INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

University Microfilms International
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 USA
St. John's Road, Tyler's Green
High Wycombe, Bucks, England HP10 8HR

77-21,741

HOBSON, Carol McLester, 1944-
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PARENTAL ANDROGYNY AND EARLY CHILD-REARING ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIORS.

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Ph.D., 1977
Sociology, individual and family studies

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

© 1977

CAROL McLESTER HOBSON

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PARENTAL ANDROGYNY AND EARLY CHILD-REARING ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIORS

by

Carol McLester Hobson

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Greensboro
1977

Approved by

Mary Elizabeth Keister
Dissertation Adviser

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation Adviser Mary Elizabeth Kester

Committee Members J. Allen Watson

Rebecca M. Smith

William A. Brown

Nancy N. Foster

January 21, 1977
Date of Acceptance by Committee

HOBSON, CAROL MCLESTER. The Relationship Between Parental Androgyny and Early Child-rearing Attitudes and Behaviors. (1977)
Directed by: Dr. Mary Elizabeth Keister. Pp. 145.

The purpose of the present study was to assess the relation between child-rearing attitudes and practices and three independent variables: 1) sex of parent; 2) sex of child; and 3) sex-role orientation of parent. Two copies of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory were distributed to approximately 600 parents of children aged four to seven. Parents who returned the two sex-role inventories (one on themselves and one on their idealized child) were then asked to complete the Child-Rearing Practices Report which is a Q-Sort procedure. Thirty-nine parents completed the Q-Sort in a group setting and 80 parents completed it in their homes. Forty parents also completed 15 games of ticktacktoe with their child. These games were tape-recorded and were rated for competitiveness, nurturance, and punitiveness.

Twenty-eight sex-typed fathers and 34 sex-typed mothers were identified on the basis of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory for a total of 62 sex-typed parents. Fourteen androgynous fathers and 10 androgynous mothers were identified for a total of 24 androgynous parents. Fifty-two sex-typed parents accurately completed the CRPR and 23 androgynous parents accurately completed the CRPR. Twenty-one sex-typed parents and 10 androgynous parents were rated for competitiveness, nurturance, and punitiveness.

It was hypothesized that androgynous parents would differ from sex-typed parents on reported child-rearing attitudes and practices. The results indicated a significant relation between

sex-role orientation of parent and their idealized child's sex-role orientation. In addition, sex-typed fathers placed a significantly greater emphasis on achievement than did the other three groups but the area of significance was not revealed by Scheffe's test. Androgynous parents of boys encouraged individuation significantly more than did sex-typed parents of girls, but this result was not in the hypothesized direction. No other differences were found between sex-typed and androgynous parents.

Further analysis of the results indicated more and greater differences when the undifferentiated and cross-sex-typed parental groups were included in the analysis. Also, more differences were found when the sex of the child was used alone as the independent variable. Therefore, it was suggested that these variables receive more attention in future research.

It was concluded that the only real difference between the child-rearing attitudes and behaviors of androgynous and sex-typed parents revealed by this study was the desire of the respective groups that their child grow up to possess a sex-role orientation similar to their own. In other words, sex-typed parents wanted sex-typed children and androgynous parents wanted androgynous children. But there was nothing in the behavior of these groups of parents to indicate that they were using different child-rearing practices to achieve their idealized child's sex-role orientation. Further research is necessary to substantiate these findings and to more closely consider the cross-sex-typed and undifferentiated parents.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to extend my appreciation to Dr. Mary Elizabeth Keister, Dr. J. A. Watson, Dr. Nancy White, Dr. Kendon Smith, and Dr. Rebecca Smith for their supportive guidance and advice throughout my graduate career. I would also like to acknowledge Dr. Bill Powers for his help with the data analysis and his support in the completion of the dissertation.

I would like to express gratitude to all of the parents and children who participated in the study. Thanks go to the school superintendent, the principals, the day care directors and others who helped make contacts with parents for the study.

Sincere appreciation is extended to Dr. Bryan Robinson who provided encouragement and support throughout the research. To Diane Neese, I express my warmest thanks for typing the final copies of the dissertation.

A special thanks is extended to the members of my family and especially to Bill Hobson and Lara McLester for their understanding love and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The development of appropriate sex-role behavior has long been considered to be an essential aspect of healthy personality development and functioning (Bem, 1975 (a and b); Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, & Vogel, 1972). A complementariness of roles has been emphasized resulting in the traditional conceptulization of masculinity and femininity as polar opposites (Constantinople, 1973). Until 1970 the majority of the research literature dealt with the naturalistic description of sex-role acquisition, the variety and nature of sex differences, and with the extent of sex stereotypes (Block, von der Lippe, & Block, 1973).

As a consequence of the women's liberation movement the traditional stereotypes have been questioned as to their detrimental effects on the development of the fullest human potential in both men and women (Horner, 1969; Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974; Rossi, 1964). For women, socialization has inhibited individuation, discouraged achievement, and restricted autonomy (Block et al., 1973). For men socialization processes have facilitated individuation but inhibited the expression of affect. There are signs that a gradual convergence of sex roles is taking place in American society. This trend includes broader, less rigidly defined, less sex-typed, and more overlapping masculine and feminine roles with an increase in freedom of choice for the individual (Brown, 1958; Mead, 1935;

Seward, 1956). The psychologically androgynous person has only recently begun to receive scientific consideration. Bem (1974; 1975; 1976) demonstrated that the androgynous person exhibited a wider range of behaviors and more behavioral flexibility in experimental situations than did the sex-typed individual. Sex-role flexibility has certain implications for increasing interfamily variability (Brown, 1958), parental modeling, and socialization practices.

Little attention has been given to the psychologically androgynous person and less has been given to the developmental acquisition of psychological androgyny. No studies have directly scrutinized the parenting attitudes and behaviors of androgynous persons. Data from clinical practice indicated that many parents wish their children to acquire self-actualizing character traits and it is during early childhood that stereotyped sex roles are taught. It is currently becoming important to identify the variables which result in androgynous individuals who have the potential for maximum behavioral flexibility (Hirsch, 1974). This researcher began this task in the area of child-rearing attitudes and behaviors.

The purpose of the present study was to study the child-rearing attitudes and behaviors of androgynous parents. The study focussed on sex-differentiated socialization practices and on the relationship between androgyny or sex-typing and parental attitudes and behavior. Parental attitudes and behavior were measured by the Bem

Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI; Bem, 1974), the Child-Rearing Practices Report (CRPR; Block, 1965), and a behavioral task which consisted of fifteen games of ticktacktoe.

Sex differences in socialization practices of primary and secondary socializing agents have prevalently been believed to establish and maintain culturally defined sex-appropriate role behavior in children (Barry, Bacon, & Childs, 1957; Biller, 1971; Block et al., 1973; Hartley, 1959; 1964; Hetherington, 1965; 1966; 1967; McCandless, 1969; Mischel, 1966; Moss, 1967; Mussen, 1969; Sears, Maccoby & Levin, 1957). Recently, however, Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) found contradictory or inconclusive evidence of sex-differentiated socialization except in a very narrow sex-typed sense. Although parents dressed boys and girls differently, chose different toys for them, and assigned them different tasks, in all other areas, parental socialization emphases were found to be remarkably similar for both sexes.

In contrast to Maccoby and Jacklin's conclusions, Block (1975) found that parents emphasized achievement and competition, the control of affect, independence, and personal responsibility more in boys than in girls. Boys' parents also had a more obvious punishment orientation than did parents of girls. Fathers were stricter, firmer, and more authoritarian with sons than with daughters and were less tolerant of aggression directed toward themselves. Mothers encouraged sons more than daughters to conform to external standards. Parent-daughter relationships were characterized more by warmth and physical closeness. Parents had greater

confidence in trustworthiness and truthfulness of daughters, expected "ladylike" behaviors, and were more reluctant to punish daughters. Mothers reported greater restrictiveness and supervision of daughters than of sons. However, the data were from self-reports of child-rearing attitudes and practices. Such self-reports or self-descriptions of sex differences do not necessarily correspond with overt behavior (Mischel, 1966). Nevertheless, since the data included self-reports from sons, daughters, mothers, and fathers, and since all agreed on sex-differentiated socialization practices, the differential perceptions of socialization practices must have some basis.

In a cross-cultural comparison of sex-role stereotypes in six countries - Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, England, and the United States - Block (1973) determined that three primary factors differentiated American child-rearing values from those of the other societies. Significantly greater emphasis was placed on early, clear sex-typing and on competitive achievement while significantly less importance was attached to the inhibition of male aggression. Current American child-rearing practices tend to emphasize competition and aggression and to magnify differences between the sexes.

In other data drawn from comprehensive longitudinal studies at the Institute of Human Development, University of California, Berkeley, Block et al. (1973) categorized males and females on the basis of their scores on the Femininity (Fe) and Socialization (So) scales of the California Psychological Inventory. Since

masculinity-femininity was conceptualized as bipolar on the CPI, low scores on Fe indicated high masculinity. Early family ratings and environmental descriptions were the source of information on familial antecedents. The personality descriptions were based on extensive in-depth interviews by two or three clinical psychologists.

Sex-appropriate, socialized individuals (high-masculine/high-socialized males and high-feminine/high-socialized females) originated in family contexts where there were clear, conventional role differences, where both parents were available and psychologically healthy. Males from this context were competent and had good self-concepts, but women were tense and lacked spontaneity. These persons seemed to have achieved an identification with the same-sex parent (Block et al., 1973).

Sex-inappropriate/socialized individuals (low-masculine/high-socialized males and low-feminine/high-socialized females) came from families where parents were less stereotyped in their definitions of masculinity and femininity and offered more complex, androgynous roles as models. Parents were psychologically healthy and provided models of competence, tolerance, consideration, and sharing. Individuals in this group were said to have acquired an androgynous identification (Block et al., 1973).

For males, socialization tended to encourage androgynous sex-role identities since the socialization process emphasized positive feminine qualities such as conscientiousness, conservation, and interdependence. For women, the socialization process narrowed sex-role definitions, channeling them into nurturance, submissiveness,

and conservation. In addition education appeared to be associated with a more androgynous sex-role definition (Dahlstrom & Welsh, 1960; Murray, 1963). Maternal employment was also found to be associated with less polarization in sex-role definitions (Vogel, Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, and Rosenkrantz, 1970).

Minuchin (1965) attempted to determine whether nine-year-old children were developing different sex-role concepts and behavioral sex-typing as a function of differential school and home attitudes and models. Traditional homes and schools were characterized by fixed conceptions of sex-appropriate roles and behaviors while modern homes and schools were characterized by open conceptions of sex-appropriate roles and behaviors. Techniques administered to the children included interviews, intelligence tests, problem-solving tasks, projective techniques, and several miscellaneous tasks. Less sex-typing was associated with modern backgrounds and girls from modern families were significantly less sex-typed in play than were girls from traditional families and than all boys. The conclusion was that differing philosophies of child-rearing and education were influential in formation of sex-role attitudes and sex-typed behaviors.

Rothbart and Maccoby (1966) studied the differential reactions of parents to the voice of a child (ambiguous as to sex) as a function of the sex of the parent and the "sex" of the child. This experiment involved parental reactions to the sex-typed behaviors of dependency and aggression. Mothers tended to be more permissive to the "boy's" voice and fathers were more permissive to the "girl's"

voice. Fathers allowed more aggression from daughters than from sons and mothers allowed more aggression from sons than from daughters ($p < .05$). This presents problems for the differential socialization hypothesis since one parent was found to reinforce the child's aggression and the other parent was found to punish the same child's aggression. Parents completing a questionnaire in the same study had fairly low sex-role differentiation scores in terms of their perceptions and attitudes about children's behavior.

Fagot (1974) observed mothers and fathers in their homes as they interacted with boys and girls (six children of each sex). Both parents joined boys' play more often than girls' play but also left boys to play alone more often than girls. Parents of boys placed greater restrictions on cross-sex-typed behavior than did parents of girls.

Rheingold and Cook (1975) proposed that the furnishings of children's rooms would provide an indication of parents' sex-differentiated behavior. They canvassed the toys and furnishings of the rooms of 48 boys and 48 girls who were under six years of age. Girls' rooms were more often decorated with floral designs, lace, ruffles, and fringe. Girls' toys included more dolls, doll houses, and domestic toys. Boys' rooms were decorated more often with animal designs and boys' toys included more vehicles, educational-art materials, sports equipment, depots, toy animals, machines, fauna, and military toys. The conclusions were that sex

differences in parental behavior occur and that the contents of children's rooms is one measure of the differential treatment of boys and girls.

Additional research is important due to the incomplete and inconsistent findings in sex-typed socialization practices of parents. For one thing, there is a lack of research on fathers. Further, Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) concluded that not much sex-differentiated socialization takes place except in narrow, sex-typed areas but that greater differences may be found in selected subsamples of subjects. In the third place, Rothbart and Maccoby (1966) concluded that it was not so much the sex of the child as the sex of the parent that determined sex-differentiated child-rearing practices. Also, no research has been done on the child-rearing attitudes and behaviors of androgynous parents. Finally, Mischel (1966) and others suggested that attitudes are not always translated into behaviors.

Statement of the Problem

Previous studies examined child-rearing attitudes and practices as a function of sex of parent and sex of child but no studies singled out sex-role orientation of parents as a variable. The current study had as its purpose the examination of child-rearing attitudes and behaviors of sex-typed parents as contrasted with the attitudes and behaviors of androgynous parents. This study incorporated an attitude measure and two parental tasks to examine the relation between child-rearing attitudes and behaviors and three independent variables: (1) sex of parent, (2) sex of

child, and (3) sex-role orientation of parent. The review of the literature formed the basis for the following research questions:

1. Do androgynous parents differ from sex-typed parents in childrearing attitudes and practices?
2. Do parents of girls differ from parents of boys in self-reports of childrearing attitudes and practices?
3. Do androgynous and sex-typed parents idealize different sex-role orientations for their children?
4. Do androgynous and sex-typed parents differ in the specific behaviors of nurturance, punitiveness, and/or competitiveness with their children?

Hypotheses

The primary hypotheses which were tested were the following:

H_1 Androgynous parents and sex-typed mothers place a significantly greater value on openness to experience and on the open expression of parental feelings than do sex-typed fathers.

H_2 Sex-typed fathers place a significantly greater value on (a) achievement, (b) authoritarian control, and (c) early training than do androgynous parents and sex-typed mothers.

H_3 Sex-typed parents report greater suppression of sex and affection than do androgynous parents.

H_4 Androgynous parents of boys and androgynous parents of girls do not differ on the encouragement of independence but sex-typed parents of boys encourage independence more often than do sex-typed parents of girls.

H_5 Sex-typed and androgynous parents select their own sex-role orientation as their idealized child's orientation.

H_6 Masculine fathers score significantly lower in nurturance than androgynous fathers, androgynous mothers, or feminine mothers.

H_7 No significant differences in nurturance exist among androgynous fathers, androgynous mothers, and feminine mothers.

H_8 Masculine fathers demonstrate significantly more competitive behavior than androgynous fathers, androgynous mothers, or feminine mothers.

H_9 No significant differences exist between androgynous fathers and androgynous mothers on competitive behavior.

Definitions

Androgyny is defined as both male and female in one. An androgynous individual was described by Bem (1974) as a person who is masculine or feminine; instrumental or expressive depending upon the situation. An androgynous individual engages in masculine and feminine behaviors and is not limited by the traditional sex-role stereotypes. A sex-typed individual, on the other hand, is motivated to keep behavior consistent with an internalized sex-role standard (Kagan, 1964; Kohlberg, 1966) and will not behave in a way "inappropriate" to his or her sex. Traditional measures with masculinity and femininity conceptualized as bipolar ends of a single continuum have served to obscure the identification and study of the androgynous person.

The sex-role orientation of a parent was defined as androgynous, masculine, or feminine as operationalized by scores on the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI; Bem, 1974). The parent's idealized sex-role orientation for his or her child was operationalized as above but with the parent's marking of the BSRI in terms of ideal choices for the child at age 25.

Parental socialization attitudes and practices were defined by the Child-Rearing Practices Report (CRPR; Block, 1965). The CRPR is a set of 91 Q items which parents distributed equally among seven envelopes with cards in envelope 7 being the most descriptive and cards in envelope 1 being the least descriptive. Fathers and mothers were given card sets to sort independently.

The specific definitions in the hypotheses were taken from a factor analysis of the CRPR (Block, 1965). Openness to experience was defined as items 21, 24, 45, and 53 of the CRPR (Appendix B). Open expression of parental feelings was defined as items 18, 34, 40, 42, 58, and 11. Emphasis on achievement was defined as items 2, 17, 33, 59, and 71. Authoritarian control was defined as items 14, 15, 27, 31, 43, 54, 55, 64, and 70. Early training was defined as items 49, 78, and 82. Suppression of sex and affection was defined as items 9, 57, 63, and 86. Encouragement of independence (individuation) was defined as items 1, 6, 22, 26, 41, 67, and 75.

An item inspection of the CRPR and the BSRI was done in order to develop a third measure to assess socialization practices behaviorally. Since Knott & Drost (1970) found a more salient punishment orientation among masculine men, a punishment-reinforcement

paradigm was chosen. Punishment was defined as items 5, 6, 7, and 8 on the modified Fagot (1973) observation shcedule (see Appendix C) and reinforcement (used synonomously with nurturance) was defined as items 1, 2, 3, and 4 on the same schedule. In the analysis, only nurturance was considered since a percentage was calculated and the percent of total statements which was not nurturance was punishment. Therefore, the hypotheses related to nurturance would have simply been stated in the converse for punishment. In addition, competition was defined as the number of times the parent won at ticktacktoe out of a total number of fifteen games played.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Within the last fifteen years the movement for equalitarianism of males and females in American society has been gaining support, growing more active, and getting more results than at any other time in history (Bayer, 1975). During that time, empirical data related to male/female sex-role acquisition, stereotyping, attitudes, and behaviors and their maintenance have increased astronomically.

Hochschild (1973), in an attempt to organize the mass of data, outlined four broad types of research on sex roles. Type I research, being done primarily by psychologists, deals with sex differences and their development whereas the other three types treat sex equality. Type II research originates from a role perspective and is concerned with sex roles, role conflicts and strains, role models, and with the norms that govern these variables. Type III research deals with women as a minority group and reports prejudice, marginality, assimilation, discrimination, and segregation. Type IV is also concerned with women as a minority group, but it focuses on the politics of caste. The emphasis of the present review is on Type I research. Rather than being concerned with sex differences or sex-role correlates per se, this review, as was the one done by Biller and Borstelmann (1967), will be directed to the impact of parent-child relationships on aspects of the development of sex-role differences.

Type I research, dealing with the psychology of sex roles, has been further differentiated by Lynn's (1959) model of sex-role development. Lynn (1959) described three separate but related aspects of sex-role development: (a) sex-role preference, (b) sex-role adoption, and (c) sex-role identification. Sex-role preference represents the desire to adopt behavior traditionally associated with masculinity or femininity and has generally been operationalized by reference to the IT Scale for Children (ITSC) (Brown, 1956) or by toy preference tests (Anastasiow, 1965; DeLucia, 1963; Rabban, 1950). Sex-role adoption represents the behavioral demonstration of the characteristics of masculinity or femininity and has been operationalized by teacher ratings (Freedheim, 1960) and peer ratings (Gray, 1957). There are various definitions of sex-role identification, but in general, it is the incorporation of a sex role and the unconscious responses associated with that role (Lynn, 1959). Sex-role identification has been operationalized by reference to human figure drawings by the subject (Brown & Tolor, 1957). Due to the lack of definitional consistency of the term sex-role identification, Biller and Borstelmann (1967) suggested a substitute term: sex-role orientation. They described sex-role orientation as the way in which one perceives himself in terms of the societal stereotypes of masculinity and femininity.

Researchers have attempted to demonstrate that sex-role acquisition is sequential and to determine the timing and sequencing of sex-role adoption, preference, and identification (Biller, 1968; Biller & Borstelmann, 1967; McCandless, 1967; Thompson & McCandless,

1970; Ward, 1969). Ward (1969) found that role adoption followed role preference in both sexes and that role adoption and identification occurred simultaneously in girls but not in boys. Later Thompson and McCandless (1970) confirmed Ward's finding that sex-role preference preceded sex-role adoption. Although Lynn's (1959) model generated a great deal of research and is therefore considered valuable, this writer believes that the four dimensions of sex-role development suggested by Lynn and Biller and Borstelmann (1959; 1967) are so interdependent that the attempt to tease out the variables associated with each is artificial and futile. Therefore, the present review will do no more than refer to these concepts as points of reference.

There are three major categories of personality theory - psychoanalytic, learning, and humanistic - and each of these will be examined in terms of its contribution to an explanation of sex-role development. First these major theories will be presented, followed by a summary of techniques used to measure masculinity/femininity. Three major psychological processes - modeling, reinforcement, and self-socialization - are suggested by learning theorists (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974) to account for psychological sex-differentiation. Since learning theory is judged to be the most viable area of inquiry, these three major psychological processes will be discussed following the framework presented by Maccoby and Jacklin (1974).

The majority of research and theory in the area of sex-role development has focussed on the process of learning behaviors

considered appropriate for males or females in our society (Biller & Borstelmann, 1967). The present review will go one step farther and report the embryonic research and theory dealing with the concept of androgyny. That research contradicts the traditionally assumed appropriateness of behavioral and personality differentiation based on sex alone and it will be discussed in depth at the end of this review.

Theoretical Explanations of Sex-Role Development

Observable differences in attitudes and behavior of males and females have given rise to a number of theoretical speculations. Explanations advanced by personality theorists have ranged from the instinctually based psychoanalytic theory to a recent statement of John Money (1973) that almost every observable personality difference in males and females is culturally determined and is therefore optional. Money asserted that the hormones secreted before and after birth have less effect on brain and behavior in humans than the chain of events set off at birth with the announcement of the child's sex.

The present intent is to examine various theories and their explanations of sex differences beginning with Psychoanalytic Theory as represented by Freud and proceeding to Neo-Freudian Theory, Learning Theory, and Phenomenological and Humanistic Theory. An evaluation will be made as to the theory which is most reliable in predicting varying attitudes and behavior of the sexes.

Psychoanalytic Theory

Freudian Theory

In psychoanalytic theory, instincts, which are inborn psychological wishes, are considered to be the propelling factors of the personality. Instincts drive behavior and determine the direction that behavior will take (Hall & Lindzey, 1957). Freud based his major theoretical statement concerning sex-role identification on instinctual conflicts. The Oedipus conflict (in the case of males) and the Electra conflict (in the case of females) consists of a sexual cathexis for the opposite-sex parent and a hostile cathexis for the same-sex parent (Hall & Lindzey, 1957). These conflicts peak between the ages of four and six and form the foundation for later sexual identification. This identification with the same-sex parent, produced through the resolution of the Oedipal or Electra complex, is the basis for many psychological differences between the sexes. An inherent bisexuality in every individual complicates these conflicts which are the primary events in the phallic period (Hall & Lindzey, 1957). Freud seemed to see parent-child relationships as a major determinant of sex-role development since it is through his identification with his father that a boy learns to be masculine. However, this identification occurs because the boy fears the father and sees him as an aggressive competitor more than because of an affectionate sort of identification (Biller & Borstelmann, 1967).

Neo-Freudian Theory

Jung contended that sex characteristics are determined through the collective unconscious which is a storehouse of latent memory traces predisposing men and women to react to the world in different ways. His concept of archetypes accounted for the bisexuality of males and females. These archetypes, although influenced by sex chromosomes and glands, are produced through the collective unconscious by man and woman living together throughout the ages. The anima is the feminine archetype in man and the animus is the masculine archetype in women. These archetypes are the cause of similarities between the sexes and account for the masculine traits in women and the feminine traits in men. They also act to increase understanding, as well as misunderstanding, between the sexes.

Horney (Hall & Lindzey, 1957) attacked the Freudian concept that penis envy is the determining factor in the psychology of women. She emphasized a lack of confidence and an overconcentration on the love relationship as highly important in female psychology. Whereas Freud thought that the distinctive personality characteristics of women grew out of a feeling of genital inferiority and jealousy, Horney thought that the psychology of women was induced culturally and had very little to do with anatomy.

Learning Theory

Social Learning Theory

In attempting to reformulate Freudian theory in learning theory terms, Mowrer (1950), distinguished between defensive and developmental identification. Defensive identification is the

same as Freud's identification with the aggressor. Developmental identification is synonomous with Freud's anaclitic identification, which is based on nurturance and a fear of a loss of love. Freud postulated anaclitic identification to explain little girls' identification with their mothers, but Mowrer contended it is applicable to sex-role development in both sexes. Thus the major hypothesis of learning theory is that sex-role development is positively related to the degree of warmth and affection the father or mother gives his or her son or daughter (Biller & Borstelmann, 1967).

Social learning theorists have rejected Freudian explanations for behavioral differences in the sexes and have based their theories of male/female identification on reward and punishment contingencies. Bandura and Walters (1963), Kagan (1964), and Mischel (1966) considered differential reward systems which are established within the family and supported by the culture to be responsible for appropriate modeling behavior. A boy is rewarded for modeling of the father (or other males) and punished for female traits and the girl is rewarded for imitating her mother (Ausubel & Sullivan, 1970).

Dollard and Miller (1950) supported the reward and punishment paradigm. An infant is identified as a boy or a girl at birth and all relationships with others are defined in terms of this sex type. Margaret Mead (1949) suggested that sex typing differs from society to society and is completely arbitrary in nature. Sex specialization of personality in our society begins with male or

female names and clothes, play, and toys, and continues throughout life as a child is led to expect sex rewards from members of the opposite sex for sex-appropriate behavior (Dollard & Miller, 1950).

Cognitive Theory

Kohlberg (1966) criticized the social-learning theory. He maintained that sex-role identification results from the development of a clear concept of maleness and femaleness.

> The social-learning syllogism is: 'I want rewards, I am rewarded for doing boy things, therefore I want to be a boy.' In contrast, a cognitive theory assumes this sequence: 'I am a boy, therefore I want to do boy things, therefore the opportunity to do boy things (and to gain approval for doing them) is rewarding' (Kohlberg, 1966, p. 89).

Sex-role stereotypes develop early as a consequence of perceived bodily differences. Such perceptions are substantiated by visual experience and differential sex assignment (Ausubel & Sullivan, 1970). In a desire to be masculine, a boy will imitate a masculine model (Kohlberg, 1966).

Power Theory

Parsons (1955), in an interesting attempt to combine psychoanalytic and learning theory, proposed a power theory of sexual identification which linked the punishment aspect of Freudian theory with the reward component of learning theory. This theory states that a male perceives his father as having a privileged status, as powerful, punishing, and rewarding. This forms the basis for male sexual conditioning. Parsons' theory is not adequate in explaining sex identification for a girl who should also

perceive the father as more powerful and identify with the father instead of the mother. According to Parsons, the boy identifies with the instrumental role (the instrumental role includes decision-making for the family and limit-setting for the children) of the father, and becomes masculine (Biller & Borstelmann, 1967).

Another power theory is Whiting's (1959) status-envy theory which hypothesized that a young boy will learn masculine behavior if he sees his father as the primary consumer of resources. This theory can be seen as an extension of the Freudian hypothesis of identification with the aggressor (Biller & Borstelmann, 1967). But, again, this theory offers no adequate explanation of the development of femininity in girls, since they, too, would be assumed to identify with the higher status parent if that is a factor in identification.

Phenomenological and Humanistic Theory

The phenomenologists, with their emphasis on the uniqueness of the individual, have avoided making any type of predictions which might be useful in the development and testing of scientific theory. Rogers (1951, as summarized in Shlein, 1963) has suggested that experience is related to the self structure. If experience is significant to the self it is incorporated into the self structure. This is closely related to Kohlberg's cognitive theory. Rollo May (1961, as summarized in Shlein, 1963) has argued against the psychoanalytic theory since, in humanistic theory, man may not be reduced to forces or drives. The phenomenologist believes that

much experience and meaning exists in private worlds, not available to public inspection. Even though humanistic thinking points in the direction of cognitive theory, as opposed to psychoanalytic theory, such a great portion of personality is regarded as unique to an individual that substantive theory building has not been done.

Various neo-Freudians and humanists (Erikson, 1963; Jung, 1956; Maslow, 1962) have implied that the healthy adult (of either sex) will incorporate personality characteristics generally designated as opposite-sex appropriate (Constantinople, 1973). Traditional sex-role stereotypes will cause conflicts if one perceives oneself as a "person", attempting to develop all potentials. Olof Palme, Prime Minister of Sweden, stated a humanistic position in this manner:

> The so-called "sex roles," i.e., the culturally conditioned expectations for an individual on account of sex, act as a sort of uniform which represses the individuality of the child (Palme, 1972, p. 238).

Current research by Bem (1974, 1975, 1976) has supported this humanistic stance in indicating that sex-role stereotyping inhibits behavioral flexibility. Bem argued (1976) that one should be free to be one's own unique blend of temperament and behavior and that one's gender should no longer function as a prison.

Evaluation and Conclusion

Even though Freud's theory gives the most complete explanation of personality differences in the sexes, its emphasis on innate factors has been almost totally rejected by learning theorists (Eysenck is the only notable exception). Although Dollard

and Miller's (1950) translation of psychoanalytic theory into learning terms has lent credence to Freud's theory, a criticism is that it is not empirically based and it has been difficult to design research to test the theory. Another criticism of psychoanalytic theory and Parsons' power theory is that they require different explanations for personality development in girls and boys.

In learning theories the same theoretical stance of reward-punishment contingencies and modeling account for sex-role development in boys and in girls. Money's physiological research has supported the stance taken by learning theorists. Support for the position derives from incidents in which accidents have made it impossible to rear a child according to its genetic sex. In these instances the child has learned to feel, look and act like the opposite sex. Money believes that it is highly unlikely that changes can be made in male and female attitudes and behavior after four years of life since after that age, even serious self-attempts to change produce stress.

Such research has convinced this author that the social learning theorists are on the right track in trying to link various determinants and components into a comprehensive theory of sex-role development. Although motivated by and with implications for a humanistic stance, this dissertation relies on social learning theory. Kohlberg's cognitive or self-socialization theory has appeal, but this writer leans more toward a social learning explanation (differential reinforcement and modeling) of how a child develops the concept of maleness or femaleness than does Kohlberg.

Measurement of Masculinity-Femininity

One problem inherent in the traditional attempts to measure masculinity-femininity (M-F) has been the conceptualization of M-F as if it were bipolar in nature. M-F has traditionally been presented as opposite ends of a continuum with no allowance being made for the possibility of an individual's being masculine on one trait and feminine on another (Biller & Borstelmann, 1967). Secondly, comparisons have often been between-sex rather than within-sex in nature. It is more important to assess individual differences in boys than to infer degrees of masculinity in boys from comparisons with girls.

Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) have indicated a third problem in measuring techniques. In their attempt to ascertain the developmental nature of M-F, they found that an interpretation of the data was complicated by a lack of continuity in the measures employed with adults and children. Direct observations are the measures most often used with children, and paper and pencil tests are most often used with adults. Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) accepted that adult M-F is qualitatively different than childhood M-F, but they suggested that developmental discontinuities may seem to exist simply due to the instruments used to measure M-F. Maccoby and Jacklin contended that an adult's behavior may be part of a plan of action, and thereby not readily amenable to observational measures conducted over a short time span, but they called for a combination of paper and pencil and direct observation

measures. A discussion of the tests used to measure M-F in adults will follow a review of the major tests used to measure M-F in children.

Measurement of Masculinity-Femininity in Children

The categorizational scheme used here is the one suggested by Biller and Borstelmann (1967). Consideration of these measures points to another problem in the use of the terms sex-role preference, sex-role adoption, and sex-role identification. Even the researchers who have developed the instruments cannot agree as to whether their test measures sex-role preference, adoption, or identification.

Measures of Sex-Role Preference

The operationalization of this concept requires exposure to a choice situation where there is a clearly masculine or feminine alternative. This writer believes that a neutral alternative would be a significant addition to the test items reported in the literature.

Rabban (1950) had graduate students and school-age children rate toys as to their M-F. Eight toys (steam roller, dump truck, auto racer, fire truck, soldiers, cement mixer, knife, and gun) were rated as most masculine and eight toys (baby doll, baby buggy, highchair, bathinette, doll dishes, bed, purse, and necklace) were rated as most feminine. The measure of the degree to which a child chose sex-appropriate toys was taken as a measure of sex-preference. There were no sex-neutral choices and so a child was

forced to make a masculine or feminine choice. Anastasiow (1965), DeLucia (1963), and Fauls and Smith (1956) developed similar toy preference tests using pictures instead of the actual toys as objects. One particularly bothersome issue is that DeLucia (1963) asked college students to rate toys on a continuum as most masculine (1), neutral (5), or most feminine (9). Then when she constructed her test, she called items such as a blackboard (5.3), roller skates (5.3), and wading pool (5.0) feminine, and terms such as a rocking horse (4.6), an alphabet ball (4.9), and a banjo (4.5) as masculine when these items received a score which was closer to neutral than to masculine or feminine.

In general, the large body of research indicates that boys choose games and toys related to sports, machines, aggression, speed, and power roles while girls select games and toys related to the home and kitchen, babies, and personal attractiveness. The IT Scale (ITSC; Brown & Tolor, 1957) is the most frequently used test for sex-role preference in children. "It" was drawn as a neuter figure and a child is supposed to project his toy and activity preferences onto the It figure. Despite the fact that It is more often perceived by children to be male rather than female (Hartup & Zook, 1960; Lansky & McKay, 1963), the ITSC has been found to have construct validity (Freedheim, 1960; Hetherington, 1965; Kagan, 1964; Mussen & Rutherford, (1963). When the It figure is enclosed in an envelope or just introduced as a make-believe child (Hartup & Zook, 1960; Lansky & McKay, 1963) there is more variation in scores than when it is presented as originally developed.

In summary, boys have shown an increasing preference for sex-appropriate games with age. Girls' preferences are variable up to nine or ten years of age with many girls showing a strong preference for masculine games, activities, and objects (Kagan, 1964). Rosenberg and Sutton-Smith (1960) found that in 1960 girls were more masculine in game choices than they had been in 1930. The choices of lower-class boys and girls were more sex-typed than choices of middle-class children (Rabban, 1950). This finding corroborates Kohn's (1959) finding that lower-class mothers encouraged sex typing more consistently than did middle-class mothers. This supports the Kagan and Moss (1962) conclusion that there is a positive correlation between the family's educational level and involvement in masculine activities for girls (Kagan, 1964).

Measures of Sex-Role Adoption

Due to the difficulty in specifying the complexity and range of behaviors, few researchers have systematically attempted to measure sex-role adoption in young children. Attempts by Koch (1956) and Sears, Rau, and Alpert (1965) utilized a simple point scale rating measure. Gray (1957) used peer ratings and Sears, et al., (1965) assessed the time spent in sex-typed play areas. Freedheim (1960) used a combination of teacher and peer ratings. Freedheim compared boys with boys so that his measures were not confounded by the assumption of masculinity and femininity as polar opposites. His low-masculine boys really appeared to have

a tendency to withdraw from social activity rather than to be feminine. Sex-role adoption includes a constellation of traits and behaviors. Therefore, accurate assessment must include ratings comprised of a number of different attributes (Biller & Borstelmann, 1967).

Measures of Sex-Role Identification (Orientation)

Even though sex-role preference and sex-role adoption can be ascertained by direct methods, sex-role identification is not easily observable because of defensive operations, later learning, and adherence to social expectations (Biller & Borstelmann, 1967). Therefore indirect or projective instruments have been used such as drawings, imaginative play, or TAT responses. Franck and Rosen (1948) developed the Franck Drawing Test as a response to the difficulty of measurement of sex-role identification. This test uses the elaboration of incomplete line figures to assess M-F. Angles were found to characterize male drawings and curved lines have been found to characterize female drawings. Lansky (1964) has reported this to be a useful technique with adolescents, especially when contrasted with sex-role preference scores (Biller & Borstelmann, 1967). It appears to this writer that the sex of the first human figure drawn (Brown & Tolor, 1957) is a more reasonable measure of an aspect of sex-role identification than the line drawings mentioned above.

Measurement of Masculinity-Femininity in Adults

M-F, like intelligence, has historically been assumed to be somehow inherent in an individual and at least partially determined

by biological factors which restrict potential for change. Although Constantinople's (1973) article pointed out the lack of conceptual clarity, she did not provide definitional clarification. After examination of the major tests of M-F in adults, she summarized:

> The most generalized definitions of the terms as they are used by those developing tests of M-F would seem to be that they are relatively enduring traits which are more or less rooted in anatomy, physiology, and early experience, and which generally serve to distinguish males from females in appearance, attitudes, and behavior (Constantinople, 1973, p. 391).

Constantinople believed that the three aspects of sex-role acquisition (sex-role preference, sex-role adoption, and sex-role identity) underlie and are included in M-F. She perceived the clarification of the three constructs and their interrelationships as an essential prerequisite to defining and measuring M-F.

Basic assumptions of the major tests of M-F examined by Constantinople (1973) are: (1) M-F is best defined by responses to items that consistently allow prediction of the sex of the respondent. (2) M-F is a single bipolar dimension with masculinity at one end and femininity at the other end of the same continuum. (3) M-F is unidimensional and can be measured by a single score. These basic assumptions are untested and are being questioned (Bem, 1974; 1975; 1976; Block, 1973; 1975; Constantinople, 1973), but currently they remain basic to the major tests of M-F.

Terman and Miles: Attitude-Interest Analysis Test (M-F Test)

Terman and Miles (1936) believed that M-F acted as the central core of personality formation. The final form of their test included

seven components: (1) Word Association, (2) Ink-Blot Association, (3) Information, (4) Interests, (5) Introversion, (6) Emotional and Ethical Attitudes, and (7) Opinions. Items were selected on the basis of their yield of statistically significant differences in response of the sexes. Bipolarity was assumed and unidimensionality of M-F as measured by this M-F test. The reliability of the seven scales differed with *rs* ranging from .32 to .90. The validity is hard to determine due to the absence of a clear definition of M-F (Constantinople, 1973).

Strong: Masculinity-Femininity (MF) Scale of the Vocational Interest Blank (SVIB)

Strong (1936) used an approach similar to Terman-Miles except that differences in responses of males and females were not statistically significant. Both tests assumed bipolarity. Strong pointed out the diagnostic limitations of his test since the focus was on occupational interests, not M-F.

Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) Masculinity-Femininity Scale (Mf)

Even though a stated objective of this scale was to measure the M-F (Hathaway & McKinley, 1943) of interest patterning, three major sources stated that it was developed to measure sexual inversion in males. Items on the Mf Scale incorporated items from the original MMPI which discriminated men from women and met several other criteria. Dahlstrom and Welsh (1960) substantiated the multidimensionality of the Mf Scale and identified five dimensions of masculinity-femininity. Also no assumption of bipolarity was made. The fact that mean scores differentiate between the sexes

is an indicator of the validity of the MMPI. But Goodstein (1954) questioned the use of the MMPI with college men since such groups score between one-half to one SD above the mean reported for the total population. Cronbach (1960) in his assessment of the MMPI noted an especial weakness in the Mf Scale.

Gough: The Femininity Scale (Fe)

The final version (Gough, 1952) included fifty-eight items that significantly discriminated between males and females. Later the frequently used Fe scale was reduced to thirty-eight items. Bipolarity of M-F was assumed and multidemensionality is indicated. Support for the validity of the Fe scale is found in correlations of -.41 with the SVIB MF and +.43 with MMPI Mf on samples of males only.

Guilford: The Masculinity Scale (M)

This instrument was developed by Guilford and Guilford (1936) but Guilford and Zimmerman (1956) concluded that it was highly subject to variation due to item content.

Other Measures of Masculinity-Femininity

Adjective checklists (Berdie, 1959; Heilbrun, 1964), a word association test (Goodenough, 1946), and a semantic differential technique (Reece, 1964) represent other attempts to measure M-F Constantinople, 1973). Item selection in these additional tests was based on the differential response patterns of the two sexes. Goodenough was the only one of these other tests which attended to the bipolarity problem and none attempted to deal with the issue of dimensionality (Constantinople, 1973).

Since the Constantinople (1973) review, a new test, the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) has been developed in an attempt to deal with the problem of bipolarity of M-F. It includes a masculinity and a femininity scale and the items were selected on the basis of socially desirable sex-typed personality characteristics. A personality characteristic was judged to be masculine if it were independently rated by males and females as being significantly more desirable for males than for females (Bem, 1974). The test-retest reliability is high (r >.90 for masculinity, femininity, and androgyny). It is not highly correlated with either the California Psychological Inventory or the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey indicating that the BSRI is tapping an aspect of sex roles not tapped by the other two scales.

Other concerns in measuring sex differences and sex-role development include: (1) rater shifts due to differing reference points which should minimize sex differences where they do exist, (2) unclear definitions, (3) selective rater perceptions due to pervading stereotypes, (4) a shift from naturalistic observations in children to experimental studies in adults, (5) a shift from observational data for children to self-report in adults, (6) ages are over- or under-represented and methods of measurement change complicating a developmental analysis of data (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974). In addition, Maccoby and Jacklin point out that sex differences may be greater in some subgroups of men and women.

Sex-Typing and the Etiology of Sex Differences

In its narrowest sense, sex-typed behavior is sex-appropriate role behavior (Sears et al., 1965). McCandless (1967) thought of sex-typing as sex-role adoption, as imitative behavior which is accompanied psychologically by sex-role identification. In the social learning view (Mischel, 1966) sex-typing is the process through which an individual acquires sex-typed behavior patterns. Sex-typed behaviors are defined as behaviors that usually elicit different consequences for one sex than for the other.

Recent research (DeLucia, 1963; Hartup & Zook, 1960; Rabban, 1950) supported earlier research in demonstrating that both sexes are sex-typed at nursery school age and that starting at about age four, boys become more sex-typed than girls avoiding sex-inappropriate activities and choosing sex-appropriate activities more often than girls. There are clear indications that boys and girls choose stereotypically masculine and feminine toys and activities as early as observations have been made (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974). Before the age of three a child develops gender constancy with respect to self, begins to value what he perceives as similar to self, becomes motivated to adopt his own sex role and to avoid deviations from it. Hartup and Zook (1960) found that four-year-old boys scored more masculine on the ITSC than did three-year-old boys, and this increasing masculinity continued until age eleven in boys. Mussen (1961) found sex-typing of traits to be stable in individuals from childhood to adulthood.

Sears and colleagues (1965) found that four-year-old boys spent more time with blocks, wheel toys, and carpenter tools while girls spent more time in the housekeeping area. Brown (1956) found that girls more often preferred dolls and dishes and that boys more often preferred guns and the earthmover. Terman and Miles (1936) found that girls played with dolls and cooked and played house while boys chose to work with machinery or to shoot. In his review of the literature, Kagan (1964) delineated the following as sex-typed: (1) greater conformity among girls, (2) physical attributes, (3) skill and interest in gross motor and mechanical tasks for boys and fine motor and handicraft tasks for girls, (4) greater encouragement of affiliation and nurturance for girls (Goodenough, 1957; Hildreth, 1945; Terman & Miles, 1936).

Sex-typed differences in the toy and activity preferences in young children are well-substantiated (see Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974, pp. 280-283 for a summary table). But how do these and other sex differences develop and how are they maintained? Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) concluded that four kinds of processes exert direct influence and interact to influence the development of sex differences: genetic factors, imitation or modeling, differential reinforcement or shaping by socialization agents, and self-socialization. Each one of these processes will be reviewed following the format introduced by Maccoby and Jacklin (1974). Due to the extensiveness and the inconsistency of the literature in many of these areas, it was thought that a consideration of the broad

hypotheses and their substantiation in the Maccoby and Jacklin review would be more appropriate to the present review than would an article by article review. Since the differential socialization literature is most relevant to the current study, that section will be scrutinized more carefully.

Biological Factors

Biological factors have been clearly implicated in the greater aggression and visual-spatial ability in men and boys. In support of the biological influence on aggression are: (1) the responsiveness of aggression to sex hormones, (2) the cross-cultural universality, (3) the manifestation of this sex difference in humans and in subhuman primates. In addition there is no evidence that adults reinforce boys' aggression more than girls' aggression. Serbin, O'Leary, Kent, and Tonick (1973) observed fifteen female teachers and their nursery school students and found that boys exhibited more aggressive behaviors and that teachers were more likely to scold boys for aggressive behaviors than they were to scold girls for the same behaviors. Sears, Maccoby, and Levin (1957) interviewed mothers and found that they said they permitted boys to verbalize aggression toward parents. They also told interviewers that they allowed boys more aggression with their peers and encouraged them to fight back. Girls were reported as having more prosocial aggression. The Sears et al. (1965) findings have not been confirmed by observational data and Maccoby and Jacklin concluded that there is no evidence to support the hypothesis (Mischel, 1966) that parents differentially reinforce children's aggression.

Genetic studies have contributed the evidence for the biological control of visual-spatial ability in boys. There is evidence for a recessive sex-linked gene which contributes to high spatial ability. Approximately fifty percent of men and twenty-five percent of women manifest this phenotypically (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974).

Even with genetic factors implicated in these two areas of sex differentiation, Maccoby & Jacklin (1974) were quick to point out that aggressive behavior is certainly to a great degree learned, only boys are more biologically prepared to learn it. In addition visual-spatial ability has a large learned component. Therefore socializing agents, including parents, teachers, peer groups, and relatives can socialize children in such a way as to exaggerate and emphasize or to decrease and deemphasize such differences. Goldberg (1973) argued that socializing agents should go with nature and emphasize differences whereas Maccoby and Jacklin and others (Bem, 1974; 1975; 1976; Block, 1973; Rossi, 1964) suggested that we socialize children to decrease and deemphasize the differences.

The Role of Modeling

The major reviews and summaries of research in sex-role development have emphasized the role of imitation and identification (Kagan, 1964; Kohlberg, 1966; Mischel, 1970; Mussen, 1969; Sears et al., 1965). Mischel (1966) referred to modeling as observational learning. Maccoby and Jacklin have suggested four hypotheses which may explain the role of modeling in the acquisition of sex-typed behaviors.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis I. Imitation must be a factor in sex-role acquisition since differential reinforcement could not alone account for the rate and range of the development (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974).

Hypothesis II. Since parents are powerful, nurturant, and available, they will be most often copied in sex-role acquisition.

Hypotheses I and II are not sufficient to explain sex-role acquisition through modeling but it has been demonstrated that children imitate the more powerful model and choose the more nurturant model when other things are equal (Bandura & Huston, 1961; Hetherington, 1965; Hetherington & Frankie, 1967). However, this would not explain the differential sex-role acquisition of boys and girls since it would imply that within the same family each child would choose the same model-whichever parent is most powerful and nurturant (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974).

To summarize, observational learning does occur and children do learn through imitation of their parents. The problem is why boys and girls learn different things when exposed to the same parents. Freud said that the boy's identification is with the aggressor while the girl's is based on nurturance, but this is merely a restatement of the problem rather than an explanation. Power theories also fail to explain differences since in imitating the most powerful figure, children of the same family would choose the same model. In an attempt to account for this discrepancy, Maccoby and Jacklin advanced two additional hypotheses.

Hypothesis III. Children are exposed to same-sex models more often than to cross-sex models. Lynn (1959; 1964; 1966) argued that both sexes are exposed to the mother more frequently than to the father at an early age. Therefore, the child makes an initial, non-sex-typed identification with the mother (Heilbrun, 1965). This facilitates the girl's later sex-appropriate identification and is a disadvantage for the boy since he must later transfer his identification from his mother to his father. Kohlberg (1966) believed that no age-related shift occurs in the internal dynamics of the family to provide for this subsequent identification of the boy.

There is no clear evidence that a preschool boy spends more time with his father than does a girl. Children tend to select same-sex peers for play, but opposite-sex children are usually available too. Children watch television for large amounts of time and may certainly acquire a stereotyped view of the male and female roles which may not correspond in any way to the real roles of their fathers and mothers. However, girls and boys have the same opportunities to see the stereotyped television roles. In other words, there are many models of both sexes available for young children. Therefore Hypothesis III is not sufficient to account for the differential sex-role development of girls and boys.

Hypothesis IV. Children imitate models they perceive as similar to themselves, therefore they will imitate same-sex models

more often than cross-sex models (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974). Kohlberg (1966) argued that young children (before 5 or 6 years of age) do not selectively imitate the same-sex models.

Summary and Evaluation

Children do not develop androgynously as they would if they were imitating both parents indiscriminately. Even though modeling may be a primary factor in the acquisition of a behavioral repertoire, it seems unrelated to the performance of sex-typed behaviors. Performance of appropriate behaviors must involve other factors such as (1) eliciting conditions (gifts of appropriate toys, etc.) and (2) a belief that an action is appropriate for oneself (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974).

> To be as explicit as possible, we suggest that (a) the modeling process is crucial in the acquisition of a wide repertoire of potential behaviors, but this repertoire is not sex-typed to any important degree; (b) knowledge of what behavior is appropriate is crucial in the selection of what items will be used in performance out of the repertoire of potential actions (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974, p. 301).

But what factors contribute to the person's decision that one behavior is "appropriate" while another is not? Mischel (1970) held that the determining factor is the reinforcement history of the individual. Sex-typing would be a result of direct differential reinforcement of sex-appropriate behaviors. Kohlberg (1966) contended that sex-typing is dependent upon cognitive growth, upon the child's growing understanding of sex-role content and his sexual identity as culturally prescribed. Kohlberg's (1966) theory incorporated Mischel's theory but was not encompassed by it.

Mischel's differential reinforcement theory will be considered first and then Kohlberg's self-socialization theory will be presented.

Differential Socialization

It has been generally accepted by professionals and lay persons that parents differentially socialize boys and girls consistent with cultural definitions of sex-roles. Maccoby and Jacklin have suggested four hypotheses which may contribute to differential socialization.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis I. Parents shape appropriate sex-typed behavior in children. This includes negative and positive reinforcement (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974).

Hypothesis II. Boys and girls shape parents due to innate behavioral differences (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974).

Hypothesis III. Parents may treat boys and girls differently due to their own stereotyped idea of what a boy or girl is like (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974).

Hypothesis IV. A parent treats a cross-sex child differently than a same-sex child (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974).

Explication of Findings

In order to assess the four hypotheses, Maccoby and Jacklin summarized and evaluated the research in eleven different areas. No systematic differences were found in the total amount of interaction between parents and girls or boys, even though there was a trend for parents to stimulate gross motor activity more in boys. No differences were found in parental response to the child's

sexuality. Inconsistent findings characterized the amounts of verbal interaction, reactions to aggression, and pressures for achievement between parents and boys and girls. Little or no evidence of sex-differentiated behavior was reported with respect to parental warmth and nurturance, restrictiveness, and reactions to dependency. Significant differences in parental behaviors as a function of sex of child were found in three areas. Parents placed more pressure on boys in their encouragement of sex-typed behavior. Parents used physical and non-physical negative reinforcement more often with boys. Parents used more praise and other positive reinforcers with boys (Block, 1975).

Maccoby and Jacklin concluded that it is only in the area of sex-typing as narrowly defined that parents differentially socialize boys and girls. In addition, boys are more intensely socialized than girls. Block (1975) suggested that, even narrowly defined, sex-typing behaviors have wide implications for sex-role development in children.

For example, researchers cited data from field studies in six cultures which demonstrated that girls were more often assigned responsibilities at an earlier age than boys. Boys were assigned tasks away from the home and were given responsibility for feeding and herding animals. Due to these differences in responsibilities, girls interacted more often with adults and infants while boys interacted significantly more often with peers (Whiting & Edwards, 1975).

Maccoby and Jacklin noted that little observation of parental sex-typing pressures has been done in the earliest portions of children's lives and that fathers have been excluded from the studies that were done. Jacklin, Maccoby, and Dick (1973) made available a variety of toys in a playroom. Observations indicated that mothers did not offer different toys to boys than to girls. The children's toy choices were differentiated by sex, but the mothers' were not. However, the most sex-typed toys were not available in the room. The suggestion was made that parents may buy sex-typed toys for their children and that these purchases would have wide effects since they would remain a part of the child's environment for some time. Rheingold and Cook (1975) studied the contents of children's rooms and found that boys were given toys directed away from the home (vehicles, sports equipment, military toys) and that girls were given toys for activities directed toward the home (cooking and cleaning items, dolls). In these findings Rheingold and Cook corroborated Whiting's cross-cultural data that girls' activities are directed toward the home and that boys' activities are directed away from home.

Hartup, Moore, and Sager (1963) found that boys were more likely to avoid sex-inappropriate toys than were girls and this was especially true when an experimenter was present. This was interpreted to mean that boys had been previously subjected to more socialization pressure than had girls. Direct evidence on parental sex-typing is available from studies by Lansky (1967), Fling and Manosevitz (1972) and Fagot (1974).

Lansky (1967) presented parents of preschool children with hypothetical situations wherein boys or girls chose a sex-stereotyped activity. Neither mothers nor fathers were especially concerned when girls chose a boy activity. But both fathers and mothers reacted strongly when boys chose a girl activity and fathers were more negative in their reactions than were mothers. Fling and Manosevitz (1972) asked parents to make ITSC choices for their nursery-school children. Both mothers and fathers chose more sex-appropriate activities for sons than they did for daughters. Both parents reported in interviews that they more strongly discouraged sex-inappropriate behaviors in sons than in daughters. Both studies sustain the Hartup and Moore interpretation that more social pressure against inappropriate sex-typing is directed at boys than at girls (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974). Fagot (1974) compared fathers and mothers in twelve homes of toddlers (six boys and six girls). She hypothesized that mothers and fathers play different roles and that these roles vary with the sex of the child. Fagot found that both parents praised girls more often than boys and criticized girls more but mothers gave the girls more praise and criticism than did fathers. Boys were more often left to play alone, but both parents were also more likely to join boys at play. Mothers physically punished both sexes more than fathers. So in this more comprehensive observational study, boys were not found to receive more intense socialization pressure than girls.

Evaluation of Hypotheses

Hypothesis I - Sex-typed Shaping. The survey of research showed very little differentiation of parental behavior according to the sex of the child. However, in the narrow area of sex-typing, parents were found to dress the sexes differently and provide sex-typed toys for them (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974). Block (1975) suggested that this finding has extensive implications for differential development. Parents were also found to discourage children, especially boys, from engaging in cross-sex activities.

Hypothesis II - Different Eliciting Qualities of Children. Moss (1967) found that at three weeks of age, the more the infant cried, the more the mother interacted with it. Moss suggested that the infant was controlling the mother. At the age of three months, a girl's irritability was still positively related to the amount of mother-child interaction, but the converse was true for boys. Moss hypothesized that female infants were more easily quieted than were male infants, thus reinforcing the mother's nurturant behavior. Since Maccoby and Jacklin found no evidence to indicate that girls are more easily quieted than boys, they suggested that this hypothesis is untenable. Maccoby and Jacklin concluded that there are not many initial biologically based behavioral differences strong enouch to elicit differential reactions from caretakers.

Hypothesis III - Parents' Stereotyped Conceptions. Few studies have directly asked parents how they believe the two sexes differ. Lambert, Yackley, and Hein (1971) modified Rothbart

and Maccoby's (1966) Perception and Expectation scale for administration to parents. They found that the parents thought that the typical behavior of boys and girls was different on many items, but parents thought that the two sexes "should" behave in very similar ways. Girls were thought to be more helpful, neater, cleaner, quieter, more reserved, sensitive, well mannered, and more easily frightened than boys. But parents valued the same positive behavioral traits for boys and girls.

The Lambert et al. (1971) study and a similar one done by Smith (1971) indicated that parents wanted the same behaviors for boys and girls, but they believed that they were starting from different points with boys and girls. To date there is not enough evidence to determine whether parents direct stronger socialization pressures to one sex than to the other based on their beliefs about behaviors "natural" for one sex. In two categories of behavior, dependency and aggression, boys and girls are treated quite similarly. Even though aggression is thought to be more typical for boys, parents don't treat them differently (according to Maccoby and Jacklin's 1974 evaluation).

Another hypothesis related to this issue is that since parents expect aggressive behavior from boys, they will be more likely to define an ambiguous action as aggressive if performed by a girl. Meyer and Sobieszek (1972) studied this issue showing videotapes of young children's behavior to adults. The children on the tapes were androgynous in appearance and some adults were told that the

child was a girl whereas other adults were told that the child was a boy. The viewers were asked to rate the child on a series of sex-typed traits such as independence, aggressiveness, confidence, cooperativeness, shyness, and affection. Behaviors tended to be especially noticed when the observer thought they ran opposite to sex-role stereotypes. However, this perceptual adaptation hypothesis does not provide an explanation for differential sex-role development since each sex will be rewarded for desirable behavior when it is seen as unusual (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974).

Hypothesis IV - Cross-Sex and Same-Sex Effects. Since most of the research has involved mothers, it is difficult to determine cross-sex or same-sex effects. However, studies that have been done have revealed some interesting results. Fathers tended to tolerate aggression more from daughters, and mothers from sons. Rothbart and Maccoby (1966) found mothers as more supportive of dependency in sons and fathers as more supportive of dependency in daughters, but Lambert et al. (1971) could not replicate this finding. However, if one parent is differentiating between boys and girls in a sex-typed direction and the other parent is differentiating in the opposite direction, the situation still does not explain the development of different behaviors in each sex (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974).

Self-Socialization

Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) concluded that the self-socialization explanation of the development of sex differences in boys

and girls most clearly fits the accumulated data. This position has been delineated by Kohlberg (1966) and is summarized in this manner:

> Through self-socialization: the child first develops a concept of what it is to be male or female, and then, once he has a clear understanding of his own sex identity, he attempts to fit his own behavior to his concept of what behavior is sex-appropriate. Of course, the third process calls upon the other two. A child's conception of what is appropriate behavior for a male or female will depend both upon what he sees males and females doing and upon the approval or disapproval that these actions elicit differentially from others. Both of these kinds of events constitute information the child can draw upon in building his concept of sex-appropriate behavior (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974, pp. 1-2).

Kohlberg stressed that sex-typed behavior arises from a set of organized rules which a child has induced from what he has seen and has been told. This conception of sexual identity changes with intellectual growth and undergoes a developmental progression which parallels other aspects of conceptual growth.

Critique

The reputation of Maccoby and Jacklin is unquestioned. They reported their confirmation of a null hypothesis in the area of parental differences in the socialization of boys and girls with caution. For these reasons, their evaluation will most likely stand and have broad implications for future research, theory building, and even social policy (Block, 1975). Therefore, before the conclusions are accepted as law, Block (1975) recommended a closer examination of the empirical assumptions.

For one thing, parents were found to "shape" children's behavior in sex-appropriate ways such as differential dressing,

assignment of chores, toy choices, and encouragement of sex-typed interests. Block believed that these factors have wide implications in terms of child-rearing. Giving a young girl a nurse kit rather than a doctor kit seems to be a small thing, but it may have significant implications for her future choice of an "appropriate" occupation. In addition these parental shaping behaviors provide gender labeling for the child around which a sex-role definition is later constructed (Block, 1975).

Theoretical and Methodological Issues

Block (1975) believed that certain theoretical and methodological deficiencies (not so much in the Maccoby and Jacklin work, but in the research reviewed by them) contributed to a premature acceptance of the null hypothesis of no differences in childrearing practices as a function of sex. First, research has tended to be ex post facto. Second, studies have depended upon global concepts, sometimes obscuring important data. Along with this, Maccoby and Jacklin categorized studies globally, contributing to increased variance in the data they examined. Third, age-related comparisons have not been done very often and when they were done changes in instrumentation confounded the findings. Fourth, parental behavior is situational, and changes over time which would reflect this dynamic behavior have not been studied. Fifth, Maccoby and Jacklin examined the null hypothesis primarily in terms of the research done with children age six and under. Sixth, fathers have been excluded from studies. Seventh, studies differing widely

in statistical power were weighted equally in the Maccoby and Jacklin review. Small sample sizes, unreliable instruments, and lack of construct validity also reduced the power of the studies reviewed (Block, 1975).

Block (1975) developed an instrument to evaluate child-rearing orientations. She collected data from seventeen independent samples which included 696 mothers, 548 fathers, and 1,227 young adults. Her instrument was administered to parents whose children ranged in age from three to twenty. Block found evidence for differential socialization of males and females. She found that sex-related socialization emphases are constant as perceived by mothers, fathers, sons, and daughters. There was consistent evidence of specific sex-of-parent and sex-of-child effects. There was some evidence that sex differences in socialization increase with the age of the child. There was consistency in sex-related socialization practices across socioeconomic and educational levels and cross-culturally. There was evidence that students perceive similarities in maternal child-rearing practices and that these were cross-culturally consistent. There was evidence that various countries differ in terms of emphases on sex-role differences.

Differential Socialization of Sons

Block (1975) found that parents emphasized achievement and competition more for sons than for daughters. They more often encouraged the control of the expression of affect in sons. Parents encouraged more independence and personal responsibility for males.

Fathers were more authoritarian, stricter, more punitive, and less tolerant of aggression with boys than with girls. Mothers encouraged conformity more in sons than in daughters.

Differential Socialization of Daughters

Block found parents to provide more warmth and physical closeness to daughters than to sons. Mothers and fathers trusted daughters more than sons. They expected ladylike behavior from daughters and discouraged rough and tumble games and fighting. Parents were less likely to punish daughters than sons. Mothers tended to restrict and supervise daughters more than sons. Parents encouraged daughters more than sons to wonder and think about life.

In Block's view there is extensive evidence for differential socialization when global concepts are articulated, when older children are studied, and when fathers are studied. She suggested that modification of socialization practices could lead to an androgynous socialization which would expand the range of human behavior available to each sex.

Androgyny

Dictionaries often define the term androgyny (from "andro" male, and "gyne" female) as "both male and female in one." An androgynous society would be one in which there were no stereotyped behavioral differences between males and females originating from categorizations based on sex alone (Bem, 1975; Osofsky, 1972). Somatic androgyny, or similarity of body build, was used as an independent variable in the literature as early as 1949. Bayley explored the relationship between somatic androgyny

(based on three independent ratings from rear-view body photographs) and Kuder Masculinity-Femininity interest scores. The only significant finding was that boys rated as "masculine" and "hypermasculine" in physique had Kuder interest scores that were less masculine than other boys. This was significant at the .02 level of confidence. Bayley concluded that masculinity-femininity of interests did not follow the direction expected from physical sex variations in normal adolescents (Bayley, 1949). A possible explanation is that boys who look hypermasculine don't have to act hypermasculine in order to prove their masculinity whereas boys who look feminine think that they must act masculine to demonstrate their masculinity.

After Bayley's (1949) report, androgyny as a variable essentially disappeared from the literature until it reappeared in the early 1970's in speculative (Osofsky & Osofsky, 1972), theoretical (Block, 1973), and research (Bem, 1974; 1975; 1976) articles. Perhaps the reason for the disappearance of androgyny in the literature was due to the lack of fruitfulness of somatic androgyny as a research concept. Note that the psychological androgyny which is currently receiving attention is closely related to the Kuder Masculinity-Femininity score which was Bayley's dependent variable. The resurgence of interest in psychological androgyny as an alternate to traditional sex-role stereotyping of individuals can be attributed to two factors: (1) Assertions (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974; Money, 1973) that in human beings, at least, almost every difference between males and females, is culturally determined and

therefore optional; and, (2) The questioning of traditional stereotypes and push for equalitarianism of males and females begun by the women's liberation movement (Bayer, 1975; Bazin & Freeman, 1974; Gelpi, 1974; Harris, 1974; Rossi, 1964; Secor, 1974).

Before androgyny can seriously be considered as an alternative, the extent to which male/female behavior is genetically programmed, and thus resistant to change, must be determined. Money (1973) through his research on hormones and Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) in their extensive review of the literature set out to determine just what differences between males and females are genetically determined. A brief overview of the findings from Money and Maccoby and Jacklin is presented here to indicate the extent to which an androgynous society is possible.

Money (1973) asserted that there are only four imperative differences between men and women: men impregnate and women menstruate, gestate, and lactate. He has come to believe that almost all sex differences are cultural. Despite the overwhelming evidence that the environment is primary in molding sex roles, Money cautioned feminists that there can be little significant breakdown of sex-role stereotypes (leading to an androgynous society) in the current generation since few changes in male-female attitudes and behaviors can be made after the early conditioning (before age four).

Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) have determined only four well established sex differences. First, girls do seem to have greater verbal ability than boys. At about age 11, females begin to diverge from boys in terms of increases in receptive and productive

language. Girls excel on high-level verbal tasks including comprehension and lower-level tasks such as fluency. The female advantage is most often approximately one-quarter of a standard deviation. Second, boys excel in visual-spatial ability beginning in adolescence and continuing into adulthood. This advantage increases to about .40 of a standard deviation over girls. Third, boys begin to excel in mathematics at about ages 12 to 13 and this difference does not seem to be accounted for totally by the number of math courses taken by boys. The magnitude of this difference varied from population to population. Fourth, males are more aggressive both physically and verbally. This difference may be observed in all cultures and begins at age two to two and one-half. The primary victims of the aggression are other males rather than females.

If one can accept that scientists such as Money and Maccoby and Jacklin have done their work carefully, androgyny does seem to be a viable area of inquiry. Two problems remain however with the research that is being done in the field. By self-admission, some of the researchers who are working in the area of sex-role stereotypes are biased.

> I consider myself an empirical scientist, and yet my interest in sex roles is and has always been frankly political. My hypotheses have derived from no formal theory, but rather from a set of strong intuitions about the debilitating effects of sex-role stereotyping, and my major purpose has always been a feminist one: to help free the human personality from the restricting prison of sex-role stereotyping and to develop a conception of mental health which is free from culturally imposed definitions of masculinity and femininity (Bem, 1976, p.1).

The research tradition in science has emphasized its value-free nature. Hypotheses which contain value judgements are untestable (Helmstadter, 1970). Even though Bem (1974; 1975; 1976) has been careful to exclude hypotheses which contain value judgements, her writing and thinking is so blatantly value-laden that one may question her research as to its biases.

The second problem has to do with the situational specificity of behavior. Recently, Mischel (1966; 1974) has taken the position that individuals do not possess consistent traits but instead display situationally varying behaviors. The opposite position has been taken by Allport (1966). Allport, expressing the long-dominant position in personality research, asserted that individuals may be characterized by consistent, relatively invariant traits which are stable across situations. The research on masculinity-femininity is definitely based in the trait psychology tradition and therefore may be questioned by some persons.

Despite these problems, research into sex-role development is crucial at this time. A recent newsletter of the Society for Research in Child Development (Huston-Stein, 1976) laments the dearth of contemporary research in the area of sex-role development in children. Especially cited is the lack of research on androgyny in children. Huston-Stein emphasized the current need to determine how and when children learn sex-role definitions and if and when they learn to go beyond stereotypes. Huston-Stein encouraged the social learning research approach to sex-role learning to

determine how children learn androgyny. She called for an examination of child-rearing practices, peer influences, school atmospheres, and the mass media to determine the means of transmitting non-stereotypical behavior.

In addressing the issue of values and science, Huston-Stein asserted that the sex-role research done to date is biased in a traditional way. Traditional sex roles were treated as desirable and the development of appropriate masculinity in boys and femininity in girls was supported as necessary for normal development. Huston-Stein argued that neither the earlier nor the more recent research into sex-role development was anchored in objective or scientific criteria. The assumptions in both instances grew out of widespread societal values and theory and research were shaped to conform to the values. Huston-Stein concluded that there is no such thing as a culture-free theory or piece of research and therefore no such thing as pure objectivity. The best we can expect to do is to be alert to the biases that arise and attempt to account for them in the interpretation of data.

The next portion of the literature review will summarize the major theoretical and empirical work in the study of androgyny.

Theoretical Framework and Empirical Substantiation

Block (1973) suggested a model (Table 1) of sex-role development extrapolated from the work of Loevinger (1966, 1970). She asserted that a study of sexual identity should not follow the traditional lines of inquiry. In traditional inquiries one determines what is appropriate behavior for males and appropriate

TABLE 1

Loevinger's Milestones of Ego Development and Extrapolations to Sex-Role Development

Loevinger's milestone of ego development				Sex-role development extrapolated
Stage	Impulse control	Interpersonal style	Conscious concerns	Conceptions of sex-role
Presocial/ symbiotic		Autistic, symbiotic	Self versus nonself	
Impulse-ridden	Impulse-ridden, fear of retaliation	Exploitive, dependent	Sexual and aggressive bodily feelings	Development of gender identity, self-assertion, self-expression, self-interest
Self-protective (formerly opportunistic)	Expedient, fear of being caught	Exploitive, manipulative, wary	Advantage, control, protection of self	Extension of self, self-extension, self-enchancement
Conformity	Conformity to external rule	Reciprocal, superficial	Things, appearance, reputation, self-acceptance	Conformity to external role, development of sex-role stereotypes, bifurcation of sex-roles
Conscientious	Internalized rules, guilt	Intensive, responsive	Differentiated inner feelings, motives, self-respect	Examination of self as sex-role exemplar vis-à-vis internalized values

TABLE 1

Loevinger's Milestones of Ego Development and Extrapolations to Sex-Role Development

page 2

Loevinger's milestone of ego development				Sex-role development extrapolated
Stage	Impulse control	Interpersonal style	Conscious concerns	Conceptions of sex-role
Autonomous	Coping with conflict, toleration of differences	Intensive concern for autonomy	Differentiated inner feelings, role concepts, self-fulfillment	Differentiation of sex-role, coping with conflicting masculine-feminine aspects of self
Integrated	Reconciling inner conflicts, renunciation of unattainable	Cherishing of individuality	All of the above plus identity	Achievement of individually defined sex-role, integration of both masculine and feminine aspects of self, androgynous sex-role definition

behavior for females and then sets out to determine how boys and girls learn behavior "appropriate" to their respective sex. A basic assumption of Block's model is that the ultimate in development of sexual identity is a secure gender identity allowing an individual to manifest human qualities appropriate to either sex. Whereas nurturance in a male and aggressiveness in a female would once have been labelled unmanly or unwomanly, Block's assumption was that there should no longer be differentiation on the basis of sex.

Block saw gender as being too sophisticated a concept for the infant in the presocial stage. Essentially sexless primitive notions of gender identity are established at the impulse-ridden level. The development of sex-role stereotypes takes place at the conformity level of development. The conformity level is a critical period in the acquisition of sex-role definition. At the conscientious level of development sex-role definitions are modified by ideas of responsibility and duty. At the autonomous level awareness occurs that certain values, predispositions and behaviors depart from traditional sex-role definitions, and the individual must integrate these departures with his/her sex-role definition. At the integrated level of development the individual combines feminine and masculine traits and values to develop an androgynous self-definition, even though at this point he/she is still aware of society's stereotypes. According to this model, the learning of sex-role stereotypes is a necessary stage of development before an individual can progress through the subsequent stages to androgyny.

Concepts necessary for the understanding of Block's (1973) theory are those of agency and communion which she adopted from Bakan (1966). Agency and communion are fundamental modalities of all living forms. Agency is concerned with the protection, assertion, and expansion of self. Communion is concerned with the articulation of oneself with a system of organisms of which one is a part. According to the model, the conformity level of

development is a critical period wherein boys learn to control affect and girls learn to control aggression. This demonstrates how boys grow to be agentic while girls grow to be communal. In a few individuals, at the highest developmental stage, the two modalities of agency and communion will be integrated to form the androgynic personality. In support of this hypothesis, decreases in sex-role stereotyping have been shown to be correlated with age, educational level, and socioeconomic class (Constantinople, 1973; Kagan, 1964). Bakan (1966) suggested that agency is characteristic of capitalistic societies and Block's (1973) cross-cultural data substantiated this.

Block's cross-cultural data indicated that three primary dimensions distinguished American child-rearing values from the practices in Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, and England. Americans placed significantly greater emphasis on early, clear sex-typing and competitive achievement. Significantly less emphasis was placed on the control of American male aggression. American child-rearing practices fostered agency and tended to magnify culturally given differences between the sexes.

Implications of these theoretical propositions and empirical investigations for the sex-role socialization of children are: (1) The American emphasis on male machismo and female docility impedes mature development. Children are socialized early into culturally defined appropriate roles and are discouraged from introspection and self-evaluation of stereotypes. (2)

Significant personal costs accrue to each sex when the narrowly defined sex-role socialization is successful (Block, 1973; Naffziger & Naffziger, 1974; Hirsch, 1974).

Empirical Investigations of Androgyny

The concept of androgyny has received a lot of attention recently (see the bibliography compiled by Bazin, 1974) and Women's Studies devoted an issue to "The Androgyny Papers." However, only three published empirical studies deal directly with the concept. To date the published research consists of three articles by Bem (1974, 1975a, 1976a) and two summary articles by the same author (Bem, 1975b, 1976b). Each of the studies will be summarized here.

The Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) was developed (1974) in order to operationalize the concept of androgyny and to provide a tool for the distinction of androgynous individuals from sex-typed individuals. On this scale both masculinity and femininity represent positive behavioral domains. Upon administration of the inventory to more than 1500 undergraduates, it was determined that about fifty percent were "appropriately" sex-typed, about fifteen percent were cross sex-typed, and thirty-five percent were androgynous.

Bem (1975) studied two stereotypically masculine behaviors as a beginning to research on androgynous persons; the "masculine" behaviors were independence and assertiveness. Bem hypothesized that androgynous persons would be more likely to exhibit situational sex-role adaptability without regard to the

sex-appropriateness of the behavior, and she designed two experiments to test this hypothesis.

In the first experiment (Bem, 1975a), nine masculine, nine androgynous, and nine feminine subjects of each sex were tested on a typical conformity study of humor. The masculine and androgynous subjects conformed on fewer trials than did feminine subjects (t=3.27, $p \leq .01$). The masculine and androgynous subjects did not differ from each other on the amount of conformity.

In the second experiment (Bem, 1975), thirty-three male and thirty-three female undergraduates (one-third of the subjects of each sex were masculine, one-third androgynous, and one-third feminine as determined by the BSRI) were solicited for an experiment on "mood".

After a counterfeit task used to equalize mood, each subject was instructed to interact with a kitten. After another task, each subject was given an opportunity to do a free choice of activities while the kitten was available in the room. Feminine and androgynous males played with the kitten more (t=3.39, $p \leq .002$) than did masculine males and reported more enjoyment of the play than did masculine males. Contrary to expectation, feminine females interacted less with the kitten than did androgynous females (t=2.08, $p < .05$). Masculine females interacted more with the kitten on free play than did feminine females (t=2.11, $p < .05$), but not in forced play.

The hypothesis that androgynous persons would be more likely than nonandrogynous persons to display behavioral

flexibility was confirmed. Masculine males exhibited masculine independence (on the conformity measure) but not feminine playfulness (with the kitten) and the converse was true for feminine males. The masculine and androgynous females displayed greater independence, but the amount of playfulness of the masculine females did not bear out the hypothesis. Another contradictory finding was that feminine females did not display playfulness with the kitten. Consistent, though, was the finding that feminine females did not display independence on the conformity measure (Bem, 1975).

A second series of experiments (Bem & Lenney, 1976) was designed to test two hypotheses: (1) Sex-typed individuals will choose sex-appropriate activities and will resist sex-inappropriate activities even when they will receive more money for the sex-inappropriate activity. (2) Sex-typed persons will experience discomfort and loss of esteem when they are required to perform cross-sex behavior.

Twenty-four sex-typed, twenty-four androgynous, and twenty-four sex-reversed members of each sex were asked to choose activities to perform from thirty pairs of items. Five items pitted masculine behaviors against feminine behaviors; five items each pitted masculine or feminine against neutral behaviors; and the other fifteen pairs were neutral-neutral, masculine-masculine, or feminine-feminine. The subject was always paid more for a sex-inappropriate choice. Males were more likely than females to choose the higher paying alternative

when no sex-role conflict was involved but less likely than females to choose the higher paying alternative when sex-role conflict was a consideration. Sex-typed subjects chose the stereotyped item more often than did androgynous or sex-reversed subjects ($t(141)=3.43$, $p < .001$). Also, sex-role differences were somewhat stronger in the presence of a same-sex experimenter; thus, these results confirm the first hypothesis.

Next, the subjects were asked to perform three sex-appropriate, three sex-inappropriate,and three neutral activities for about 90 seconds per activity. The subjects were asked to rate on a seven-point scale how masculine (for males), how feminine (for females), how attractive, how likable, how nervous, and how peculiar they felt while performing. Sex-typed subjects felt worse after performing cross-sex activities than did androgynous or sex-reversed subjects ($t(141)=3.87$, $p < .001$). Androgynous and sex-reversed subjects did not differ from each other.

As a whole, the current results imply that sex-typed persons actively avoid cross-sex behavior. It seems clear that sex-typing restricts one's behavior in unnecessary and perhaps dysfunctional ways (Bem, 1976). Sex-role restrictions are more pervasive for males than for females in our society. A doctoral dissertation by Robinson (1976) revealed that three occupational groups (i.e., male caregivers, female caregivers, and male engineers) held highly masculine attitudinal preferences toward boys.

However, the sex-typed attitudes toward girls in each group clustered just above zero, indicating their thinking that girls should be androgynous in their behaviors. This finding that more narrowly prescribed sex roles were held for boys than girls by significant adults confirmed other works (Brown, 1956; 1957; Lynn, 1959; Mussen & Rutherford, 1963), which revealed that boys form a more rigid pattern of masculine preferences while girls make male-type choices and female-type choices equally as often which may be due to the increased flexibility allowed females in our society.

In further experiments reported briefly in summary articles (Bem, 1975b, 1976b), work was done to further explicate the unexpected finding that feminine women were unresponsive to the kitten. The first study reported in the additional work allowed subjects to interact with a human baby and the other required subjects to listen to an unhappy fellow student. Feminine and androgynous subjects did not differ significantly from each other on responsiveness (smiling, holding, talking, kissing, playing) with the baby. Both feminine and androgynous males and females were significantly more nurturant toward the baby than were masculine males and females. In the second study, a talker became quite personal and began to tell the listener an unhappy story. Feminine and androgynous subjects of each sex were significantly more nurturant than masculine males and females.

Bem's findings suggest that rigid sex-roles seriously restrict behavior. Masculine men did masculine things but did not express important human (but stereotypically "feminine") traits such as warmth, playfulness, or concern. Feminine women, on the other hand, played with the baby and were nurturant with the troubled student, but were not independent or assertive. Androgynous men and women did just about everything; they did well on both masculine and feminine tasks. The research indicated (Bem, 1975b) that masculine and feminine stereotypes restricted a person's behavior whereas an androgynous orientation permitted behavioral flexibility, expanding the range of human behaviors.

Implications for Research

Traditionally, research into sex-role development has considered masculinity and femininity to be polar opposites. On psychological tests of masculinity and femininity a person could score as either masculine or feminine but could not score as both. Recently a new concept has been introduced into the literature; that is, androgyny as opposed to the traditional concept of appropriate sex-typing. Androgynous persons are not sex-typed; they match their behavior to the situation rather than be limited by what is defined as male or female. An androgynous society is one with no sex-role stereotypes. According to Bem (1974; 1975; 1976) androgyny expands the range of human behavior allowing individuals to cope effectively in a variety of situations.

Since sex-typed persons are limited in behavioral flexibility and are handicapped in certain aspects of adult life in American society (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974), perhaps what is needed is a new standard for mental health. Societies have the option to minimize, rather than to maximize, sex differences through socialization practices (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974; Palme, 1972). More information is needed on the effects of the attempt to change traditional definitions of masculinity and femininity (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974). In addition:

> Parental sex-typing pressures need to be studied in the earliest portions of children's lives and little such observation has been done (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974, p. 327).

Even though the process of sex-role acquisition came under serious scrutiny in the 1930's (Benjamin, 1932; Hattwick, 1937), androgyny as an alternative has only begun to be considered in the 1970's. The increased interest in research and speculative literature related to androgyny was precipitated by the women's rights movement. Feminists began to demand equal rights for women only to be countered with questions as to the ability of women to handle an equal role with men in our society. This questioning, along with the consideration of the impact of such equality on the future of society, brought with it a new approach to research on sex-role stereotyping.

Since sex differences may be greater among subgroups of men and women (masculinity and femininity are essential self-defining attributes for some persons) (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974),

these subgroups offer a ready opportunity to study parental sex-typing pressures and to consider implications for change in American society. If, for example, an androgynous person has been seen to incorporate a broader range of personality traits and behaviors than a sex-typed person, we would expect that same flexibility to be carried over into parenting behavior. This should also carry definite implications for the socialization of children and for the American future. In general, parents were not found to differentially socialize boys and girls, except in the most narrow definition of sex-typing. Perhaps these results were confounded due to the inclusion of androgynous, sex-typed, and cross-sex-typed parents in the populations studied. Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) suggested that:

> If the studies summarized in previous chapters of this book had been based on selected subsamples of subjects, including only those women who consider it important to be feminine and those men for whom masculinity is central to their self-concept, the chances are that greater sex differences would have been reported and the findings would have been much more consistent... (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974, p. 360).

Bem developed a measure of androgyny and observed how androgynous persons behaved in contrast to the behavior of sex-typed persons. However, no studies have been done to determine how persons become androgynous. Systematic research into the acquisition of psychological androgyny is called for. Before that is done, it seemed appropriate to consider how androgynous adults differ from traditionally stereotyped adults in the pressures that they exert on their children.

This writer proposed to combine the variables suggested for study by Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) and to study the sex-typing pressures exerted by parental subgroups selected for sex-typing (or lack of sex-typing) on the basis of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. In addition, Maccoby and Jacklin have indicated that there is a dearth of research on fathers (and that perhaps fathers sex-type children more than mothers). Hence fathers were included in this study.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Research Design

The present study used a three-factor design, with three primary measures of child-rearing attitudes and behaviors. The three independent variables were Sex-Role Orientation (two levels), Sex of Parent, and Sex of Child. The dependent variables were reported child-rearing attitudes and practices and actual practices.

Each parent took the Bem Sex-Role Inventory to determine sex-role orientation. In addition, each parent was presented with two measures of child-rearing attitudes and practices: (a) the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI; Bem, 1974) (see Appendix A) was utilized to determine the parent's idealized sex-role orientation for the child; (b) the Child-Rearing Practices Report (CRPR; Block, 1975) (see Appendix B) was utilized to determine child-rearing attitudes and practices. A measure of actual socialization practices consisted of a series of fifteen games of ticktacktoe which the parent played with the child. The games were tape-recorded to be rated in terms of parental nurturance, punitiveness, and competitiveness. The behaviors were rated by two independent raters (a male and a female) who were blind as to the sex-role orientation of the parents at the time of the ratings. Ratings were based on a modification of the observation schedule developed by Fagot (1975) (see Appendix C for the modified rating form).

Sample Selection

The sample for this study included mothers and fathers of 4-, 5-, 6-, or 7-year-old children in a southern town. Initial contact for approval of the research study was made with the Assistant Dean of the College of Education of the University of South Carolina and with the superintendent of a suburban school district. An appointment was made for the purpose of explaining the objectives of the study to the superintendent. The researcher agreed to teach a workshop in exchange for help in soliciting parents for the study. In addition, parent participation was obtained through speaking engagements contracted for by the researcher and through personal contacts and the university laboratory school.

After obtaining consent from the superintendent and the Assistant Dean, each parent of a kindergarten child was contacted through a letter (see Appendix D). A packet containing the letter of request, two copies of the BSRI (see Appendix A), and a stamped, addressed envelope was taken home by each child in two schools and in the university day care center for distribution to the parents. The parents from the university center who agreed to participate were graduate students, faculty, and a university administrator. Parents in the group setting were contacted directly. The fathers in the group setting were college educated as were many of the mothers.

Subjects

Parents were requested to fill out two copies of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory first describing self and then describing their

idealized child. Parents who returned the Bem Sex-Role Inventory were requested to complete the CRPR. Of the 119 parents who completed the BSRI, 102 accurately completed the CRPR in time for inclusion in the final data analysis. Forty parents played fifteen games of ticktacktoe with their child and were rated on nurturance, punitiveness, and competitiveness. The first 40 parents who responded to the BSRI by mail were arbitrarily chosen to play the games of ticktacktoe. The other parents did not play the ticktacktoe games due to time restraints. Parents were then categorized as androgynous, masculine, feminine, cross-sex-typed, or undifferentiated on the basis of their scores on the BSRI. The socioeconomic level of the parents was primarily middle and upper-middle class as judged by their home ownership in residential suburbs and high educational level (all except three of the fathers were college educated).

Research Instruments

Bem Sex-Role Inventory

The Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI; Bem, 1974) is distinguished from other masculinity-femininity scales in four important ways. First, it includes both masculinity and femininity scales so that a person can rate as both masculine and feminine. Second, items were chosen on the basis of social desirability since the sex-typed person was conceptualized as a person who has internalized societal sex role stereotypes. A characteristic was judged as masculine if it were judged to be more desirable for a male in American society

than for a female. Third, a person is judged as masculine, feminine, or androgynous as a function of his or her mean score for masculinity or femininity. Fourth, the BSRI includes a social desirability scale which is neutral with respect to sex.

The BSRI consists of a total of 60 adjectives. These adjectives include 20 adjectives selected from a list of 200 characteristics as significantly more desirable for a man than for a woman and 20 adjectives selected from the same list as significantly more desirable for a woman than for a man. Twenty neutral items were selected from a different list of 200 characteristics if the characteristic was judged by both males and females to be no more desirable for one sex than for the other. The usual bipolarity of masculinity-femininity measures was eliminated from the BSRI since individuals describe themselves independently on each trait. After completing the BSRI on himself, the parent scored the BSRI for his child. Each parent was asked to rate the traits in terms of what they would like for their child when he or she reached young adulthood. This total procedure required from 20 to 35 minutes (see Appendix A).

Scoring. A person indicates on a 7-point scale how well each of the 60 personality characteristics describes himself. If the characteristic is never or almost never true of that person it is rated 1. If the characteristic is always or almost always true it is rated as 7. The Masculinity score is the mean score for the

20 masculine items with the Femininity score being the mean score for the 20 feminine items. Persons are categorized as androgynous if both their Masculinity and Femininity scores are above the medians for the same scores in the rest of the population. Persons are categorized as feminine if their Femininity score is greater than the median of the Femininity scores and if their Masculinity score is lower than the median for the Masculinity scores. Persons are categorized as masculine if their Masculinity score is higher than the median for masculinity and if their Femininity score is lower than the median score for femininity. In this method of scoring, some persons may be categorized as cross-sex-typed. Persons whose Femininity scores and Masculinity scores are lower than the median for the population are scored as undifferentiated. Undifferentiated and cross-sex-typed persons were eliminated from the final data analysis in this study.

Internal Consistency. The coeffieient alpha was computed separately for the Masculinity, Femininity, and Social Desirability scores. All three scores were highly reliable in the Stanford sample (Masculinity α = .86; Femininity α = .80; Social Desirability α = .75). In a sample at another college the scores were also found to be reliable (Masculinity α = .86; Femininity α = .82; Social Desirability α = .70). The reliability of the Androgyny difference score was greater than .80 for each sample.

Test-Retest Reliability. A second administration of the BSRI to 28 males and 28 females was done approximately four weeks after the first administration. Subjects were instructed not to try to

remember how they had responded previously. Product-moment correlations were computed between the first and second administrations. The Masculinity, Femininity, Androgyny, and Social Desirability scores all proved to be highly reliable (Masculinity r = .90; Femininity r = .90; Androgyny r = .93; Social Desirability r = .89).

Correlations with Other Measures. At the second administration of the BSRI, subjects filled out the Masculinity-Femininity scales of the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) and the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. The BSRI was moderately correlated with the CPI, but the Masculinity, Femininity, and Androgyny scales of the BSRI were not at all correlated with the Guilford-Zimmerman scale. The fact that none of the correlations was high indicated that the BSRI measures a different aspect of sex roles than the CPI and Guilford-Zimmerman scale.

Child-Rearing Practices Report

The Child-Rearing Practices Report (CRPR; Block, 1965) (see Appendix B) was developed to provide a self-descriptive instrument of socialization practices that would minimize the problems of most self-report measures. The CRPR was derived from empirical observations of mothers and children in structured experimental settings. A Q-sort format was chosen for administration. The subject sorts 91 behaviorally oriented items on cards into seven different envelopes ranging from 7 (almost always descriptive of me) to 1 (almost never descriptive of me). Equal numbers of cards are placed in each envelope.

Instructions for Administration. The instructions for self-administration were devised and pretested with many different groups. The instructions were modified for use in this study (see Appendix B). Block has administered in group sessions and by mail.

Reliability. The reliability of the CRPR has been assessed in two studies. Ninety students in a child psychology course described their child-rearing philosophies at the beginning of the course and again eight months later. The average correlation between the two tests was .707 with a range from .38 to .85 and sigma = .10. In addition, 66 Peace Corps volunteers were administered the CRPR two times with a three year interval. The correlations of CRPR responses was greater than r = .60 for females and males in their descriptions of mothers and fathers. The cross-time correlations suggested considerable stability for the first and third person forms of the CRPR. The present study utilized only the first person form and Block (1965) suggested that these scores would be more reliable than the thrid person scores.

Construct Validity. In assessing the construct validity of the CRPR, it is desirable to determine the degree to which parental self-descriptions of child-rearing behaviors reflect actual parental behaviors. Maternal behaviors were noted in interactions with the child in three structured situations tapping achievement emphasis, modes, and degree of control, and independence training (Block et al., 1964). There was considerable coherence in the findings derived from the observational and self-descriptive data. A complete

report of the findings has been mimeographed and can be obtained from J. H. Block, Institute of Human Development, University of California, Berkeley.

Scoring. Block derived a score for each item and utilized a t test comparison between mothers and fathers of boys and girls. Due to the statistical concerns related to performing 91 t tests, the present study utilized a scoring procedure based on a factor analysis of the CRPR (Table 2). Each factor from the Block (1965) study in which the reliability was greater than .50 for at least one of the trials was scored in the present study if it seemed relevant to this research based on the review of the literature. As may be noted in Table 2 the number of items in the factors ranged from 4 to 9 with maximum scores for the factors ranging from 28 to 63.

Fagot Observation Schedule

The Fagot (1974) Observation Schedule was developed to study sex differences in toddlers' behavior and parental reactions. Fagot attempted to make an exhaustive list of parental behaviors, child behaviors, and child mood in order to do an observational study of children in their own homes. This Observation Schedule was modified for use in the present study (see Appendix C). Parental Reactions excluded as inappropriate to the proposed observations were Mother/Father joins play and Neither parent interacts. One item was added to the Parent Reactions - Mother/Father challenges. Three of the tape-recorded sessions were conducted to obtain

Table 2

Scales for Scoring Items in the Child-Rearing Practices Report (defined by results of R-type factor analysis with Varimax rotation and a refactoring of items loading high on heterogeneity)*

Scale	Average inter-item correlation based on five samples	r for scale scores	r on ego and cognitive study
1. Encouraging Openness to Experience Items: 21,24,45,53	.31	.64	.71
2. Suppression of Sex and Affection Items: 9,57,63,86	.22	.52	.58
3. Emphasis on Achievement Items: 2,17,33,59,71	.11	.39	.58
6. Authoritarian Control Items: 14,15,27,31,43, 54,55,64,70	.14	.59	.38
9. Open Expression of Parental Feelings Items: 18,34,40,42,58,11	.19	.54	.57
10. Encouraging Individuation Items: 1,6,22,26,41,67,75	.18	.60	.62
16. Emphasis on Early Training Items: 49,78,82	.34	.61	.63

*Modified from Block (1965) to reflect only the scales utilized in the current study.

observer reliability data. Two observers were required to give exactly the same code number on each observation to be considered in agreement. Ninety percent agreement on an entire interaction sequence of 15 games of ticktacktoe was an acceptable standard. A male and a female rater scored all tape recordings independently while blind to the sex-role orientation of the parent.

Experimental Setting and Materials

The majority of the parents completed the entire testing sequence in their homes. Thirty-nine of the parents completed the Bem Sex-Role Inventory and the Child-Rearing Practices Report in a group setting. Usually, one parent would work on the CRPR in the kitchen or dining room of the home while the other parent played the 15 games of ticktacktoe with the child in the living room of the home. The parents would then reverse settings. An AKAI X-1800SD reel-to-reel recording system was used to tape-record the parent-child interaction.

A 9 by 12-inch canvas board with heavy black lines was used for the ticktacktoe board. Brightly colored, translucent plastic chips (five square ones and five circular ones) were used as playing pieces. These chips were approximately 1½ inches in diameter. Score for the ticktacktoe games was kept by the parent. The possible scores were parent wins, child wins, and tie.

The CRPR consisted of the materials described in Appendix B. Each of the 91 items was reproduced on a 1½ by 3-inch card. Seven envelopes were supplied with the appropriate statement reproduced

on the front. A large brown envelope was supplied to hold the seven smaller envelopes so that the mother's responses could be kept separate from the father's responses.

Procedure

After receiving approval for the study, packets containing a letter for request to participate, two copies of the BSRI for the mother, and two copies of the BSRI for the father were stapled together with a stamped, addressed envelope (see Appendix A and Appendix D). These packets were taken to the school secretaries who distributed them to the kindergarten teachers. Parents contacted personally or through parent enrichment groups were given these items directly. Fathers and mothers were asked not to discuss the procedures until they were completed. The packets were taken home by the kindergarten children and then returned by the parents in the stamped, addressed envelope. Parents were contacted immediately for a session in which they sorted the CRPR cards and played the ticktacktoe games with their child. Parents contacted through parent enrichment groups completed the BSRS and the CRPR in a group setting.

The Q-sort procedure and the games were done at the parents' convenience in the afternoon or evening or on a weekend. This was done since fathers and working mothers most often interact with their children during these periods. In order to control for order of taping, in one-half of the cases mothers were taped before

fathers and in the other one-half of the cases fathers were taped before mothers. This was done on an alternate basis and occurred while the researcher was blind as to the sex-role orientation of the parent.

The experimenter explained the ticktacktoe procedure to the parents. The child was then asked to play fifteen games of ticktacktoe with Mother or Father to be tape-recorded. While one parent was completing the ticktacktoe sequence the other parent was asked to proceed with the Q-sort. The researcher was available to answer questions about the Q-sort. The parent and child playing ticktacktoe were left alone. The Q-sort required about thirty minutes of time and the ticktacktoe games required about fifteen minutes of time. The parents were then asked to reverse situations. In only one instance did the child become so frustrated that he did not want to continue with the other parent. When the ticktacktoe portion of the experiment was omitted, both parents completed the CRPR Q-sort at the same time.

The researcher felt a responsibility to make the procedure meaningful for the persons who participated. For that reason, the scores of the Mother and the Father on the CRPR were listed side by side and either left with the parents or returned to them later with a copy of the CRPR. The parents were allowed to keep these scores and the CRPR so that they could compare their thinking about child-rearing practices and attitudes.

Data Analysis

The analysis of data plan is presented according to the hypotheses that were tested. Hypotheses I, II, III, and IV were tested by one way analyses of variance with a Scheffé procedure being performed when differences among the groups were found to be significant beyond the .05 level. Hypothesis V was tested by chi square. Hypotheses VI and VIII were tested by one-way analyses of variance with the Scheffé test being performed to pinpoint the area of significance for Hypotheses VII and IX. The one-way analysis of variance was chosen since the SPSS (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, & Bent; 1975) procedure can cope with unequal cell sizes and missing values. In addition, the Scheffé test was chosen since it is appropriate for examining all linear combinations of group means instead of simple pairwise comparisons. In addition, Scheffé is stricter than the other a posteriori contrast tests available for use with one-way analysis of variance and is exact even for unequal group sizes.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The return rates for the various groups involved in the study are presented in Table 3. The scoring of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory yielded a mean masculinity score and a mean femininity score for each subject. Each subject was categorized as masculine, feminine, androgynous, cross-sex-typed, or undifferentiated following a median split procedure described in the revised scoring procedure for the BSRI (Bem & Watson, 1976). The means for masculinity and femininity for each parent's idealized child's sex-role orientation were calculated and the children were categorized in the same manner as the parents (Table 4).

Table 5 shows the total number of parents in each category as determined by the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. This table also indicates the total number of parents in each category who accurately completed the Child-Rearing Practices Report and who were rated on the fifteen games of ticktacktoe.

Demographic data including the means for the age and the number of children for sex-typed and androgynous mothers and fathers of boys and girls and for cross-sex-typed and undifferentiated mothers and fathers are presented in Table 6. Occupation and sibling composition are presented in the same table.

Interrater reliability for the ticktacktoe games was computed, based on the scoring of all response forms (n=37) by two independent raters (one male and one female). A Pearson Correlation Coefficient was calculated for the total number of ratings and for the

Table 3

Return Rate

Source	Number of Children	Maximum No. of Parents	Total Returns	Estimated Returns(%)
School I (parents of 5-year-olds)	160	320	29	9
School II (parents of 5-year-olds)	135	270	34	12
University Day Care (parents of 5-year-olds)	20	40	7	17
*Group I (parents of 4-,5-,6-,or 7-year-olds)	13	23	23	100
*Group II (parents of 4-,5-,6-,or 7-year-olds)	10	16	16	100
*Personal Contact (parents of 4-,5-,and 7-year-olds)	5	10	10	100

*These parents were contacted personally, thus the high rate of participation in these groups. The parents in the other groups were contacted through handouts which were taken home with kindergarten children.

Table 4

Means and Medians for Masculinity and

Femininity for Parents and their Idealized Children*

	Groups	
	Parents	Children
Masculinity	Mean = 5.01	Mean = 5.59
	Median = 5.00	Median = 5.59
	SD = 9.33	SD = 5.97
Femininity	Mean = 4.90	Mean = 5.18
	Median = 4.99	Median = 5.15
	SD = 5.79	SD = 4.86

*n=119

Table 5

Number of Parents Rated on each Measure

Role Orientation of Parent and Sex of Child			BSRI	CRPR	TTT
Sex-Typed Fathers of Boys	(STFB)		16	14	6
Sex-Typed Fathers of Girls	(STFG)		12	10	6
Sex-Typed Fathers	(STF)	Total	28	24	12
Sex-Typed Mothers of Boys	(STMB)		19	14	5
Sex-Typed Mothers of Girls	(STMG)		15	14	4
Sex-Typed Mothers	(STM)	Total	34	28	9
Sex-Typed Parents	(STP)	Total	62	52	21
Androgynous Fathers of Boys	(ANFB)		4	3	2
Androgynous Fathers of Girls	(ANFG)		10	10	3
Androgynous Fathers	(ANF)	Total	14	13	5
Androgynous Mothers of Boys	(ANMB)		7	7	3
Androgynous Mothers of Girls	(ANMG)		3	3	2
Androgynous Mothers	(ANM)	Total	10	10	5
Androgynous Parents	(ANP)	Total	24	23	10
Cross-Sex-Typed Fathers	(CSTF)		4	3	1
Cross-Sex-Typed Mothers	(CSTM)		7	7	1
Cross-Sex-Typed Parents	(CSTP)	Total	11	10	2
Undifferentiated Father	(UNDF)		9	7	0
Undifferentiated Mothers	(UNDM)		13	10	4
Undifferentiated Parents	(UNDP)	Total	22	17	4
Total Number of Parents Categorized in the Bem Sex-Role Inventory			119		
Total Number of Parents Completing the Child-Rearing Practices Report				102	
Total Number of Parents Rated on the 15 games of Ticktacktoe (TTT)					37

Table 6

Description of Population

Role Orientation of Parent, Sex of Child, and Occupation of Parent		Mean Age	Mean Number of Children	Siblings Boys	Siblings Girls	Siblings Mix
STFB	14 professional 2 trade	33.8	2.13	7	0	9
STFG	11 professional 1 student	33.3	2.25	0	9	3
STMB	17 homemaker 1 trade	32.4	2.05	9	0	9
STMG	10 homemaker 3 professional 3 trade	32.8	2.25	0	10	6
ANFB	4 professional	34.0	2.50	1	0	3
ANFG	8 professional 2 trade	31.1	1.70	0	7	3
ANMB	3 homemaker 2 professional 1 trade 1 student	34.0	2.57	2	0	5
ANMG	2 homemaker 1 professional	30.7	2.00	0	3	0
CSTF	3 professional 1 student	37.5	1.25	(these parents were not included in the analysis of the results, so this information was not tabulated for them)		
CSTM	4 homemaker 3 professional	33.6	1.86			
UNDF	7 professional 2 trade	34.2	2.22			
UNDM	10 homemakers 2 professional 1 student	30.7	1.85			
	119 Total			Total 19	29	38
		less cases incomplete on CRPR		-1 18	-2 27	-8 30

per cent nurturance. In both instances the correlation coefficient was greater than .95. Due to the high reliability of the ratings, the mean of the scores of the raters was used in the analysis.

The remainder of this chapter is organized in the order of the hypotheses for the study. The measure and the number of subjects involved in the testing of each hypothesis is presented in Table 7.

Child-Rearing Practices Report

The first four hypotheses were derived from a factorial analysis of the Child-Rearing Practices Report (Block, 1965) (Table 2). In each case the mean for the factor was calculated for each group and the means were compared utilizing analysis of variance tests. The range of the number of items for the seven factors was from three to nine.

Hypothesis I

H_1 Androgynous parents and sex-typed mothers place a significantly greater value on the factor, openness to experience, and on the factor, open expression of parental feelings, than do sex-typed fathers. The means for the four groups on encouraging openness to experience are shown in Table 8 and the analysis of variance is reported in Table 9. The means for the open expression of parental feelings factor are reported in Table 10 and the analysis of variance is reported in Table 11.

As Tables 9 and 11 indicate, there were no significant differences among the sex-typed and androgynous groups for the factors encouraging openness to experience and open expression of parental feelings. Therefore, Hypothesis I is rejected.

Table 7

Measure and Number of Subjects Involved

in Testing Each Hypothesis*

Child-Rearing Practices Report used to test Hypotheses 1,2,3,4			
$H_{1,2,3}$			
	Androgynous Fathers	(ANF)	13
	Androgynous Mothers	(ANM)	10
	Sex-Typed Mothers	(STM)	28
	Sex-Typed Fathers	(STF)	24
H_4			
	Androgynous Parents of Boys (ANFB + ANMB)		10
	Androgynous Parents of Girls (ANFG + ANMG)		13
	Sex-Typed Parents of Boys (STFB + STMB)		28
	Sex-Typed Parents of Girls (STFG + STMG)		24
Bem Sex-Role Inventory used to test Hypothesis 5			
H_5			
	Sex-Typed Parents	(STP)	62
	Androgynous Parents	(ANP)	24
Fifteen Games of Ticktacktoe were Rated to Obtain Scores for testing Hypotheses 6,7,8, and 9			
$H_{6,7,8,9}$			
	Masculine Fathers	(STF)	12
	Feminine Mothers	(STM)	9
	Androgynous Fathers	(ANF)	5
	Androgynous Mothers	(ANM)	5
			31

*see Table 5 for derivation of numbers

Table 8

Mean Scores on Encouraging Openness to Experience* for Four Groups

Androgynous Fathers	23.46
Androgynous Mothers	25.90
Sex-Typed Fathers	22.21
Sex-Typed Mothers	23.00

*CRPR items 21, 24, 45, 53

Table 9

Analysis of Variance for Encouraging Openness to Experience

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Between groups	3	98.49	32.83	2.64
Within groups	71	884.10	12.45	
Total	74	982.59		

Table 10

Mean Scores on Open Expression of Parental Feelings* for Four Groups

Androgynous Fathers	37.54
Androgynous Mothers	37.10
Sex-Typed Fathers	35.79
Sex-Typed Mothers	36.89

*CRPR items 18,34,40,42,58,11

Table 11

Analysis of Variance for Open Expression of Parental Feelings

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Between groups	3	31.50	10.50	1.36
Within groups	71	548.88	7.73	
Total	74	580.38		

Hypothesis II

H_2 Sex-typed fathers place a significantly greater value on (a) achievement, (b) authoritarian control, and (c) early training than do androgynous parents and sex-typed mothers. The means for the four groups on achievement are reported in Table 12 and the analysis of variance is reported in Table 13. It may be noted that the additive effect for the difference among the groups is significant ($p < .05$). However, a Scheffé's test revealed no significant differences due to the strictness of that a posteriori test. It is shown in Table 12 that the trend of the means is in the hypothesized direction, therefore Hypothesis IIa is tentatively accepted. The means for the four groups on authoritarian control may be noted in Table 14 and the analysis of variance is presented in Table 15. The means and the analysis of variance for an emphasis on early training are shown in Tables 16 and 17. There are no significant differences among the groups for the authoritarian control and early training factors. Therefore Hypothesis IIb and IIc are rejected.

Hypothesis III

H_3 Sex-typed parents report greater suppression of sex and affection than do androgynous parents. The mean scores for the four groups of parents are reported in Table 18. The analysis of variance is reported in Table 19. As may be noted in Table 19 there is no significant difference among the groups so Hypothesis III is rejected.

Table 12

Mean Scores on Emphasis on Achievement* for Four Groups

Androgynous Fathers	22.69
Androgynous Mothers	24.80
Sex-Typed Fathers	25.38
Sex-Typed Mothers	22.71

*CRPR items 2,17,33,59,71

Table 13

Analysis of Variance for Emphasis on Achievement

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Between groups	3	118.37	39.46	3.45*
Within groups	71	811.72	11.43	
Total	74	930.09		

*$p < .05$

Table 14

Mean Scores on Authoritarian Control* for Four Groups

Androgynous Fathers	24.77
Androgynous Mothers	25.40
Sex-Typed Fathers	28.21
Sex-Typed Mothers	26.21

*CRPR items 14,15,27,31,43,54,55,64,70

Table 15

Analysis of Variance for Authoritarian Control

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Between groups	3	123.35	41.12	1.60
Within groups	71	1821.40	25.65	
Total	74	1944.75		

Table 16

Mean Scores on Emphasis on Early Training* for Four Groups

Androgynous Fathers	8.00
Androgynous Mothers	6.40
Sex-Typed Fathers	8.58
Sex-Typed Mothers	6.61

*CRPR items 49,78,82

Table 17

Analysis of Variance for Emphasis on Early Training

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Between groups	3	65.68	21.89	2.70
Within groups	71	574.91	8.10	
Total	74	640.59		

Table 18

Mean Scores on Suppression of Sex and Affection* for Four Groups

Androgynous Fathers	10.00
Androgynous Mothers	8.20
Sex-Typed Fathers	9.08
Sex-Typed Mothers	8.82

*CRPR items 9,57,63,86

Table 19

Analysis of Variance for Suppression of Sex and Affection

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Between groups	3	20.41	6.80	0.64
Within groups	71	759.54	10.70	
Total	74	779.95		

Hypothesis IV

H_4 Androgynous parents of boys and androgynous parents of girls do not differ on the encouragement of independence but sex-typed parents of boys encourage independence more often than do sex-typed parents of girls. The mean scores for Androgynous Parents of Boys, Androgynous Parents of Girls, Sex-Typed Parents of Boys, and Sex-Typed Parents of Girls are reported in Table 20. As may be noted in Table 21 there was a significant difference among the groups when the analysis of variance was performed. Scheffé's test revealed that the androgynous parents of boys placed a significantly greater emphasis on the encouragement of independence than did sex-typed parents of girls. As was predicted, androgynous parents of boys did not differ significantly from androgynous parents of girls, but neither did sex-typed parents of boys differ significantly from sex-typed parents of girls. It was expected that the sex-typed parents of girls would place less emphasis on independence than the other groups, but it was also expected that sex-typed parents of boys would encourage independence significantly more than the other groups. Therefore, Hypotheses IVa is accepted but Hypothesis IVb is rejected.

Bem Sex-Role Inventory

Hypothesis V

H_5 Sex-typed and androgynous parents select their own sex-role orientation as their idealized child's orientation. A chi square test was performed to assess the relation between the sex-role orientation of parents and their idealized child's sex-role

Table 20

Mean Scores on Encouragement of Independence* for Four Groups

Androgynous Parents of Boys	n=10	36.10
Androgynous Parents of Girls	n=13	31.77
Sex-Typed Parents of Boys	n=28	33.40
Sex-Typed Parents of Girls	n=24	30.58

*CRPR items 1,6,22,26,41,67,75

Table 21

Analysis of Variance on Encouragement of Independence

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Between groups	3	246.69	82.23	4.00*
Within groups		1459.75	20.56	
Total		1.706.44		

*$p < .05$

orientation. The test was performed only for the sex-typed and androgynous parents. The results of the test are summarized in Table 22. The chi square statistic showed a highly significant relationship between sex-role orientation of parent and idealized child's orientation, X^2 (1) = 22.87, $p < .001$. Therefore Hypothesis V is confirmed. Sex-typed parents do prefer that their children grow up to be appropriately sex-typed and androgynous parents do prefer that their children grow up to be androgynous.

Ticktacktoe Ratings

A total number of ratings was performed and from that total, the percent labeled nurturance and the percent labeled punitiveness was computed. Since punitiveness was simply the converse of nurturance, it was ignored in the hypothesized relationships.

Hypotheses VI and VII

H_6 Masculine fathers score significantly lower in nurturance than androgynous fathers, androgynous mothers, or feminine mothers. The mean scores for the four groups on nurturance are presented in Table 23 and the analysis of variance is presented in Table 24. As may be noted in Table 24, Hypothesis VI was not confirmed.

H_7 No significant differences in nurturance exist among androgynous fathers, androgynous mothers, and feminine mothers. This hypothesis was confirmed based on the results shown in Table 24.

Hypotheses VIII and IX

H_8 Masculine fathers demonstrate significantly more competitive behavior than do androgynous fathers, androgynous mothers, or

Table 22

Chi Square Test of Sex-Role of Parent and

Idealized Sex-Role of Child

Sex-Role of Parent	Idealized Sex-Role of Child: Sex-Typed	Androgynous	Total
Sex-Typed	41	8	49
Androgynous	6	17	23
Total	47	25	72

$X^2 = 22.87^{***}$

df = 1

***p < .001

Five sex-typed parents chose a cross-sex-typed role for their children.
Eight sex-typed and one androgynous parent chose an undifferentiated role for their children.

Total Sex-Typed Parents on the BSRI	62
Total Androgynous Parents on the BSRI	24
	86

Table 23

Mean Scores on Nurturance for Four Groups

Androgynous Fathers	81.91
Androgynous Mothers	75.58
Sex-Typed Fathers	77.53
Sex-Typed Mothers	78.41

Table 24

Analysis of Variance for Nurturance

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Between groups	3	108.88	36.29	.29
Within groups	27	3427.81	126.96	
Total	30	3536.69		

feminine mothers. The mean scores for the groups are shown in Table 25 and the analysis of variance is shown in Table 26. As may be noted in Table 26, Hypothesis VIII was not confirmed.

H_9 No significant differences exist between androgynous fathers and androgynous mothers on competitive behavior. This hypothesis was confirmed as a result of the analysis of variance shown in Table 26.

Table 25

Mean Scores for Competition for Four Groups

Androgynous Fathers	8.00
Androgynous Mothers	7.20
Sex-Typed Fathers	6.17
Sex-Typed Mothers	5.56

Table 26

Analysis of Variance for Competition

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Between groups	3	22.99	7.66	1.43
Within groups	27	144.69	5.36	
Total	30	167.68		

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND CONCLUSIONS

Previous studies examined child-rearing attitudes and practices as a function of sex of parent and sex of child but no studies singled out sex-role orientation of parent as an independent variable. This investigation had as its purpose the examination of child-rearing attitudes and behaviors of sex-typed parents as contrasted with the attitudes and behaviors of androgynous parents.

The sample for this study consisted of 119 adults in a large southern town. The adults, aged 27 to 45 were administered questionnaires related to their sex-role orientation and their child-rearing attitudes and practices. Forty of the adults participated in a behavioral interaction sequence with their child which was tape-recorded and rated at a later time. The remainder of the adults (79) did not participate in the behavioral interaction sequence due to the time constraints on the researcher. Analysis of variance was the main statistical procedure utilized.

The results indicated a significant relation between parental sex-role orientation and the sex-role orientation of the idealized child. In other words, androgynous parents wanted their children to become androgynous and sex-typed parents wanted their children to become sex-typed. In addition, sex-typed fathers placed a greater emphasis on achievement than the other three groups, with androgynous mothers placing the second greatest emphasis on achievement, and sex-typed mothers and androgynous fathers placing an equal but

lesser emphasis on achievement. In no other instance did the role of the parent (androgynous or sex-typed) alone predict significant differences in child-rearing attitudes and practices.

When the role of the parent was considered in conjunction with the sex of the child, it was found that androgynous parents of boys encouraged independence the most, with sex-typed parents of boys next, androgynous parents of girls next, and sex-typed parents of girls encouraging independence the least. The significant area of difference was located by Scheffé's test to be between androgynous parents of boys and sex-typed parents of girls.

Further analysis indicated that the sex of the child predicted more differences (4) in child-rearing attitudes and behaviors as measured by the CRPR and the ticktacktoe games than did the sex of the parent (1 significant difference), or the role of the parent (1). Since the three independent variables predicted <u>different</u> areas of child-rearing attitudes and practices, perhaps it is not that one variable is a better predictor than the other, but that one is a better predictor of a particular facet of child-rearing attitudes and behaviors than the others. The findings from the additional analysis will be elaborated in the next section.

Discussion

The hypotheses of this study were concerned with the sex-role orientation of the parent as the primary independent variable. The reason for this choice was that Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) suggested that differences in sex-typed socialization practices may be

found if selected subsamples of parents were studied. Since essentially no differences were found when androgynous parents were compared with sex-typed parents, a further analysis of the data was done in order to provide direction for future research. Therefore, comparisons were made which included the independent variables (2 categories of sex-role orientation of parents, sex of parent, and sex of child) which had been omitted in the primary hypotheses for the study. This further analysis of the data revealed some interesting results. All analyses are reported in this section.

Role of Parent: Androgynous or Sex-Typed

When androgynous parents were compared with sex-typed parents it was found that sex-typed fathers emphasized achievement more than the other three groups with the area of significance occurring between sex-typed fathers and androgynous fathers ($p < .05$). It was also found that androgynous and sex-typed parents elected their idealized child's sex-role to be similar to their own ($p < .001$).

Role of Parent: Androgynous, Sex-Typed, Cross-Sex-Typed, Undifferentiated

When all parents studied were included in the comparisons, a slightly different pattern emerged than when the cross-sex-typed parents and undifferentiated parents were eliminated from the analysis. As may be expected from previous research (DeLucia, 1963; Hartup & Zook, 1960; Rabban, 1950) which indicated that boys become more sex-typed than girls from an early age, a greater percentage of the 64 mothers interviewed were cross-sex-typed (11%) than were

the 55 fathers interviewed (7% cross-sex-typed). This substantiates the general finding that females have more freedom in sex-roles than do males. There is not as much pressure on women to adopt an "appropriate" sex-role. In addition, 20% of the women studied were undifferentiated as compared with only 16% undifferentiated men. This may be a reflection of society's proscription against women describing themselves in a positive way (i. e. women should be yielding, shy, soft-spoken).

When analyses of variance were done comparing the six groups (1. sex-typed fathers, 2. sex-typed mothers, 3. androgynous fathers, 4. androgynous mothers, 5. cross-sex-typed parents, and 6. undifferentiated parents) on the same factors on which the four groups (1-4) were compared, significant findings occurred in the areas of emphasis on achievement, authoritarian control, open expression of parental feelings, and emphasis on early training. It was determined that cross-sex-typed parents placed a slightly greater emphasis on achievement than did the sex-typed fathers and that undifferentiated parents placed less emphasis on achievement than any of the other groups ($p < .01$). Undifferentiated parents stressed authoritarian control more than any other group with sex-typed fathers a close second and with cross-sex-typed and androgynous fathers and mothers placing the least emphasis on authoritarian control ($p < .05$). In terms of the open expression of parental feelings, it was found that cross-sex-typed parents and undifferentiated parents scored lowest of all groups on this factor with undifferentiated parents

scoring significantly lower than androgynous mothers ($p < .01$). Finally, undifferentiated parents stressed early training more than any other group ($p < .05$).

Sex of Parent

When the sex of the parent was taken as the independent variable and compared on all of the CRPR factors and on the ticktacktoe ratings the only significant difference occurred in the area of an emphasis on early training. Fathers stressed early training more than mothers ($p < .01$).

Sex of Child

When the sex of the child was taken as the independent variable and compared on all of the CRPR factors and on the ticktacktoe ratings, significant differences between the parents of boys and the parents of girls were found in the areas of suppression of sex and affection, open expression of parental feelings, encouraging individuation, and nurturance. Parents of girls stressed the suppression of sex and affection significantly more than did parents of boys ($p < .01$). Parents of girls stressed the open expression of parental feelings more than did parents of boys ($p < .05$). Parents of boys encouraged individuation more than did parents of girls ($p < .01$). Parents of girls were significantly more nurturing on the behavioral interaction measure than were parents of boys ($p < .05$). And the converse, parents of girls were significantly less punitive on the behavioral interaction measure than were parents of boys ($p < .05$).

Relation to Previous Research

Block et al. (1973) maintained that socialization processes have inhibited the expression of affect for men. In the present study this was found not to hold true. Androgynous fathers reported a more open expression of parental feeling than any of the other five groups of parents and their mean score was significantly different from undifferentiated parents ($p < .01$). The sex-typed fathers reported a less open expression of feelings than did the sex-typed and androgynous mothers, but their scores did not differ significantly from each other or from androgynous fathers. Thus, it may be that specific subgroups of fathers have inhibited affect, but this was not true for the fathers in this study. Almost every father in this study was college educated and of middle to upper-middle socioeconomic status. The results could have been different for a lower socioeconomic group of fathers. On the other hand, since fathers have generally been excluded from studies, the findings of the present study may be a more accurate reflection of what is happening in contemporary American families than were Block's results.

Bem (1975b) found that feminine and androgynous subjects of each sex were more nurturant than masculine males and females. In the current study there was no significant difference among the four groups of parents when they were compared on nurturance. In contrast, when parents of girls were compared with parents of boys the parents of girls were found to be more nurturant ($p < .05$). And

the definition of nurturance in this study was not dissimilar to the definition in the Bem study. The current study utilized a rating of verbal behavior while the Bem study utilized nonverbal (smiling and touching) and verbal behaviors.

Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) found no differences in parental response to children's sexuality based on sex of child. In contrast, the current findings indicated that parents of girls suppressed sex and affection significantly ($p < .01$) more than did parents of boys. In support of Maccoby and Jacklin's (1974) conclusions, the current study was able to determine no significant differences in parents of girls and parents of boys in the emphasis on achievement. Cross-sex-typed parents and sex-typed fathers were found to stress achievement more than the other groups of parents ($p < .01$).

In contradiction to the current findings, Block (1975) found a greater emphasis on achievement and competition for sons than for daughters. The current study did support Block's finding that parents encouraged independence and personal responsibility (individuation) more for boys than for girls ($p < .01$). In addition the present study concurred with Block's finding that parents of boys controlled the expression of affect more in boys than in girls ($p < .05$). Also in support of Block, parents in this study were found to provide more nurturance to daughters than to sons ($p < .05$) and to make more punitive statements to sons than to daughters.

Kagan (1964) also reported the greater encouragement of affiliation and nurturance for girls. Serbin et al. (1973) observed

teachers scolding boys for aggression more than girls for the same behaviors even though they took into consideration that the boys exhibited aggressive behavior more often than the girls. Since boys have been observed to be more aggressive than girls, this may be the reason that parents in the current study made more punitive statements to boys than to girls. That is, it may be a response to the boys' greater aggression.

Rothbart and Maccoby (1966) reported that fathers allowed more aggression and more dependency from daughters and that mothers allowed more aggression and more dependency from sons. Rothbart and Maccoby suggested that it is the sex of the parent more than the sex of the child that predicts parental reactions. The present study suggested that it is the sex of the child more than the sex of the parent that predicts parental reactions.

Summary of the Research Questions, Hypotheses, and Findings

The investigation was concerned with four primary research questions. The research questions, hypotheses, and results of the analysis of data follow.

Question I

Do androgynous parents differ significantly from sex-typed parents in child-rearing attitudes and practices?

Hypothesis I

Androgynous parents and sex-typed mothers place a significantly greater value on openness to experience and on the open expression of parental feelings than do sex-typed fathers.

Finding. Hypothesis I was not supported by the data. Even though the trend of the means was in the predicted direction, the variability within the groups was so great as to render the differences between the groups meaningless.

Hypothesis II

Sex-typed fathers place a singificantly greater value on (a) achievement, (b) authoritarian control, and (c) early training than do androgynous parents and sex-typed mothers.

Finding. The trend of the means for an emphasis on achievement indicated that sex-typed fathers placed a greater value on achievement than did the other three groups. A one-way analysis of variance indicated that this was a significant result ($p < .05$). However, the use of Scheffé's test did not pinpoint the difference. Therefore, Hypothesis IIa was tentatively accepted. Hypotheses IIb and IIc were rejected as untenable based on the current data.

Hypothesis III

Sex-typed parents report greater suppression of sex and affection than do androgynous parents.

Finding. This hypothesis was not confirmed by the data, therefore it was rejected.

Hypothesis IV

Androgynous parents of boys and androgynous parents of girls do not differ on the encouragement of independence but sex-typed parents of boys encourage independence more often than do sex-typed parents of girls.

Finding. This hypothesis was not confirmed by the data. Even though androgynous parents of boys did not differ from androgynous parents of girls, neither did sex-typed parents of boys differ from sex-typed parents of girls. The only significant difference on the encouragement of independence occurred between androgynous parents of boys and sex-typed parents of girls with androgynous parents of boys encouraging independence significantly more ($p < .05$).

The answer to Question I is that androgynous parents do not differ significantly from sex-typed parents in child-rearing attitudes and practices as measured by the CRPR and games of ticktacktoe.

Question II

Do parents of girls differ from parents of boys in self-reports of child-rearing attitudes and practices?

This question was substantiated by the data analyzed in Hypothesis IV in that parents of boys did differ from parents of girls with androgynous parents of boys placing significantly greater emphasis on individuation than sex-typed parents of girls. In addition, further analysis of the data indicated that parents of girls suppressed sex and affection, openly expressed feelings, and exhibited greater nurturance with girls than with boys ($p < .05$). In addition, parents of boys encouraged individuation more than did parents of girls ($p < .01$). Therefore Question II is answered affirmatively by the measures used in this research.

Question III

Do androgynous and sex-typed parents idealize their own sex-role orientations for their children?

Hypothesis V

Sex-typed and androgynous parents select their own sex-role orientation as their idealized child's orientation.

Finding. This hypothesis was confirmed by the data ($p < .001$). Therefore Question III is answered affirmatively. This would indicate that androgynous parents at least want different personality traits to develop in their children than do sex-typed parents. The problem remains to identify the behavioral differences (if any) by which androgynous parents hope to achieve their goals of child rearing.

Question IV

Do androgynous and sex-typed parents differ in the specific behaviors of nurturance, punitiveness, and/or competitiveness with their children?

Hypothesis VI

Masculine fathers score significantly lower in nurturance than androgynous fathers, androgynous mothers, or feminine mothers.

Hypothesis VII

No significant differences in nurturance exist among androgynous fathers, androgynous mothers, and feminine mothers.

Hypothesis VIII

Masculine fathers demonstrate significantly more competitive behavior than do androgynous fathers, androgynous mothers, or feminine mothers.

Hypothesis IX

No significant differences exist between androgynous fathers and androgynous mothers on competitive behavior.

Finding. None of these hypotheses was confirmed by the data, therefore, the answer to Question IV is in the negative.

Conclusions

It is concluded that despite self-reports of differential goals for their children, androgynous and sex-typed parents have highly similar attitudes and practices related to child rearing. In fact, androgynous parents were more similar to sex-typed parents in reported attitudes and in actual behavior than parents of girls (without concern to sex-role) were to parents of boys. The sex-role orientations which seemed to be highly related to differing socialization practices were the undifferentiated and cross-sex-typed parents. Although this finding was not originally predicted in this research, it is perhaps not surprising. These groups are the ones whose scores on the BSRI were either very low for masculinity and femininity or were low for the same sex and high for the opposite sex. Thus, it appears that these groups deviated most from the norm. Block et al. (1973) indicated that psychologically healthy parents (whether high or low on sex-typing) tended to produce healthy children. Therefore, the area of greatest concern when looking at selected subsamples of parents appears to be the categories which may be the psychologically unhealthy (very low self-ratings on both M and F or very low self-ratings on the appropriate sex scale on the BSRI) categories.

Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) suggested that if fathers were included in the research into sex-roles and that if selected subsamples of subjects were studied (selected for high or low sex-typing), then results might be more conclusive and the findings more consistent in terms of sex differentiated child rearing. The fathers in this study (55) were quite willing to participate, but in fact were quite similar in their attitudes and behaviors to mothers. Androgynous parents (low sex-typed) and sex-typed parents were also similar in their child-rearing attitudes and behaviors. The greatest number of dissimilarities occurred between parents of boys and parents of girls.

The further point should be made that the instruments for this research have become increasingly suspect by the present investigator. For example, the median split technique of scoring the BSRI produces groups wherein some members are more similar to a group that they are not in than they are to the group that they are in. Self-descriptions on the BSRI do not appear to be reflected in any behaviors in the present study even though Bem (1974, 1975) found those self-descriptions highly related to behaviors similar to the ones studied here.

When the data from the current research were factor analyzed, very different results were obtained than the factor analysis done by Block (Table 2). A factor analysis of the current results revealed seventeen factors while Block's analysis revealed twenty-one factors. Perhaps the current population was more homogeneous than Block's population, but Block's data may be confounded by the lack

of reliability of the factors in her analysis. A personal communication from Block suggested the use of *t* tests on each of the ninety-one items of the CRPR. This method of analysis (although utilized by Block) was rejected by the present investigator because of serious statistical concerns. The concerns related to the CRPR and BSRI will be elaborated in an article being prepared by this researcher.

Implications for Future Research

Based upon the findings and conclusions of this study, the following implications for further research are suggested:

1. More precise observational studies should be conducted to determine what androgynous and sex-typed parents are doing (if anything) to differentially socialize their children for androgyny or sex-typing. Since parents so strongly chose their own orientation for their child, it would seem reasonable to assume that they perceive their socialization practices differently.

2. Longitudinal studies are needed to elucidate the developmental nature of sex roles and to determine if the children of androgynous parents actually become androgynous adults and if the children of sex-typed parents become sex-typed adults.

3. More research is needed to determine the reliability of the Child-Rearing Practices Report.

4. More attention must be paid to the validity of the BSRI and to its scoring procedures. A median split scoring procedure may invalidate results. Perhaps other measures of androgyny should be developed to use in conjunction with the BSRI.

5. Studies should be designed to determine whether the children of androgynous parents are less sex-typed at early ages than are children of sex-typed parents.

6. Cross-sex-typed parents and undifferentiated parents should be included in future studies of sex-role orientation.

7. Future research should focus on families wherein both parents are androgynous and all children are of one sex in order to avoid possible interaction effects.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allport, G. W. Traits revisited. American Psychologist, 1966, 21, 1-10.

Anastasiow, N. J. Success in school and boys' sex-role patterns. Child Development, 1965, 36, 1053-1066.

Ausubel, D. P., & Sullivan, E. V. Theory and problems of child development (2nd ed.). New York: Grune & Stratton, 1970.

Bakan, D. The duality of human existence. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.

Bandura, A., & Huston, A. C. Identification as a process of incidental learning. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 63, 311-318

Bandura, A., & Walters, R. H. Social learning and personality development. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1963.

Barry, H., Bacon, M. K., & Childs, I. L. A crosscultural survey of some sex differences in socialization. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1957, 55, 327-332.

Bayer, A. Sexist students in American colleges: A descriptive note. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1975, 37 (2), 391-397.

Bayley, N. Kuder masculinity-femininity scores in adolescent boys and girls related to their scores in somatic androgyny. American Psychologist, 1949, 4, 251.

Bazin, N. T., & Freeman, A. The androgynous vision. Women's Studies, 1974, 2, 185-215.

Bem, S. L. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 155-162.

Bem, S. L. Sex role adaptability: One consequence of psychological androgyny. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 634-643. (a)

Bem, S. L. Androgyny vs. the tight little lives of fluffy women and chesty men. Psychology Today, 1975, 9 (4), 59-62. (b)

Bem, S. L. Beyond androgyny: Some presumptuous prescriptions for a liberated sexual identity. To be published in J. Sherman and F. Denmark (Eds.) Psychology of women: Future directions of research. New York: Psychological Dimensions, Inc. In press, 1976.

Bem, S. L., & Lenney, E. Sex typing and the avoidance of cross-sex behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 33 (1), 48-54.

Bem, S. L., & Watson, C. Scoring Packet: Bem Sex-Role Inventory (Revised). Unpublished manuscript, 1976.

Benjamin, H. Age and sex differences in the toy preferences of young children. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1932, 41, 417-429

Berdie, R. F. A femininity objective check list. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1959, 43, 327-333.

Biller, H. B. A multiaspect investigation of masculine development in kindergarten boys. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1968, 78, 89-138.

Biller, H. B. Father dominance and sex-role development in kindergarten-age boys. Developmental Psychology, 1968, 1, 87-94.

Biller, H. B. Father, child and sex role: Paternal determinants of personality development. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath, 1971.

Biller, H. B., & Borstelmann, L. J. Masculine development: An integrative review. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1967, 13, 253-294.

Block, J. H. The Child-Rearing Practices Report. Berkeley, California: Institute of Human Development, University of California, 1965.

Block, J. H. Conceptions of sex role: Some cross-cultural and longitudinal perspectives. American Psychologist, 1973, 28 (b), 512-526.

Block, J. H. Another look at sex differentiation in the socialization behaviors of mothers and fathers. Paper presented at conference on New Directions for Research on Women, Madison, Wisconsin, May, 1975. (To be published in Psychology of Women: Future Directions of Research. New York: Psychological Dimensions, Inc. In press, 1976.)

Block, J., von der Lippe, A., & Block, J. H. Sex-role and socialization patterns: Some personality concomitants and environmental antecedents. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1973, 41 (3), 321-341.

Broverman, I. K., Vogel, S. R., Broverman, D., Clarkson, F., & Vogel, S. R. Sexrole stereotypes: A current appraisal. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 59-78.

Brown, D. G. Sex-role preference in young children. Psychological Monographs, 1956, 70, 1-18.

Brown, D. G. Masculinity-femininity development in children. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1957, 21, 197-202.

Brown, D. G. Sex-role development in a changing culture. Psychological Bulletin, 1958, 55, 232-242.

Brown, D. G., & Tolor, A. Human figure drawings as indicators of sexual identification and inversion. Perceptual Motor Skills, 1957, 7, 199-211.

Constantinople, A. Masculinity-femininity: An exception to a famous dictum. Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 80 (5), 389-407.

Cronbach, L. J. Essentials of Psychological Testing (2nd ed.). New York: Harper, 1960.

Dahlstrom, W. G., & Welsh, G. S. An MMPI Handbook: A guide to use in clinical practice and research. Minneapolis: University of Minneasota Press, 1960.

De Lucia, L. A. The toy preference test: A measure of sex-role identification. Child Development, 1963, 34, 107-117.

Dollard, J., & Miller, N. E. Personality and psychotherapy. New york: McGraw-Hill, 1950.

Erikson, E. H. Childhood and society (2nd ed.). New York: Norton, 1963.

Fagot, B. I. Sex-related stereotyping of toddlers' behaviors. Developmental Psychology, 1973, 9, 429.

Fagot, B. I. Sex differences in toddlers' behavior and parental reaction. Developmental Psychology, 1974, 10, 554-558.

Fauls, L. B., & Smith, W. D. Sex-role learning of five-year-olds. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1956, 89, 105-117.

Fling, S., & Manosevitz, M. Sex-typing in nursery school children's play interests. Developmental Psychology, 1972, 7, 146-152.

Franck, K., & Rosen, E. A. A projective test of masculinity-femininity. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1948, 13, 247-256.

Freedheim, D. K. An investigation of masculinity and parental role patterns. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Duke University, 1960.

Gelpi, B. C. The politics of androgyny. Women's Studies, 1974, 2, 151-160.

Goldberg, S. The inevitability of patriarchy. New York: Morrow, 1973.

Goodenough, F. W. Semantic choice and personality structure. Science, 1946, 104, 451-456.

Goodstein, L. D. Regional differences in MMPI responses among male college students. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1954, 18, 437-441.

Gough, H. G. Identifying psychological femininity. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1952, 12, 427-439.

Gray, S. W. Masculinity-femininity in relation to anxiety and social acceptance. Child Development, 1957, 28, 203-214.

Guilford, J. P., & Guilford, R. B. Personality factors S, E, and M and their measurement. Journal of Psychology, 1936, 2, 109-127.

Guilford, J. P., & Zimmerman, W. S. Fourteen dimensions of temperament. Psychological Monographs, 1956, 70 (10, whole No. 417).

Hall, C. S., & Lindzey, G. Theories of personality. New York: John Wiley, 1957.

Harris, D. A. Androgyny: The sexist in disguise. Women's Studies, 1974, 2, 171-184.

Hartley, R. E. Sex-role pressures and the socialization of the male child. Psychological Reports, 1959, 5, 457-463.

Hartley, R. E. A developmental view of female sex-role definition and identification. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1964, 10, 3-16.

Hartup, W. W., Moore, S. G., & Sager, G. Avoidance of inappropriate sex-typing by young children. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1963, 27, 467-473.

Hartup, W. W., & Zook, E. A. Sex-role preferences in three- and four-year-old children. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1960, 24, 420-426.

Hathaway, S. R., & McKinley, J. C. The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1943.

Hattwick, L. A. Sex differences in behavior of nursery school children. Child Development, 1937, 8, 343-355.

Heilbrun, A. B. Conformity to masculinity-femininity stereotypes and egoidentity in adolescents. Psychological Reports, 1964, 14, 351-357.

Heilbrun, A. B. An empirical test of the modeling theory of sex-role learning. Child Development, 1965, 36, 789-799.

Helmstadter, G. C. Research concepts in human behavior: Education, psychology, sociology. New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts, 1970.

Hetherington, E. M. A developmental study of the effects of sex of the dominant parent on sex-role preference, identification, and imitation in children. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2, 188-194.

Hetherington, E. M. Effects of paternal absence on sex-typed behaviors in Negro and white preadolescent males. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 87-91.

Hetherington, E. M. The effects of familial variables on sex typing, on parent-child similarity, and on imitation in children. In J. P. Hill (Ed.), Minnesota symposia on child psychology. Minneapolis: Lund Press, 1967.

Hetherington, E. M., & Frankie, G. Effects of parental dominance, warmth, and conflict on imitation in children. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 6, 119-125.

Hildreth, G. The social interests of young adolescents. Child Development, 1945, 16, 119-121.

Hirsch, G. I. Nonsexist child rearing: Demythifying normative data. The Family Coordinator, 1974, 23 (2), 165-170.

Hochschild, A. R. A review of sex-role research. American Journal of Sociology, 1973, 78 (4), 1011-1029.

Horner, M. Fail: Bright women. Psychology Today, 1969, 3 (6), 36, 38, 69.

Huston-Stein, A. Issues in child development: New directions in understanding sex roles. Society for Research in Child Development Newsletter, 1976 (summer), 5-6.

Jacklin, C. N., Maccoby, E. E., & Dick, A. E. Barrier behavior and toy preference: Sex differences and their absence in the year-old child. Child Development, 1973, 44 (1), 196-200.

Jung, C. G. Two essays on analytical psychology. New York: Meridian Books, 1956.

Kagan, J. The acquisition and significance of sex-typing and sex-role identity. In M. L. Hoffman & L. W. Hoffman (eds.), Review of child development research. Vol. I. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1964.

Kagan, J., & Moss, H. Birth to maturity. New York: Wiley, 1962.

Knott, P. D., & Drost, B. A. Sex-role identification, interpersonal aggression, and anger. Psychological Reports, 1970, 27, 154.

Koch, H. L. Sissiness and tomboyishness in relation to sibling characteristics. Journal of Psychology, 1956, 88, 231-244.

Kohlberg, L. A cognitive-developmental analysis of children's sex-role concepts and attitudes. In E. E. Maccoby (Ed.), The development of sex differences. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1966.

Kohn, M. L. Social class and parental values. American Journal of Sociology, 1959, 64, 337-351.

Lambert, W. E., Yackley, A., & Hein, R. N. Child training values of English-Canadian and French-Canadian parents. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 1971, 3, 217-236.

Lansky, L. M. The family structure also affects the model: Sex-role identification in parents of preschool children. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1964, 10, 39-50.

Lansky, L. M. The family structure also affects the model: Sex-role attitudes in parents of preschool children. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1967, 13, 139-150.

Lansky, L. M., & McKay, G. Sex-role preferences of kindergarten boys and girls: Some contradictory results. Psychological Reports, 1963, 13, 415-421.

Loevinger, J. The meaning and measurement of ego development. American Psychologist, 1966, 21, 195-206.

Loevinger, J., & Wessler, R. Measuring ego development (Vol. I). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970.

Lynn, D. B. A note on sex differences in the development of masculine and feminine identification. Psychological Review, 1959, 66, 126-135.

Lynn, D. B. Divergent feedback and sex-role identification in boys and men. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1964, 10, 17-23.

Lynn, D. B. The process of learning parental and sex-role identification. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1966, 28, 466-470.

Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. H. The psychology of sex differences. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1974.

Maccoby, E. E. (Ed.). The development of sex differences. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1966.

Maslow, A. H. Toward a psychology of being. Princeton, N. J.: Van Nostrand, 1962.

McCandless, B. R. Children: Behavior and development (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1967.

McCandless, B. R. Childhood socialization. In D. A. Goslin (Ed.). Handbook of socialization theory and research. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.

Mead, M. Sex and temperament in three primitive societies. New York: New American Library, 1935.

Mead, M. Male and female: A study of the sexes in a changing world. New York: William Morrow, 1949.

Meyer, J. W., & Sobieszek, B. J. The effect of a child's sex on adult interpretations of its behavior. Developmental Psychology, 1972, 6, 42-48.

Minton, C., Kagan, J., & Levine, J. A. Maternal control and obedience in the two-year-old. Child Development, 1971, 42, 1873-1894.

Minuchin, P. Sex-role concepts and sex typing in childhood as a function of school and home environments. Child Development, 1965, 36, 1033-1048.

Mischel, W. A social-learning view of sex differences in behavior. In E. E. Maccoby (Ed.), The development of sex differences. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1966.

Mischel, W. Sex typing and socialization. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), Carmichael's manual of child psychology. New York: Wiley, 1970.

Mischel, W. Toward a cognitive social learning reconceptualization of personality. Psychological Review, 1974, 80, 252-283.

Money, J. The sexes: Biological imperatives. Time, January 8, 1973.

Moss, H. A. Sex, age, and state as determinants of mother-infant interaction. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1967, 13 19-36.

Mowrer, O. H. Identification: A link between learning theory and psychotherapy. In Learning theory and personality dynamics. New York: Ronald Press, 1950.

Murray, J. B. The Mf scale of the MMPI for college students. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1963, 19, 113-115.

Mussen, P. H. Some antecedents and consequents of masculine sex typing in adolescent boys. Psychological Monographs, 1961, 75, 1-24.

Mussen, P. H. Early sex-role development. In D. A. Goslin (Ed.), Handbook of socialization theory and research. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.

Mussen, P. H., & Rutherford, E. Parent-child relations and parental personality in relation to young children's sex-role preferences. Child Development, 1963, 34, 589-607.

Naffziger, C. C., & Naffziger K. Development of sex role stereotypes. The Family Coordinator, 1974, 23 (3), 251-258.

Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K., & Bent, D. H. Statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS, 2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Osofsky, J. D., & Osofsky, H. J. Androgyny as a life style. The Family Coordinator, 1972, 21 (4), 43-50.

Palme, O. The emancipation of man. Journal of Social Classes, 1972, 28 (2), 237-246.

Parsons, T. Family structure and the socialization of the child. In T. Parsons & R. F. Bales (Eds.), Family, socialization, and interaction process. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1955.

Rabban, M. Sex-role identification in young children in two diverse social groups. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1950, 42, 81-158.

Reece, M. Masculinity and femininity: A factor analytic study. Psychological Reports, 1964, 14, 123-139.

Rheingold, H. L., & Cook, K. V. The contents of boys' and girls' rooms as an index of parent's behavior. Child Development, 1975, 46, 459-463.

Robinson, B. E. Sex-typed attitudes, sex-typed contingency behaviors, and personality characteristics of male caregivers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Greensboro: University of North Carolina, 1976.

Rosenberg, B. G., & Sutton-Smith, B. A revised conception of masculine-feminine differences in play activities. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1960, 96, 165-170.

Rossi, A. Equality between the sexes: An immodest proposal. Daedalus, 1964, 93, 607-652.

Rothbart, M. K., & Maccoby, E. E. Parents' differential reactions to sons and daughters. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 237-243.

Sears, R. R., Maccoby, E. E., & Levin, H. Patterns of child rearing. New York: Harper, 1957.

Sears, R. R., Rau, L., & Alpert, R. Identification and child rearing. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1965.

Secor, C. Androgyny: An early reappraisal. Women's Studies, 1974, 2, 161-169.

Serbin, L. A., O'Leary, K. D., Kent, R. N., & Tonick, I. J. A comparison of teacher response to the pre-academic and problem behavior of boys and girls. Child Development, 1973, 44, 796-804.

Seward, G. H. Psychotherapy and culture conflict. New York: Ronald, 1956.

Shlein, J. M. Phenomenology and personality. In J. M. Wepman and R. W. Heine (Eds.), Concepts of personality. Chicago: Aldine, 1963.

Smith, W. D. Black parents' differential attitudes toward childhood behaviors and child-rearing practices. Unpublished first-year project, Stanford University, 1971. As reported in Maccoby and Jacklin, 1974.

Strong, E. K. Interests of men and women. Journal of Social Psychology, 1936, 7, 49-67.

Terman, L. M., & Miles, C. C. Sex and personality: Studies in masculinity and femininity. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1936.

Thompson, N. L., & McCandless, B. R. IT score variations by instructional style. Child Development, 1970, 41, 425-436.

Vogel, S. R., Broverman, I. K., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., & Rosenkrantz, P. S. Maternal employment and perception of sex roles among college students. Developmental Psychology, 1970, 3, 384-391.

Ward, W. D. Process of sex-role development. Developmental Psychology, 1969, 1, 163-168.

Whiting, B., & Edward, C. P. A cross-cultural analysis of sex differences in the behavior of children age three through eleven. In S. Chess and A. Thomas (Eds.), Annual progress in child psychiatry and child development, 1974. New York: Brunner/Mazel, 1975.

Whiting, J. W. M. Sorcery, sin, and the superego: A cross-cultural study of some mechanisims of social control. In R. Jones (Ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1959.

APPENDIX A

Bem Sex-Role Inventory

(Father or Mother was typed at the top of this page.)

Full Name_____
Sex:_____ Age:_____ Occupation:_____
Sex and age of children:_____

_____
Telephone:_____ (If you have no phone, please give us some way of contacting you, e.g., your address)

On the back you will be shown a large number of personality characteristics. We would like you to use those characteristics in order to describe yourself. That is, we would like you to indicate, on a scale from 1 to 7, how true of you these various characteristics are. Please do not leave any characteristic unmarked.

Example: sly

Mark a 1 if it is NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER TRUE that you are sly.

Mark a 2 if it is USUALLY NOT TRUE that you are sly.

Mark a 3 if it is SOMETIMES BUT INFREQUENTLY TRUE that you are sly.

Mark a 4 if it is OCCASIONALLY TRUE that you are sly.

Mark a 5 if it is OFTEN TRUE that you are sly.

Mark a 6 if it is USUALLY TRUE that you are sly.

Mark a 7 if it is ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE that you are sly.

Thus, if you feel it is sometimes but infrequently true that you are "sly", never or almost never true that you are "malicious", always or almost always true that you are "irresponsible", and often true that you are "carefree", then you would rate these characteristics as follows:

Sly	3	Irresponsible	7
Malicious	1	Carefree	5

Please complete this form describing yourself.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER TRUE	USUALLY NOT TRUE	SOMETIMES BUT INFREQUENTLY TRUE	OCCASIONALLY TRUE	OFTEN TRUE	USUALLY TRUE	ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE

Self reliant		Reliable		Warm	
Yielding		Analytical		Solemn	
Helpful		Sympathetic		Willing to take a stand	
Defends own beliefs		Jealous		Tender	
Cheerful		Has leadership abilities		Friendly	
Moody		Sensitive to the needs of others		Aggressive	
Independent				Gullible	
Shy		Truthful		Inefficient	
Conscientious		Willing to take risks		Acts as a leader	
Athletic		Understanding		Childlike	
Affectionate		Secretive		Adaptable	
Theatrical		Makes decisions easily		Individualistic	
Assertive		Compassionate		Does not use harsh language	
Flatterable		Sincere		Unsystematic	
Happy		Self-sufficient		Competitive	
Strong personality		Eager to soothe hurt feelings		Loves children	
Loyal		Conceited		Tactful	
Unpredictable		Dominant		Ambitious	
Forceful		Soft-spoken		Gentle	
Feminine		Likable		Conventional	
		Masculine			

Please complete this form describing your child as you would like him or her to be at age 25.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER TRUE	USUALLY NOT TRUE	SOMETIMES BUT INFREQUENTLY TRUE	OCCASIONALLY TRUE	OFTEN TRUE	USUALLY TRUE	ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE

Self reliant		Reliable		Warm	
Yielding		Analytical		Solemn	
Helpful		Sympathetic		Willing to take a stand	
Defends own beliefs		Jealous		Tender	
Cheerful		Has leadership abilities		Friendly	
Moody		Sensitive to the needs of others		Aggressive	
Independent		Truthful		Gullible	
Shy		Willing to take risks		Inefficient	
Conscientious		Understanding		Acts as a leader	
Athletic		Secretive		Childlike	
Affectionate		Makes decisions easily		Adaptable	
Theatrical		Compassionate		Individualistic	
Assertive		Sincere		Does not use harsh language	
Flatterable		Self-sufficient		Unsystematic	
Happy		Eager to soothe hurt feelings		Competitive	
Strong personality		Conceited		Loves children	
Loyal		Dominant		Tactful	
Unpredictable		Soft-spoken		Ambitious	
Forceful		Likable		Gentle	
Feminine		Masculine		Conventional	

Name of Child:_____ Age:_____ Sex: M F

APPENDIX B

Child-Rearing Practices Report

Instructions for the Q-Sort Cards

(Modified to Apply to this Study)

Developed by

Jeanne H. Block

Institute of Human Development

University of California, Berkeley

In trying to gain more understanding of effective parenting techniques, we would like to know what is important to you as a parent and what kinds of methods you use in rearing your child who is now in kindergarten. You are asked to indicate your opinions by sorting through a special set of cards that contain statements about bringing up children.

Please do the task separately and do not discuss the card placements with your spouse. After you have each completed the task on your own, then you may find it interesting to discuss the sorts. It is important that we find out the real differences, as well as the similarities, between mothers and fathers in their child-rearing attitudes and behavior.

The Cards and Envelopes

Each set or deck contains 91 cards. Each card contains a sentence having to do with child rearing. Some of these sentences will be true or descriptive of your attitudes and behavior in relation to your child. Some sentences will be untrue or undescriptive of your feelings and behavior toward this child. By sorting these cards according to the instructions below, you will be able to show how descriptive or undescriptive each of these sentences is for you.

Together with the cards you have received 7 envelopes, with the following labels:

7. These cards are most descriptive.
6. These cards are quite descriptive.
5. These cards are fairly descriptive.
4. These cards are neither descriptive nor undescriptive.
3. These cards are fairly undescriptive.
2. These cards are quite undescriptive.
1. These cards are most undescriptive

Your task is to choose 13 cards that fit into each of these categories and to put them into their proper envelopes.

How to Sort the Cards (You may wish to check off each step as completed)

_____1. Take the cards and shuffle them a bit first.

_____2. Find a large cleared surface, like a kitchen table or desk, and spread out the envelopes in a row, going from 7 to 1 (Most Descriptive to Most Undescriptive):

7 6 5 4 3 2 1

_____3. Now take the shuffled deck of cards, and read each sentence carefully.

_____4. Now, pick out the 13 cards that are most descriptive of your behavior with your child. Put these cards on top of envelope #7. Don't put them inside yet, because you might want to shift some of them later.

_____5. Next, from the cards that remain, pick out 13 cards that you think are quite descriptive of your behavior and put these on top of envelope #6.

_____6. Now, pick out the 13 cards that are most undescriptive of you. Put these on top of envelope #1.

_____7. Then pick out the 13 cards which are quite undescriptive and put them on envelope #2.

_____8. You should now have 39 cards left over. These are now to be sorted into three new piles with 13 cards in each: 13 cards that are fairly descriptive of you (to be put on envelope #5); 13 cards that are neither descriptive nor undescriptive (to be put on envelope #4); and 13 cards that are fairly undescriptive (to be put on envelope #3).

You may find it hard, as others have, to put the same number of cards in each pile but we must ask you to follow these directions exactly, even if you feel limited by them.

_____9. Now, as a last step, look over your sort to see if there are any changes you want to make. When the cards seem to belong where you have put them, double-check to be sure you have 13 cards in each pile. Then put each pile in the proper envelopes and tuck in the flaps. The small envelopes go into the large envelope for return.

Thank you for your cooperation.

1. I respect my child's opinions and encourage (him) (her) to express them.

2. I encourage my child always to do (his) (her) best.

3. I put the wishes of my mate before the wishes of my child.

4. I help my child when (he) (she) is being teased by his friends.

5. I often feel angry with my child.

6. If my child gets into trouble, I expect (him) (her) to handle the problem mostly by (himself) (herself).

7. I punish my child by putting (him) (her) off somewhere by (himself) (herself) for a while.

8. I watch closely what my child eats and when (he) (she) eats.

9. I don't think young children of different sexes should be allowed to see each other naked.

10. I wish my spouse were more interested in our children.

11. I feel a child should be given comfort and understanding when (he) (she) is scared or upset.

12. I try to keep my child away from children or families who have different ideas or values from our own.

13. I try to stop my child from playing rough games or doing things where (he) (she) might get hurt.

14. I believe physical punishment to be the best way of disciplining.

15. I believe that a child should be seen and not heard.

16. I sometimes forget the promises I have made to my child.

17. I think it is good practice for a child to perform in front of others.

18. I express affection by hugging, kissing, and holding my child.

19. I find some of my greatest satisfactions in my child.

20. I prefer that my child not try things if there is a chance (he) (she) will fail.

21. I encourage my child to wonder and think about life.

22. I usually take into account my child's preferences in making plans for the family.

23. I wish my child did not have to grow up so fast.

24. I feel a child should have time to think, daydream, and even loaf sometimes.

25. I find it difficult to punish my child.

26. I let my child make many decisions for himself.

27. I do not allow my child to say bad things about (his) (her) teachers.

28. I worry about the bad and sad things that can happen to a child as (he) (she) grows up.

29. I teach my child that in one way or another punishment will find (him) (her) when (he) (she) is bad.

30. I do not blame my child for whatever happens if others ask for trouble.

31. I do not allow my child to get angry with me.

32. I feel my child is a bit of a disappointment to me.

33. I expect a great deal of my child.

34. I am easy-going and relaxed with my child.

35. I give up some of my own interests because of my child.

36. I tend to spoil my child.

37. I have never caught my child lying.

38. I talk it over and reason with my child when (he) (she) misbehaves.

39. I trust my child to behave as (he) (she) should, even when I am not with (him) (her).

40. I joke and play with my child.

41. I give my child a good many duties and family responsibilities.

42. My child and I have warm, intimate times together.

43. I have strict, well-established rules for my child.

44. I think one has to let a child take many chances as (he) (she) grows up and tries new things.

45. I encourage my child to be curious, to explore and question things.

46. I sometimes talk about supernatural forces and beings in explaining things to my child.

47. I expect my child to be grateful and appreciate all the advantages (he) (she) has.

48. I sometimes feel that I am too involved with my child.

49. I believe in toilet training a child as soon as possible.

50. I threaten punishment more often than I actually give it.

51. I believe in praising a child when (he) (she) is good and think it gets better results than punishing (him) (her) when (he) (she) is bad.

52. I make sure my child knows that I appreciate what (he) (she) tries or accomplishes.

53. I encourage my child to talk about (his) (her) troubles.

54. I believe children should not have secrets from their parents.

55. I teach my child to keep control of (his) (her) feelings at all times.

56. I try to keep my child from fighting.

57. I dread answering my child's questions about sex.

58. When I am angry with my child, I let (him) (her) know it.

59. I think a child should be encouraged to do things better than others.

60. I punish my child by taking away a privilege (he) (she) otherwise would have had.

61. I give my child extra privileges when (he) (she) behaves well.

62. I enjoy having the house full of children.

63. I believe that too much affection and tenderness can harm or weaken a child.

64. I believe that scolding and criticism makes my child improve.

65. I believe my child should be aware of how much I sacrifice for (him) (her).

66. I sometimes tease and make fun of my child.

67. I teach my child that (he) (she) is responsible for what happens to (him) (her).

68. I worry about the health of my child.

69. There is a good deal of conflict between my child and me.

70. I do not allow my child to question my decisions.

71. I feel that it is good for a child to play competitive games.

72. I like to have some time for myself, away from my child.

73. I let my child know how ashamed and disappointed I am when (he) (she) misbehaves.

74. I want my child to make a good impression on others.

75. I encourage my child to be independent of me.

76. I make sure I know where my child is and what (he) (she) is doing.

77. I find it interesting and educational to be with my child for long periods.

78. I think a child should be weaned from the breast or bottle as soon as possible.

79. I instruct my child not to get dirty while (he) (she) is playing.

80. I don't go out if I have to leave my child with a stranger.

81. I think jealousy and quarreling between brothers and sisters should be punished.

82. I think children must learn early not to cry.

83. I control my child by warning (him) (her) about the bad things that can happen to (him) (her).

84. I think it is best if the mother, rather than the father, is the one with the most authority over the children.

85. I don't want my child to be looked upon as different from others.

86. I don't think children should be given sexual information before they can understand everything.

87. I believe it is very important for a child to play outside and get plenty of fresh air.

88. I get pleasure from seeing my child eating well and enjoying (his) (her) food.

89. I don't allow my child to tease or play tricks on others.

90. I think it is wrong to insist that young boys and girls have different kinds of toys and play different sorts of games.

91. I believe it is unwise to let children play a lot by themselves without supervision from grown-ups.

CRPR Coding Sheet

	subject number	
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
29		
30		
31		
32		
33		
34		
35		
36		
37		
38		
39		
40		
41		
42		
43		
44		
45		
46		
47		
48		
49		
50		

51			
52			
53			
54			
55			
56			
57			
58			
59			
60			
61			
62			
63			
64			
65			
66			
67			
68			
69			
70			
71			
72			
73			
74			
75			
76			
77			
78			
79			
80			
81			
82			
83			
84			
85			
86			
87			
88			
89			
90			
91			
92			
93			sex of parent
94			
95			sex of child
96			
97			role of parent
98			
99	1.	2.	nurturance (%)
100			competitiveness

APPENDIX C

RATING FORM FOR TICKTACKTOE

RATING FORM

Nurturing Statement

1. Mother/Father praises or speaks favorably
2. Mother/Father gives physical or verbal comfort
3. Mother/Father helps or guides child
4. Mother/Father explains (positively)

fifteen games of ticktacktoe

Nurturing
Statements
(1,2,3,4)

Punitive
Statements
(5,6,7,8)

Punitive Statement

5. Mother/Father criticizes (negatively)
6. Mother/Father challenges child (negatively)
7. Mother/Father corrects or reprimands
8. Mother/Father punishes

	Rater 1	Rater 2
Total number of statements	_____	_____
Percentage nurturance	_____	_____
Percentage punitiveness	_____	_____

Parent's Name:_____ Wins:____

Ties:____

APPENDIX D

Form Letter

November, 1976

Dear Parents:

I would like to ask for your help in a project that I am doing on child-rearing practices and opinions of parents of school-age children. This study is important because children are important. If we can learn about how capable parents rear their children, then we can help other parents acquire the necessary skills for effective parenting. I especially need to learn about fathers for this study since most of the research that has been done so far has not included fathers. I think fathers are important too!

The study will be done in several parts, but not everyone will do all parts. Right now, all I am asking that you do is to rate yourself and your five-year-old child on the enclosed scales. This will take about thirty minutes. From the group of parents who agree to help in this important project, I will select 100 persons at random. The 100 persons will be contacted for a visit to their homes. This visit will last about one hour. At that time I would observe while you play several games with your child and I would ask you to tell me your priorities in child rearing.

Please help me. Your thinking is important. The total project will, at the most, take two hours of your time. You will gain insight into your ideas about bringing up children and you will help me to help other parents improve their skills. When the study is finished you will be sent a copy of the results. Please complete the attached scales without consulting each other. When you finish you may wish to compare your answers but do not change them at that time. Then mail the completed forms to me in the attached, stamped envelope. This study is not being conducted by your child's school but by the USC Department of Early Childhood Education. Your participation is completely voluntary. If you have any questions please contact me at 777-5129 or 798-5926.

Sincerely,

/s/ Carol Hobson

Carol Hobson
Instructor
Early Childhood Education