more positive or negative consequences. Moreover, concerning all the marriage-related outcomes, their positivity or negativity cannot be determined from their surface interpretation. More research is needed to be done on the associated outcomes of each of these outcomes. Moreover, as the marriage-related outcomes are subjected to cultural perspectives on gender roles, we cannot determine the positivity or negativity of such outcomes without doing more cross-cultural studies. Therefore, more cross-cultural research is needed.

Compared to the family and children and marriage-related outcomes, more outcomes were found relating to equality and women’s employment-related category. For the analysis purposes, we further categorized them into two sub-themes as equality and women’s employment-related. The “equality”-related outcomes found were; “Reduction of Traditional Gender Role Stereotyping” (Dawson et al., 2016), “Egalitarian Essentialism” ( Cotter et al., 2011), “Non-Difference in Men or Women for Work-Life” (Lyness and Judiesch, 2014), “Gender Difference in Personality” (Schmitt et al., 2017). We believe that these outcomes may change in different cultural contexts. Hence, more cross-cultural research is needed to make generalizations. Similarly, the women’s employment-related outcomes found were: increases in “Women’s Full-Time Employment Opportunities” (Cunningham et al., 2005), “Reduction of Women’s Disadvantage in Entering Male-Dominated Occupations” (He and Zhou, 2018), “More Working Hours and More Income for Women” (Corrigall and Konrad, 2007), “Women’s Increased Entrepreneurial Intention” (Perez-Quintana et al., 2017), “Women’s Independent Living” (Cunningham et al., 2005) and their “Economic Rationality” (Onozaka and Hafzi, 2019). These outcomes reveal the improved economic status and independent living of females. These can help reduce the employment gender gap that ultimately contributes to economic growth. For this also, more cross-cultural research is needed to make more generalizations. It is proven in this study that family responsibilities are missed and have adverse effects on health and reproductivity when females are involved in employment opportunities. Therefore, the outcomes provide an implication for the policymakers to avoid those harmful effects. Moreover, more research is needed to test whether these outcomes exist over time since the socialization forces are diverse (Brown and Stone, 2016).

Practicality and research implications
There are implications for future researchers from the findings of the current research. Although the 50 years considered for reviewing the literature on gender stereotype outcomes, we were able to find very few outcomes from only 15 studies conducted on an empirical basis. Therefore, more research is needed on this area. More specifically, gender stereotyping is
coupled with cultural values on gender norms. Mainly, we have cultures on gender role stereotyping and gender role egalitarianism. Therefore, future researches need to focus more research on a cross-cultural basis. Moreover, since the socialization forces are diverse, complex and continuously evolving, more research is essential to have a well-established knowledge of gender stereotype change outcomes.

Additionally, the outcome of “Family Role Overload and Stress” (Duxbury et al., 2018) has a high possibility to create more health risks to the employees whose gender role attitude changed. Moreover, “Fewer Children” (Barber and Axinn, 1998), “Later School Enrollment” (Cunningham et al., 2005), “Increase in Cohabitation,” “Low Marriage Rate” (Barber and Axinn, 1998) and “Delay in Marriage” (Cunningham et al., 2005), and all the outcomes of women employment-related category can negatively impact on population growth. Therefore, they provide implications to policymakers to avoid those harmful effects.
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