SEX-TYPED ATTITUDES, SEX-TYPED CONTINGENCY BEHAVIORS, AND PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF MALE CAREGIVERS

by

Bryan E. Robinson

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
1976

Approved by

Helen Canaday
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

Helen Canaday

Oral Examination Committee Members

John B. Shore, Jr.

Garett Lange

J. Allen Watson

Barbara Clauran

May 11, 1976
Date of Examination

ROBINSON, BRYAN EUGENE. Sex-Typed Attitudes, Sex-Typed Contingency Behaviors, and Personality Characteristics of Male Caregivers. (1976) Directed by: Dr. Helen Canaday. Pp. 191.

The present study was designed to investigate the sex-typed attitudes, sex-typed contingency behaviors, and personality characteristics of male caregivers. The data for sex-typed attitudes were collected from The Sex-Typed Attitude Checklist, drawn from a study by Williams and Bennett (1975). The Adjective Check List (Gough & Heilbrun, 1965) assessed the personality characteristics of the respondents, and The Fagot-Patterson Checklist (1969) was employed to determine the sex-typed contingency behaviors of the male and female caregivers.

A contrasting samples survey design was implemented. A random sample of 20 male caregivers who had adopted a traditionally feminine occupation was contrasted to 20 male engineers who were employed in a more traditionally masculine occupation. The male engineers were matched to the male caregivers on age, education, and years of experience. The contrasting variables were the sex-typed attitudinal preferences for boys and girls and the personality characteristics between the two groups. An additional group of 20 female caregivers matched by day care center, age, education, and experience was included to provide additional contrasts on the sex-typed attitudes and personality characteristics of the male caregivers. The sex-typed contingency behaviors of the male caregivers were also compared with those of the females.

An analysis of variance conducted on the three groups revealed that all subjects maintained masculine attitudinal

preferences for boys but felt that girls should be equally masculine and feminine (i.e., androgynous) in their behavior. It was also found, however, that the sex-typed attitudes and personality traits of the caregivers were unrelated to their actual contingency behaviors in a classroom setting. A repeated measures analysis of variance indicated that both male and female caregivers reinforced children significantly more for feminine behaviors than masculine behaviors. The behaviors of the females were congruent to those of females in previous studies; however, the reinforcing contingencies of the employed male caregivers in this study were more feminine than the masculine reinforcing contingencies of younger, male students in an earlier study (McCandless & Bush, 1975). The variable of sex-role adoption was believed to be an important factor in the discrepancy between these studies. Both male and female caregivers punished masculine behaviors more than they punished feminine behaviors which indicated that feminine behaviors were allowed to manifest themselves. This trend was explained by the fact that feminine behaviors are frequently those which allow for more order and quiet in the classroom. Both male and female caregivers were more rewarding than punitive in their interactions with children.

Generally, the findings reported here did not confirm the deluge of impressionistic reports in the educational literature which claim that males should be employed to counterbalance the "feminized" environment in early education. Although male caregivers may have modeling value for children, this variable was not measured here; furthermore, it was

concluded that the utilization of males for sex-typing purposes was questionable when their contingency behaviors were considered.

An analysis of variance on the three groups revealed that the personalities of the male and female caregivers were more similar than those of the male engineers. Although the personalities of the male caregivers corresponded to the feminine direction of their female counterparts, they were no more feminine than the personalities of the male engineers which were judged to be androgynous. Thus, it was concluded that the personalities of neither the male caregivers nor the male engineers were highly masculine. The personalities of the female caregivers, however, were significantly more feminine than the androgynous personalities of the male engineers. Female caregivers were less achievement-oriented than male engineers. Both caregiver groups were lower in endurance or were less likely to persist at tasks.

Significant positive correlations were found to exist between the personalities of the subjects and their sex-typed attitudes. The more masculine personalities held masculine-preferred attitudes towards children while the more feminine personalities maintained feminine-preferred attitudes.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to extend my sincere appreciation to Dr. Helen Canaday, my adviser and Professor of Home Economics, Dr. Garrett Lange, Assistant Professor of Child Development, Dr. John B. Chase, Jr., Professor and Dean of the College of Human Development and Learning, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Dr. Barbara Clawson, Associate Professor of Home Economics, Dr. James Watson, Associate Professor and Chairman of the Department of Child Development and Family Relations, the members of my doctoral committee, for their supportive guidance and advice given to me during the course of this study.

I wish to acknowledge Dr. Minta Saunders, whose enthusiastic approach to research has been a constant inspiration to me.

To Dr. Garrett Lange, who gave invaluable guidance with the statistical design, and to Dr. Bill Powers, who helped with the data analysis, I am especially grateful.

Sincere appreciation is extended to Jamey McCullers for his assistance in establishing observer reliability data. To Laur Stayer, I express my warmest thanks for typing all of the preliminary and final copies. Her dependability was a valuable asset.

A special thanks is extended to the Day Care Consultants of the State of North Carolina for their active participation in helping me compile a list of male caregivers in North Carolina.

I would like to express my appreciation to all the participants in this study. I especially wish to acknowledge the Day Care Center Directors and the male and female caregivers in the participating centers for their unyielding cooperation.

To my parents, Mr. and Mrs. W. B. Robinson, I express my gratitude for their enduring support and encouragement throughout my academic career.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Since its inception, the topic of sex-role acquisition has received little research attention. Systematic inquiry into the sex-role development of young children has its rudiments in the early 1900's (Hattwick, 1937). The early studies (Benjamin, 1932; Hattwick, 1937) were frequently lacking polish and research sophistication. Nevertheless, these embryonic endeavors laid the foundation for later, more viable inquiries.

As late as 1957, Brown (1957) and even later Ward (1969) lamented the paucity of research dealing with this subject, while concurrently citing the substantial amount of information prevailing in other areas of child development (e.g., physical and cognitive realms). A rash of works appeared in the late 1950's and early 1960's. Fewer contributions are cited in the literature beyond the sixth decade. Thus, it seems we have only begun to make progress in the scientific scrutiny of sex-role acquisition in the human organism.

The process of sex-role acquisition is important because it is at the root of how our society socializes the young. An obvious need exists for more sophisticated, creative, relevant, and heuristic approaches into the manner in which sex roles are acquired and maintained within the

human organism. The effects of male teachers and caregivers upon the sex-role acquisition of young children is an especially new area and one which has realized a modest amount of empirical attention. The few studies which do exist are conflicting ones.

Statement of the Problem

The major purpose of the present study was to assess the sex-typed contingency behaviors dispensed by male caregivers and further clarify the direction of these behaviors by males in early education. An attempt was made to discern whether males in day care encourage sex-appropriate behaviors or sex-inappropriate behaviors. Although previous inquiries (McCandless & Bush, 1975; Raines, Bush, Carden, & McCandless, 1974) revealed that male caregivers differentially reinforce boys and girls for sex-appropriate behaviors, pilot work by the current writer (Robinson, 1975) indicated conflicting data. It was found that male caregivers did not differentially reinforce children for sex-typed behaviors. Of all reinforcements given to boys, 59 per cent were given to the average boy for feminine behaviors. This is contrasted to only 26 per cent in the McCandless and Bush (1975) study. The average girl received 51 per cent reinforcement for feminine behaviors compared to 81 per cent in the previous study. Thus, male caregivers in the pilot work reinforced boys just as often for feminine behaviors as they did for masculine behaviors. The same trend was noted for girls.

The males also discouraged boys more for masculine behaviors and hardly punished either boys or girls for engaging in feminine behaviors, allowing these behaviors to be manifested. This tendency was similar to the female teacher or caregiver's pattern of responses which has been well documented in the literature (Etaugh, Collins, & Gerson, 1975; Etaugh & Hughes, 1975; Fagot & Patterson, 1969; Feshbach, 1969; Good & Grouws, 1972; Levitin & Chananie, 1972; McCandless & Bush, 1975; Raines et al., 1974).

There was only one study known to the writer which investigated the contingency behaviors of male caregivers (McCandless & Bush, 1975). It was believed that the male subjects in this study were not representative of those men actually employed in day care. They were predominantly young, inexperienced high school adolescents receiving academic credit and minimum wages for participating in the research. It was doubtful that these males had any intentions of pursuing a career in a female-dominated field. The investigators themselves lamented this fact and attributed it to a lack of prestige, salary, and in some cases to the stigma attached to adopting cross-sex-role behavior (Bush, Carden, & Raines, 1975; Raines et al., 1974). In one study (Bush et al., 1975) it was revealed that there was some resentment on the part of the males in having to accept direct commands from women; furthermore, when asked about actual employment, the male subjects responded negatively to entering a field currently dominated by females.

Male caregivers in the pilot study exemplified one characteristic which the subjects in previous studies did not. Men in day care have chosen it as their profession and, in so doing, have adopted an aspect of the feminine role as discussed by Lynn (1959; 1966). In one study (Etaugh & Hughes, 1975) the variable of sex-role adoption was considered because men who were actually employed as elementary school teachers were surveyed. This study confirmed the results of the pilot work and revealed that male and female teachers both gave more approval to feminine sex-typed behaviors (i.e., dependent behaviors) as opposed to masculine sex-typed behaviors (i.e., aggressive behaviors) in both boys and girls.

One would expect, however, more "feminizing" to occur at the day care level than at the elementary school level. School teaching is no longer regarded so much a woman's world as it once was. It is not unusual to locate a population of men at this level of employ (Mason, Dressel, & Bain, 1959); on the other hand, it is difficult to locate males working in day care centers. Out of the total number of school teachers in the United States 35.5 per cent are men (NEA, 1965); whereas, men in day care in this nation comprise only four per cent of the total number of workers ("Drive To Open Up More Careers for Women," 1974). Furthermore, teaching, unlike day care, does not entail the caregiving and nurturing of children characteristic of the

female sex. Day care is a field traditionally and contemporaneously monopolized by women.

Mason, Dressel, and Bain (1959) have shown that sex role and occupational role are in close alignment. They assert that some occupations are dubbed either masculine or feminine; when studying them, it is a valid assumption to conceive of sex role as a constant factor. They reported that men traditionally choose their occupations for economic reasons; moreover, where males have elected teaching as an occupation (and in this case caregiving), a relationship exists between this choice and factors intrinsic to their work and job satisfaction (e.g., working conditions, nature of the work).

Brophy and Good (1974) in their extensive review of the literature concluded that male and female teachers tend to prefer compliant and conforming children to assertive and independent ones (Etaugh & Hughes, 1975; Feshbach, 1969; Good & Grouws, 1972; Levitin & Chananie, 1972). They have cited this trend as an indication that there is something unique to those who enter the profession and/or the content of the programs themselves. It was believed this uniqueness causes teachers to adopt their particular pattern of preferences. Further, it was believed that male caregivers enter day care because of intrinsic needs and unique personality traits.

It was proposed that although the males in these previous studies appeared to be offering sex-appropriate contingencies for children, this trend does not depict the true

picture of the behaviors of men who choose to enter the day care field. Because sex role as a background characteristic and its relation to occupation have been largely unexplored (Colombotos, 1963), it seemed crucial that the men actually choosing day care as a profession be scrutinized in order to determine the reality of the situation.

The literature is replete with articles, largely impressionistic ones, which espouse the greater utilization of males in day care and other school settings to circumvent the "feminizing" of children (Burtt, 1965; Fagot & Patterson, 1969; Johnston, 1970; Kendall, 1972; Kyselka, 1966; Peltier, 1968; Raines et al., 1974; Sexton, 1969; Triplett, 1968; Vairo, 1969; Williams, 1970). The belief is that a strong male figure will perpetuate sex-appropriate behaviors in the child, thus facilitating sex-role acquisition in young children. The actual behaviors of men in this "feminine counterbalancing" capacity, however, have been the subject of little research. Evidence to suggest that men in early education have a more "masculinized" influence is very weak, yielding a modest amount of empirical support to corroborate these claims (Lee, 1973). In order to validate or invalidate the impressionistic data, the present study served to further clarify the sex-typed attitudes and contingency behaviors of males in early education. To this writer's knowledge no other study has examined a sample of males actually employed as day care teachers.

Definitions

Sex-role adoption has been defined by Lynn (1959; 1966) as the overt demonstration of the desire to assume the properties of one sex or the other. He illustrates cross-sex-role adoption with the example of male hairdressers. Male nurses constitute another situation of feminine sex-role adoption (Lynn, Vaden, & Vaden, 1975). These examples do not imply that the men involved either prefer the feminine sex role or identify with it. Sex-role preference, adoption, and identification have been shown (Ward, 1969) to be three separate and independent entities.

Feminine sex-role adoption was defined as the propensity of the male or female to choose a traditionally feminine occupation; on the other hand, masculine sex-role adoption was the propensity of the male to assume a traditionally masculine occupational role.

Sex-typed attitudes were defined by either masculine or feminine preferences on a sex-typed checklist. For each subject, a count was made of the number of adjectives which the subject indicated to be more preferable for either young boys or young girls. Masculine preferences were represented by the selection of those adjectives which were found to be sex-typed for males in a study by Williams and Bennett (1975). Feminine preferences were those adjectives which were found to be sex-typed for females in the same study (see Appendix D for the list of adjectives).

Sex-typed contingency behaviors consisted of the frequency of sex-typed reinforcers or punishers dispensed by male and female caregivers. The total number of reinforcements (i.e., teacher's favorable comments and joining a child's activity) and punishers (i.e., teacher criticism and initiating new behaviors) dispensed by the caregivers for sex-characteristic behavior were assessed. Masculine contingencies were those contingencies which reinforced traditionally masculine behaviors in boys and girls and punished feminine behaviors in both sexes. Feminine contingencies were those which reinforced traditionally feminine behaviors in boys and girls and punished masculine behaviors in both sexes.

Personality traits were assessed by utilizing the scores from the need scales of The Adjective Check List. Masculine personality traits were operationalized by raw scores on the Achievement, Dominance, Endurance, and Autonomy scales. Feminine traits were defined by raw scores on the Abasement, Nurturance, Affiliation, Succorance, and Deference scales. These scales were found to be sex-typed in a study by Heilbrun (1964). The remaining scales (i.e., Exhibition, Heterosexuality, Change, Order, Aggression, and Intraception) were defined as neutral or non-sex-typed traits.

Hypotheses

The assumption was made that one rewards another for the roles that he himself adopts. Tentative yet consistent

support for this conceptualization is afforded by the work of Patterson and Reid (1969). They have suggested that one reinforces another for behaviors that are high in strength in his or her own repertoire. This position is explicitly stated thus:

> The degree of similarity between repertoires of social behavior covaries with the frequency of occurrence of reinforcers forthcoming in an interchange between person A and person B (p. 143).

This conceptualization is consonant with imitation, modeling, and reinforcement theories of sex-role learning (Bandura & Walters, 1963; Mischel, 1966). It would predict that boys and girls taught by a male figure would receive more masculine sex-typed cues (Brophy & Laosa, 1971). This paradigm was utilized in the current study to account for those males who have adopted an aspect of the feminine sex role to behave similarly to females. Recent evidence (Etaugh & Hughes, 1975; Good & Grouws, 1972; Robinson, 1975) indicated that where males have adopted a part of the feminine sex role, they are responding similarly as females by reinforcing and approving of feminine sex-typed behaviors in all children.

The primary hypotheses which were tested are the following:

1. a. No significant difference exists between the contingency behaviors of male and female caregivers.

b. Both male and female caregivers reinforce children more for feminine behaviors than masculine behaviors.

c. Both male and female caregivers punish children

more for masculine behaviors than feminine behaviors.

2. a. Male caregivers are significantly more feminine in their sex-typed attitudes than professional engineers.

b. Professional engineers are the most masculine in their attitudes of all three groups.

c. Female caregivers are the most feminine in their sex-typed attitudes of all three groups.

3. a. Male caregivers score significantly more feminine in their personality traits than male engineers.

b. Female caregivers are more feminine in their personality traits than male engineers.

c. Female caregivers are more feminine in their personality traits than male caregivers.

4. The sex-typed attitudes of male and female caregivers correlate positively with their actual sex-typed contingency behaviors.

5. A positive relationship exists between the sex-typed attitudes and personality traits of all subjects.

6. a. A positive relationship exists between the degree to which the caregivers reinforce sex-typed behaviors and their masculine or feminine personality traits.

b. It was further predicted that the sex-typed reinforcements dispensed by males, although feminine in orientation, correlate somewhat lower with personality scores than the females' contingency behaviors.

Limitations and Delimitations

1. All day care centers in this study were certified by the State of North Carolina and were similar in their physical facilities. There were two reasons for limiting the population of male caregivers to those in certified centers. It was believed that having all certified day care centers would offer some standardization across centers and control to some extent for what Kerlinger (1973) has termed "unit differences." He cautions that researchers frequently ignore the variances due to the differences among schools. Secondly, it was believed that because no known data of this type have been reported on male or female caregivers, an effort should be made to assess these behaviors under as optimal conditions as possible. The standards for certification are of a higher quality than for licensing. Professional educators interested in the field of child care are striving to upgrade the quality of care; thus, certified centers were selected with the anticipation that in the future, certification will be the norm by which all statewide centers will abide, while other standards become obsolete.

2. The contingency behaviors of the professional engineers could not be ascertained. Their actual behaviors can only be inferred from their sex-typed attitudes as measured by a checklist-questionnaire rather than by firsthand observation. Because the survey design has the potential weakness of temporarily lifting the respondent out of his

environmental context (Kerlinger, 1973), optimal conditions for procuring the data would have been to observe all subjects in vivo. Due to the remoteness of the groups, however, it was impossible to observe all subjects under standardized conditions. According to Campbell and Katona (1953), the survey design is used when data can not be ascertained more easily and less expensively from other sources. Therefore, the sample survey seemed to be the most appropriate method for obtaining the information upon consideration of the nature of this study.

3. The female caregivers were matched as closely as possible with male caregivers on each of these variables: years of experience, age, schooling, and day care center. It was difficult, however, to obtain complete matching on each variable; nevertheless, every attempt was made to reach the ideal.

4. The contrasting samples survey design reflects only the extremes of a distribution (e.g., the most feminine sex-role adoption and the most masculine). It, therefore, has the danger of depicting what might appear to be a linear relationship when none exists (Campbell & Katona, 1953). Thus, there were limitations within which these data could predict the locus of the variables throughout the total range of the continuum.

5. In delimiting the scope of the study, only the behaviors of caregivers were examined. Although The Fagot-Patterson Checklist (1969) is composed of 10 consequences,

six of which are child consequences, only the four teacher consequences were of interest here. Parameters must be drawn. Therefore, because they were beyond the realm of this study, the child consequences were not included as part of the data collection; furthermore, other studies have consistently shown that children reinforce like-sexed peers for same-sex behaviors (Charlesworth & Hartup, 1967; Fagot & Patterson, 1969; McCandless & Bush, 1975).

6. An additional delimitation was on the contingency behaviors themselves. The relevance of modeling and incidental learning was not accounted for in the data although others have demonstrated their significance (Bandura & Huston, 1961; Bandura & Walters, 1963; Madsen, 1968; Mussen & Parker, 1965; Raines et al., 1974; Sciarra, 1970). Generally, however, the social learning theorist purports that it is the reinforcing and punishing contingencies operating in our society which impinge upon the individual to effect sex-typed behaviors (e.g., dependency in girls and aggression in boys) (Bandura & Walters, 1963).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The point that little research exists on the sex-typed behaviors of men in day care was made in Chapter I. In Chapter II a more detailed survey of the research literature on sex-role acquisition is given. Many of these studies were concerned with parental reinforcing and punishing consequences, while a few stressed the maintenance of these established behaviors by those outside the home. Especially relevant in regard to this maintenance were the sex-typed contingencies dispensed by male caregivers. In the pages that follow an attempt is made to discuss the problem in regard to male teachers of young children. A survey of the literature examined the scores of impressionistic reports on teacher sex and sex-typing, followed by a series of contrasting empirical investigations.

A survey of the literature revealed that sex-role acquisition is a broad rubric which subsumes three dimensions: sex-role preference, sex-role adoption, and sex-role identification (Lynn, 1959). These three dimensions were first delineated by Lynn (1959). Role preference is simply the desire to adopt the behavior associated with masculinity or femininity. In the literature role preference has been traditionally assessed by the IT Scale for Children (ITSC)

(Brown, 1956), a sexless figure onto which a child is assumed to project his or her role preferences. Sex-role adoption is the overt demonstration of the desire to assume the properties of one sex or the other. The Toy Preference Test (TPT) is used extensively to discern the degree of sex-role adoption in preschoolers. Sex-role identification is explained as the internalization of the role of a given sex and incorporation of the "unconscious responses" characteristic of such a role. Human figure drawings have been utilized as indices of sex-role identification (i.e., if the male child draws a male figure, he has appropriately identified himself with the male model) (Brown & Tolor, 1957). Extensive research has shown these three measures to be stage-like and sequential in development (Biller, 1969; Biller & Borstelmann, 1967; McCandless, 1967; Thompson & McCandless, 1970; Ward, 1969).

Ward (1969) sought to assess the timing and sequence of sex-role development and to investigate the intricacies among the three aspects of such development. Measures for preference, adoption, and identification were assessed for kindergarten, first, and second grade children. Ward (1969) surmised that role adoption and role identification were found to occur concurrently among girls but in sequence among boys. In a later work Thompson and McCandless (1970) found that sex-role preference preceded sex-role adoption.

Biller and Borstelmann (1967) added a fourth dimension to Lynn's (1959) original rubrics. They defined sex-role

orientation as the manner in which one perceives himself in terms of femaleness or maleness. In a subsequent work Biller (1969) showed that role orientation, preference, and adoption proceed in a stage-like manner and in this sequence.

These three measures are also believed to be separate and independent entities (Ward, 1969). Because of this autonomy, there are varying degrees with which they are integrated within the human organism (Lynn, 1959). A variety of responses is, therefore, theoretically possible. Lynn (1959) succinctly depicted these intricacies thus:

> ...a person may be identified with the opposite sex, but for expediency adopt much of the behavior characteristic of his own sex. He may even prefer the role of his own sex, although identified with the opposite sex-role (p. 127).

Lynn (1959; 1964; 1966) postulated that for both male and female infants, learning to identify with the mother (or mother surrogate) is among the earliest learning experiences. Lynn (1964) has shown that both boys and girls identify more closely with the mother than the father. According to Heilbrun (1965), this process begins as the child makes his initial identification with the mother; this original identification is not sex-typed. However, a subsequent identification of the child with the father in which he forms distinctive role-relationships with the son and the daughter affords the foundation for sex-role acquisition of both sexes. Although the girl has the initial advantage of appropriate identification because of her closeness with her mother in the early years, this fact is counterbalanced by the

male-oriented culture in which she is later socialized (Lynn, 1959; 1966). The male child is deprived of early modeling experiences of the father while the female child is accompanied by the feminine model daily. According to Lynn (1966), the time spent with the child and the intimacy and intensity therewith are crucial determinants for learning parental identification.

The male child, on the other hand, has the early disadvantage of transferring his identification from his mother to his father. However, his sex-role identification is facilitated by a stereotyped and conventional role which is lucidly delineated for him by his mother and by society in general. Thus, the boy learns to prefer the masculine role to the feminine, to adopt the masculine role, and eventually to identify with it (Lynn, 1959; 1966). In cases where the child has difficulty in this transfer process, a discrepancy is said to exist (Lynn, 1964) among preference, adoption, and identification. Males will reveal same-sex-role preferences but persist with underlying opposite-sex-role identification; whereas, females will portray opposite-sex-role preference with a more pervading same-sex-role identification. Other research (Brown, 1957; De Lucia, 1963; Hartup & Zook, 1960; Mandeville, 1972; Rabban, 1950) has substantiated Lynn's hypotheses on sex-role preferences and adoption.

Theoretical Formulation and Experimental Substantiation

The majority of studies relating to the effects of sex-role acquisition has been stimulated by theories of identification. There seems to be little unanimity in the literature as to exactly what the term "identification" denotes. The concept of identification has been variously described (Kagan, 1958) as imitation learning, prohibition learning, identification with the aggressor, and vicarious affective experience. Bandura and Huston (1961) conceptualized the term as incidental learning, that is, an internalization in the child of attitudes and patterns of behaviors that parents have never directly attempted to teach. Kagan (1958) has depicted identification as an internalized cognitive response, a process more than simply modeling and imitation. Kohlberg (1966) similarly viewed sex-role learning as the child's cognitive organization of his social world along sex-role dimensions without the assistance of modeling and reinforcement.

The literature on sex-typing has yielded three major theories which attempt to account for sex-role acquisition in young children. The defensive identification hypothesis is a Freudian interpretation in which the boy identifies with the father out of fear and self-protection because the father is so threatening and powerful (Freud, 1937). The female child, moreover, fears losing the mother's love which enhances her identification. Anna Freud has dubbed

this phase "identification with the aggressor" (Freud, 1937). Learning theory espouses the developmental identification hypothesis in which identification with the father is contingent upon a positive, affectionate relationship between father and child (Mowrer, 1950). Lastly, Parsons (1955) has set forth the role-theory hypothesis which integrates the psychoanalytic and learning theory concepts and holds that children (both boys and girls) identify with or adopt the role of powerful parents, that is, parents who can both reward and punish them. According to Maccoby (1959), the child identifies with the powerful parent because he is wholly dependent upon the parent for his resources. The child covertly rehearses the behavior of the powerful parent and eventually learns to identify with that parent so that he, too, can gain control of the resources. The preponderance of research has purported that a high degree of nurturance toward both boys and girls by the same-sexed parent will facilitate the child's sex-role development (Biller, 1969; Hetherington & Brackbill, 1963; Mussen, 1961; Mussen & Distler, 1959; Mussen & Parker, 1965; Mussen & Rutherford, 1963; Sears, 1953).

Mussen (1961) gave laudable support to the developmental identification hypothesis. His subjects included 68 adolescents divided into two groups in terms of masculinity and femininity by scores on the Strong Vocational Interest Blank. A series of personality tests, observer ratings, and sociometric questionnaires were administered. The

adolescents in the masculine group regarded their fathers as more favorable and rewarding than the more feminine group. Secondly, those adolescents adopting masculine interests showed behaviors and social characteristics typical of the male sex. The adolescents lower in masculinity exemplified more feminine personal and social attributes. The highly masculine adolescents manifested more stable emotional patterns and better social adjustment trends than the adolescents scoring low in masculinity.

Sears (1953) has suggested that warm, permissive, easygoing, and rewarding fathers have sons who are most likely to sex-type appropriately and do so at an earlier age. It was found that boys who chose the father role (sex-typed appropriately) in a doll-play situation were more often reported to have fathers who exhibited warm, permissive, and nurturant mannerisms compared to boys who assumed the mother role. Elsewhere it has been postulated (Payne & Mussen, 1956) that those adolescent males who perceive their fathers as nurturant (assessment from projective tests) are more likely to identify strongly with this parent than those boys who do not perceive their fathers as rewarding. Furthermore, Bandura and Walters (1959) reported an association between the father's rated warmth and the son's feeling of similarity to the father. Likewise, Heilbrun (1965) demonstrated that identification is more efficacious for girls and boys when the father is both strong and nurturant and when the mother approves of the father. Males and

females who were identified in a modeling sense with instrumental fathers showed the most extensive and appropriate sex-role differences in personality. These conclusions supported Johnson's (1963) findings which posited that identification with the instrumental father is associated with enhanced masculinity in the son and femininity in the daughter. Bandura and Huston (1961) corroborated that nurturance has a facilitating effect upon imitation of sex-typed behaviors.

Not only has nurturance been a critical variable to effect appropriate sex-typing, but numerous studies (Altucher, 1966; Biller, 1969; Hetherington, 1965) have maintained that for boys, dominance is an impinging factor. Although this is congruent with the role-theory hypothesis, Hetherington (1965) argued that boys from father-dominant homes scored more masculine on a projective sex-role test (IT Scale for Children) than boys from mother-dominant homes. She further demonstrated that children of both sexes tended to imitate the dominant parent more than the passive parent. This was assessed by an increasing similarity between child and dominant disciplinarian. Altucher (1966) has informed us that appropriately sex-identified boys reported that the father was dominant in discipline, while more feminine boys reported that the mother was the dominant disciplinarian.

Biller (1969) espoused an additive influence on sex-role development from perceived father dominance. He explored the relationship among kindergarten-age boys'

perceptions of father dominances in father-mother interaction, and different aspects of the boys' sex-role development. The boys' perception of father dominance was significantly related to their fathers' dominance in father-mother relationships. A positive correlation existed between the degree boys perceived their fathers as dominant and the ensuing masculinity of the boy.

Moulton, Burnstein, Liberty, and Altucher (1966) contributed an integral precept relating to dominance and sex-role acquisition. Parental dominance alone, void of high affection, did not produce corresponding sex-typing in the offspring. On the other hand, when the father and mother were dominant and high in affection, an analogous amount of masculinity and femininity was detected in the son and daughter, respectively. Thus, strong identification was promulgated by the parent who combined affection with dominance.

Mussen and Distler (1959) rated boys who were highly identified with their fathers (i.e., highly masculine in their interests) to ascertain the sons' perceptions of their fathers. The responses were rated (a) as basically nurturant and rewarding (developmental identification hypothesis), (b) as punitive and threatening (defensive identification hypothesis), (c) as powerful dispensors of both rewards and punishments (role-theory hypothesis of identification). Thirty-eight five-year-olds were administered the IT Scale for Children (ITSC) and a structured doll-play situation. Analysis of the data confirmed all three hypotheses; yet,

the authors concluded that role-theory, with its explicit emphasis on both rewards and punishments, best represented the data in this study.

Perhaps the most convincing and most interesting investigation lending credence to the role-theory hypothesis was an inquiry by Mussen and Rutherford (1963) which ran commensurate with the studies of their precursors (Mussen & Distler, 1959; 1960). These investigators revealed that a positive correlation existed between the boy's (five-and-one-half to six-and-one-half years of age) perception of his father as highly nurturant, rewarding, and punitive and a subsequent strong identification with the father. The point was made that these results corroborated other studies in which sex-typing of interest in young males was more directly linked to perceptions of their fathers than to feelings about the mothers (Mussen & Distler, 1959; 1960; Payne & Mussen, 1956). A second aspect of the study inquired into the personality of the father and the implication this had for appropriate sex-typing in the male and female offspring. No significance was reported in regard to the degree of sex-typing, self-confidence, or other personality variables in the father and subsequent effect on the child's sex-role preference. In recapitulation, it was not so much whether the father was self-confident, or possessed a high degree of sex-appropriate behavior, nor even his degree of encouragement of his son in masculine activities that determined the boy's sex-typing. The critical variable was the degree of

nurturance of the relationship. On the other hand, a ruggedly masculine, self-confident father who maintained poor relationships with his son was unlikely to produce a highly masculine son, even if he actively campaigned to involve the son in male-related activities.

Contrary to the father, the mother was believed to play a more active role in the sex-role acquisition of the female offspring (Mussen & Rutherford, 1963). Girls tended to be more feminine when they perceived their mothers as nurturant (but not punitive and threatening). In addition fathers played a clear role in steering daughters into appropriate feminine roles. Fathers of the highly feminine group provided more encouragement and stimulation of daughters' participation in appropriate sex-typed activities. The writers suggested that because boys receive more assistance and support from their psychosocial heritage than girls, both father and mother must be more direct socializers with girls to insure adequate sex-role development.

The studies cited here found both the defensive identification hypothesis and the developmental identification hypothesis tenable; however, it was suggested that it is a combination of the two approaches which makes the most viable argument. The preponderance of the research was best integrated and explained in terms of the role-theory hypothesis. In general, it can be concluded that the boy who sees his father as a highly salient and powerful person in his life (both rewarding and punishing) is likely to

develop highly sex-appropriate responses (Biller, 1969; Hetherington & Frankie, 1967; Mussen & Distler, 1959; 1969; Mussen & Parker, 1965; Mussen & Rutherford, 1963; Sears, 1953). Sex-role acquisition for girls was best explained on the basis of the developmental identification hypothesis, that appropriate indentification occurs as a result of nurturant, but not punitive, parents (Hetherington & Frankie, 1967; Mussen & Rutherford, 1963). On the other hand, boys' sex-typing tended to correspond to the sex of the dominant disciplinarian, especially when the dominant disciplinarian was high in affection (Altucher, 1966; Biller, 1969; Hetherington, 1965; Hetherington & Frankie, 1967; Moulton, 1966; Sears, 1953).

Contrary to these direct socializing approaches are the secondary reinforcements which serve to strengthen sex-role behaviors. Not unlike Mussen and Distler (1959), who explained identification in males as the result of secondary reward value from the father's nurturant behavior, Mussen and Parker (1965) surmised that the integration of sex roles in girls emanates from imitation which occurs independently of teaching or direct immediate rewards (incidental learning). This assertion was the antithesis of an earlier conclusion (Mussen & Rutherford, 1963). Mother-daughter pairs were given a maze test to check for daughter imitation of mother's vocalizations and deliberate choices of maze routes. Although mother's nurturance did not significantly affect the children's direct responses in regard to the achievement goal, preassessed nurturant scores of the mothers correlated

highly with the child's incidental imitation, or learning not relevant to the task at hand (e.g., the number of times the child picked up a crayon of the same color as the one the mother used).

The concept of incidental learning from a nurturant model was reminiscent of other exponents (Bandura & Huston, 1961; Bandura & Walters, 1963). Bandura and Huston (1961) argued that the process subsumed within the concept "identification" is accounted for in terms of incidental learning which occurs in the absence of an induced set or intent to learn specific behaviors. More specifically, they hypothesized that while learning a two-choice discrimination problem, children would also learn to imitate irrelevant experimenter behaviors as well. Subjects were 24 boys and 24 girls ranging in age from 45 to 61 months. Initially, half of the control and experimental groups were exposed in a play room to a nurturant model. The remaining groups were exposed to a cold, non-nurturant model. Following exposure, the experimental subjects performed a two-choice discrimination task with the same model. In the discrimination phase, the model exhibited salient behaviors which were nonfunctional to the task at hand. These behaviors were verbal phrases and motor and aggressive behaviors irrelevant to the performance of the task. The extent to which the subjects reproduced the models' incidental behavior was measured. Differences in the control and experimental procedures were in the incidental behaviors displayed by the model only.

Results indicated that 90 per cent of all subjects in the experimental groups adopted the aggressive behavior of the model; moreover, 45 per cent imitated the motor behaviors (e.g., marching) while 28 per cent parroted the model's verbalizations (e.g., "Here we go"). It was further revealed that none of the controls behaved aggressively, marched, or verbalized. Those subjects in the nurturant group imitated the marching, verbalizations, and other behaviors significantly more than those who were exposed to the cold, non-nurturant model. Aggression, however, was imitated by subjects regardless of the quality of interaction between model and child. None of the groups differed significantly in imitation of the model on the discrimination task per se.

Early Sex-Role Contingencies

There is a plethora of research on social learning which focuses on the shaping of new behavior through rewarding and punishing consequences (Horowitz, 1967). Many of these studies are concerned with parental cues, while a few stress the maintenance of these established behaviors. It has been suggested by many authors that sex roles are acquired as a function of differential expectancies and reinforcements from adult men and women (Fagot & Patterson, 1969; Mischel, 1966; Sears, Maccoby, & Levine, 1957). The literature is surfeit with accounts of sex-appropriate behaviors contingent upon differential reinforcements, incidental learning, and modeling with the parent as the

primary mediator of these cues. It is difficult to adequately discuss sex-role acquisition apart from the reinforcing contingencies imposed by the significant others in the child's environment (Robinson, in press).

In their comprehensive summary of the research literature on sex differences, Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) delineated three factors which account for sex-typing in the child. They concluded that the acquisition of sex-typed behaviors results from an interaction of genetic factors, reinforcement contingencies from significant others, and imitation of the same-sex parent or adult model.

McCandless (1961) insisted that parents begin differential reinforcement of specific behaviors for males and females when the child is around eighteen months. However, later researchers (Bell & Costello, 1964; Moss, 1967; Goldberg & Lewis, 1969; Rheingold & Cook, 1975) underscored that sex-typing is eminent within the first year of life. It is without contest, according to Moss (1967), that children are being responded to differentially due to sex as early as three weeks of age. Moss has demonstrated a number of statistically significant differences between boys and girls in this early period. Males slept less and cried more than did the girls; thus a preponderance of maternal interaction was evident. Those more irritable infants (mostly boys) were responded to less by the mothers (this inability of the mother to soothe an irritable male may have been perceived as part of his "maleness"). Moss (1967) envisioned these

responses as a type of differential reinforcement in which male infants were being reinforced for aggressive, assertive behaviors and thus appeared less conducive to socialization (i.e., responsiveness to maternal handling). Concomitantly, more imitative behavior was exemplified by the mothers to the girls than to the boys. Again, this behavior was interpreted as reinforcement of verbal responses which were differentially reinforced on the basis of the sex of the child.

Goldberg and Lewis (1969) observed sex differences on children's behavior toward mothers, toys, and a frustration situation. The writers observed significant differences present as early as thirteen months in the manner in which infants played, reacted to mothers and to frustrating situations. The data revealed these sex variations to be due to differential treatment by mothers when the child was six months of age. Mothers of girls touched their infants and vocalized to them more than mothers of boys. These differential modes of behavior peculiar to sex were correlated with differential reaction patterns by the mother during the child's first year of life.

Rheingold and Cook (1975) have demonstrated that from the early neonatal period parents reinforced (i.e., provided objects and toys) male infants for activities directed away from the home (e.g., sports, vehicles, animals, and the military); on the other hand, girls were reinforced (i.e., provided objects and toys) for activities directed toward the home (e.g., cooking, cleaning, ironing, and caregiving).

Brown (1956), in devising the ITSC (IT Scale for Children), found dolls and dishes to be the most frequent choice for girls and the earthmover and gun to be the favorites of boys. Furthermore, Terman and Miles (1936) discovered that boys preferred "shooting" and "working with machinery" as opposed to girls who favored "playing dolls" and "cooking and playing house."

Kagan (1964a) pointed out that parents reward sex-appropriate behavior in children, thus facilitating the adoption of sex-typed traits. In his thorough review of the literature, Kagan (1964a) delimited as one class of sex-typed behavior that of conformity. While girls are allowed greater license to conform, boys and men are pressured to non-conformity. He further reported that there are more studies reporting greater dependency, conformity, and social passivity for females than for males at all ages. Kagan (1964a) also listed physical attributes as a source of sex-typed characteristics. According to Cobb (1954), a girl is sex-typed as pretty and small and a boy as large and strong. Also, for the child eight to ten, an attractive face was a primary sex-typed attribute for girls, a tall physique primary for boys (Cobb, 1954). As a third class of sex-typed behaviors, Kagan (1964a) cited the development of skill and interest in gross motor and mechanical tasks for males as opposed to the development of skill and interest in fine motor and handicraft tasks for girls. Kagan's (1964a) review of the literature further revealed affiliative and

nurturant behaviors to be considered more appropriate for females than males. Furthermore, story-telling responses showed more affiliative and nurturant behaviors and a preponderance of affective relationships among girls as opposed to boys (Goodenough, 1957; Hildreth, 1945; Terman & Miles, 1936).

Perhaps the most notable referents for assessing sex-typed behaviors have been measures of dependency and aggression (Levitin & Chananie, 1972). Physical aggression, independence, and dominance are expected and rewarded in boys' behavior more so than in girls' behavior (Mischel, 1966). According to Mischel (1966), in our society dependent behaviors are less rewarded for males and physically aggressive behaviors are less rewarded for females; hence, mean frequency differences between the sexes of such behaviors are evident after the first few years of life. Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) have isolated four well-established sex differences. Among them, aggression is the only one which appears in the early years. With regard to sex-role standards, Kagan (1964a) corroborated his findings with the following:

> The standard requires inhibition of verbal and physical aggression among girls and women; but gives boys and men license -- and even encouragement -- to express aggression when attacked, threatened, or dominated by another male (p. 139).

In a more recent study by Fagot (1974), the behaviors of toddlers most considered appropriate by parents for boys

only were roughhouse play, aggressive behaviors, and adorning male attire. Behaviors deemed suitable for girls only were playing with dolls, dressing up like a female, singing, and dancing. Comparisons were made between parents' feelings and values about sex differences and the degree of sex-typed behaviors of the offspring. It was found that the children of those parents who were conventional in their values, i.e., felt certain behaviors were only appropriate to one sex, showed no more sex-typing in their behavior than children whose parents felt all the behaviors were equally appropriate for both sexes. The author concluded that parents reacted differently to boys and girls, despite a strong commitment to egalitarian treatment. In addition, the child's behavior may have been exerting pressure for specific types of parental behaviors (bidirectional socialization).

In a separate study by the same investigator (Fagot, 1973), young adults who had not had a great deal of contact with young children showed cultural standard expectations of sex-appropriate behaviors for toddlers (18-30 months old). Appropriate to boys were roughhouse play, aggressive behavior, and transportation toys. Appropriate to girls were doll play, dress-up, and looking in the mirror. Bandura and Walters (1963) further surmised that aggression was much more tolerated in boys than in girls.

Mussen (1961) demonstrated the tendency to exercise sex-typed traits to be relatively stable from early childhood

to adulthood. Parents' differential reinforcement of sex-appropriate behavior in preschool children enhanced the habit strength of that behavior (Mussen & Rutherford, 1963). Parents concomitantly demarcate distinctive cues of sex-typed behavior for the child to emulate. Because the cues for sex-appropriate male typing are more lucidly delineated and more facile to discriminate, boys have an easier time in the acquisition of masculine predilections than do girls in acquiring feminine traits (Brown, 1957; Hartup & Zook, 1960; Lynn, 1959; Mussen & Rutherford, 1963). The research of Mussen and Rutherford (1963) substantiated this position. It was concluded that "the feminization of young girls involves a greater number of, and more complex, determinants than does the masculinization of boys." (p. 244). Hartup and Zook (1960) implied that the acquisition of sex-role preferences by the female is a more complicated process than for males.

Unlike the boy, the girl upon leaving infancy, is not reinforced through distinct rewards for adopting the feminine role and punishment for adopting the masculine role. As a result, the female child often tends to exemplify a preference for and an adoption of the masculine role (Lynn, 1959). A deluge of studies supported the perspective that boys show a much stronger preference for the masculine role than girls show for the feminine role (Brown, 1956; 1957; Lynn, 1959; Mussen & Rutherford, 1963; Schell & Silber, 1968; Ward, 1968). Conversely, girls tended to prefer the masculine role more

than boys preferred the feminine role, particularly at kindergarten age (Brown, 1956; 1957; Hall & Keith, 1964). Most of these studies utilized the ITSC and measured girls' willingness to choose male activities and toys more than boys exhibited toward female choices.

In his classic study Brown (1957) revealed that in the early years (kindergarten to fourth grade) the girls maintained high masculinity mean scores (based on ITSC), at times comparable to boys (e.g., in the second grade boys scores 81.16 and girls, 80.21). There was a steady diminution in masculine scores for girls, and concomitant increment in femininity. Brown noted that at each age level girls compared to boys were significantly more variable in their sex-role preference. Brown, furthermore, held that double the amount of girls over boys projected a preference for the parental role of the opposite sex (52 per cent compared to 23 per cent). Such proclivities persisted but at a decreasing rate from the first to the fifth grades. In conjunction with these proportions, Emmerich (1959) lodged that more boys than girls (three-and-one-half to five years of age) exhibited a significant tendency to select the same-sex parent as a model more than the opposite-sex parent. Hall and Keith (1964) corroborated that on the ITSC girls varied in scores from zero to 84. None of the boys, however, scored below 55 on the test. These findings were interpreted to mean that boys formed a more rigid pattern of masculine preferences while girls made male-type choices and female-type

choices equally as often. The abundance of variability of girls in sex-role preference was accounted for by the fact that our society allows increased flexibility for girls in sex role while delimiting a narrow conceptualization for boys (Hall & Keith, 1964). These findings were reversed in one inquiry (Lansky & McKay, 1963) where boys showed a greater preference for the feminine role than the girl did for the masculine role when the ITSC was individually administered in an envelope to 36 kindergarten children.

Implementation of a separate, more direct instrument (The Toy Preference Test) yielded similar results to the original findings, however. Ward (1968) confirmed that boys preferred boys' toys more than girls preferred girls' toys. (These indices were significant at the .01 level of confidence.) Older children preferred toys of their same sex more so than younger children. This trend was explained first by the greater latitude of sex-role choice allowed females in our culture as opposed to males. Secondly, toy preferences develop as a result of reinforcement histories from significant adults in the child's life. As further confirmation, Hartup and Zook (1960) found that boys more strongly preferred the stereotyped male role than girls preferred the stereotyped female role. However, this tendency was less salient among preschoolers than among older boys. These studies contradicted the arguments made by Lansky and McKay (1963) and supported the original hypothesis executed by Brown (1957) as tenable. Thus, the generalization that

boys prefer masculine toys to a greater extent than girls prefer feminine toys seemed to hold whether projective or more direct measures were used.

The literature further expounds that with increasing age there is an improvement in making various sex-typed discriminations (Schell & Silber, 1968). Schell and Silber (1968) have suggested that boys and girls have learned to make sex-typed discriminations by three years of age and that girls were better, or as good, as boys. Four-year-olds were better than three-year-olds, and as one ages, the better he could distinguish between sex roles.

Concurrence with these tenets was revealed in other works (Biller & Borstelmann, 1967; Brown, 1957; Hartup, Moore, & Sager, 1963; Hartup & Zook, 1960; Lynn, 1959). Kohlberg (1966) attributed these changes to a cognitive element within the child which is programmed along sex-role dimensions. By the age of two or three, the child learns his sex label, values what is similar to himself, and is motivated to adopt his sex role and to see deviations from it as bad. Hartup and Zook (1960) depicted four-year-old boys to be more masculine than three-year-olds and an increased change toward greater masculinity from age three to 11 was evident. The authors informed us that this change was due to the boys' receiving consistent reinforcement throughout the early years for assuming a stereotyped male role. Augmentation of parental demands for appropriate sex-typing in the later

years by other socializing agents (e.g., teachers, peers) contributes to this trend.

A separate piece of research culminated in antithetical data (Ward, 1969). Girls demonstrated an increase in perceived similarity with their mothers as age increased. Boys, however, failed to perform in a parallel fashion with the father; instead, they progressed in the direction of the mother also. Lynn (1959) rendered an interpretation of these data inconsistent with the one just executed by Hartup and Zook (1960). Thus, Ward's (1969) conclusions were explained by the girls' and boys' early closeness with the mother, thus, increased identification with her.

Brown (1957), utilizing the ITSC with kindergarten through fifth grade boys and girls, found that significant mean differences occurred at each age level disclosing that boys scored higher in masculinity and girls higher in femininity as their age increased. Mussen (1961) contributed that sex-role attributes are stable over time. Adolescent males who scored high in masculinity tested more masculine sixteen years later as adults than a group who had previously tested feminine.

Appropriate sex-typing was also defined in terms of avoidance of inappropriate sex-role behavior. Harley and Hardesty (1964) investigated children's perceptions of peer-age sex roles. On an open-ended question technique (i.e., describing male and female sex roles to people from Mars who had just landed on Earth), boys scored equally sensitive

to male and female peer-age roles. To be exact, boys were equally aware of female roles as girls and more aware of the feminine role than girls were of the masculine role. The researchers posited that a "negative directive" was the cause of the greater perception on the part of the male child. This directive made it vital for boys to be aware of opposite sex-role activities in order to avoid them.

As futher evidence, Lynn (1964) postulated that boys must learn not only how to be little boys, but also how not to be little girls. Thus, the male child is furnished with what Lynn (1964) termed "divergent feedback" which is incoming stimuli indicating that he is neither giving the desired response nor progressing toward a culturally desirable goal. Such a feedback system does not render clearly defined demands. Because of the incongruity and anxiety inherent in this type of feedback system, Lynn (1964) maintained that there is more anxiety surrounding the sex-role identification of males than females.

This theoretical formulation was put to empirical test by one team of investigators (Hartup, Moore, & Sager, 1963). Masculinity in boys was measured by the avoidance of femininity and conversely, femininity in girls was measured by the avoidance of masculinity. The data confirmed that with increasing age, young children (aged three to eight) increasingly avoided inappropriate sex objects. Operationally, this was realized when the elementary school subjects spent less time with the appropriate items than the nursery school subjects.

A study by Bem (1976) showed that highly sex-typed individuals actively avoided cross-sex-role behavior because it was motivationally problematic for them. Sex-typed subjects preferred only sex-appropriate activities even when these choices cost them money. In addition, engaging in cross-sex behavior caused the sex-typed subjects to report greater psychological discomfort and more negative feelings in regard to their self-concepts.

There was some evidence, however, that sex-inappropriate behaviors could be established in young children through modeling. Wolfe (1973) observed that play behaviors with a sex-inappropriate toy could be promoted by exposure to a same-sex model as compared to an opposite-sex model. This observation suggested that sex-typed behaviors may not be as stable, rigid, and irreversible as previous studies have indicated. Nevertheless, the majority of studies conceded that sex-role preferences were clearly established for both sexes by the age of five (Biller & Borstelmann, 1967; Fauls & Smith, 1956; Verner & Snyder, 1966; Ward, 1969). Some ambiguity, however, was noted in girls up to the fifth grade (Brown, 1956; Hetherington, 1965; Lynn, 1959; Rabban, 1950).

Looking at the effects of paternal dominance upon sex-role preferences, Hetherington (1965) was convinced that by age four to five boys have already developed a preference for the masculine role with continued increments through ages nine to eleven. On the other hand, girls showed a

significant increase in preference for the feminine role from ages nine to eleven. This bore out Brown's (1957) original results of increased femininity from the fifth grade on.

In a separate study by this same author (Hetherington, 1966) it was disclosed that the effects of father-absence were more severe if the occurrence presented itself during the child's first four years. Father-absence subsequent to this age, however, had little effect on the sex-typed behaviors of boys, suggesting that adequate masculine identification has stabilized by the age of six.

Utilization of the Toy Preference Test yielded sex-role preferences clearly apparent for both sexes by five years of age, however (Biller & Borstelmann, 1967; Ward, 1969). Furthermore, Fauls and Smith (1956) utilized play materials to ascertain appropriate sex-typing proclivities. Five-year-olds were shown a series of paired pictures depicting a sex-appropriate and sex-inappropriate activity. The children were then asked which activity their mothers would want the boys to do and the girls to do. Results indicated that parents rewarded imitation of sex-appropriate behaviors and punished sex-inappropriate imitative responses. Again, it was apparent that five-year-olds manifested a clear-cut identification with the appropriate sex role. The experimenters based sex-appropriate behavior on the choices of the boys (traditionally masculine activities) and girls (traditionally feminine activities). These assertions were

opposite to Rabban's (1950) conceptualizations that the middle-class child generally has not attained sex-role clarification by age five.

Contributing to the issue, Verner and Snyder (1966) asked young children (aged two-and-one-half to eleven years of age) to choose any five artifacts linked with adult sex roles. The writers insisted that two-and-one-half to five-year-olds had a lucid capacity to discuss the sex-linkage of the 44 cultural items. This was the earliest age span for sex-role discrimination and preference cited by any researcher in the literature. A second surprising event which collided with the tenets of others (Brown, 1956; 1957; Lynn, 1959; Rabban, 1950) was that girls at all ages were more clear-cut in their same-sex preferences than boys, who exhibited a clear-cut preference for feminine items (54 per cent of the time). Using a group of 16 toys (eight traditionally male and eight traditionally female), Rabban (1950) administered the test to 300 children from three to eight years of age, finding that boys possessed a clear-cut preference pattern at an earlier age than girls. Other investigations afforded a more lucid perception of sex-role preference in boys at an earlier age than girls (Brown, 1956; 1957; Hetherington, 1965; 1966; Lynn, 1959). This would seem to be more consonant with other considerations in the field.

The most renowned inquiry into sex-role acquisition as it relates to social class was launched by Rabban (1950),

who denoted strong differential sexual patterns earlier among lower-class children than among middle-class children. Middle-class females were the last to assume a pattern of feminine interests, while lower-class girls and middle-class boys placed at intermediate points on the continuum. Rabban's exegesis has emerged through the years for the most part unchallenged. One noteworthy exception was the research of Hartup and Zook (1960) who did not find lower-class children to be more sex-typed than middle-class youngsters. McCandless (1967) explained this finding to reflect either the youth of the subjects in the experiment or the permissive atmosphere of the nursery school where lower-class children may be less pressured for sex-typing. Furthermore, Hall and Keith (1964) confirmed this study in all respects except for a slight nonsignificant trend for upper-class girls to be more feminine on the ITSC than lower-class girls.

According to McCandless (1967), masculine and feminine roles are more clear-cut among the lower-class or working class populations than they are in the middle class, and the masculine role is more attractive than the feminine. Availing further information, Pope (1953) revealed that lower- and middle-class boys tended to reject the effeminate male with a nonmasculine predisposition; on the other hand, the middle-class boy accepted the academically studious boy while the lower-class boys rejected him also. It was further disclosed (Kohn, 1959) that lower-class mothers reinforced for sex-typing more consistently than middle-class

mothers. By the same token middle-class parents in general had less dichotomous sex-typed expectations (Minuchin, 1965). This was explained (Hall & Keith, 1964) by the observation that lower-class boys come from a more patriarchal environment with greater rigidity of role definition; thus, as expected, lower-class boys tended to prefer a more masculine sex role than would upper-class males. Commitment of own sex role, sex-typed play, aggressive expression in boys, and family orientation in girls were more consistent of children (nine years old) from "traditional" middle-class schools and homes as compared to those of children from "modern" middle-class backgrounds. Girls from modern backgrounds (stressing individual development) departed from conventional expectations (Minuchin, 1965).

Hetherington (1966) conducted a study in which black and white boys aged nine to 12 were compared on the basis of the effects of paternal absence and sex-typed behaviors. The only significant difference due to race was that black boys participated more in competitive activities involving force than did white boys. A more recent study (Thompson & McCandless, 1970), however, underscored the idea that the rate of sex-role preference and adoption may develop faster among white boys as opposed to black boys.

The data concerning the effects of siblings on sex-role acquisition were incongruent. The earliest study (Fauls & Smith, 1956) predicated that the presence of siblings did not have an impact on the child's perception of

appropriate choices of play materials. Only children more often chose sexually appropriate activities than children with one or more older like-sexed siblings. The majority of later works counterclaimed these data (McCandless, 1967; Schell & Silber, 1968). The popular notion remaining is that the presence of siblings of the same and/or the opposite sex results in more sex-typed discriminations and at an earlier age. According to McCandless (1967), boys with older brothers and girls with older sisters sex-typed more easily than those with different family relationships. Schell and Silber (1968) concluded that having same- or opposite-sexed siblings as models facilitated the child's learning of sex-typed discriminations and resulted in his making correct discriminations when choosing for a boy or girl.

These data were consistent with the research that holds other variables to be crucial in sex-role identity other than mere parent-child interaction. For example, it has been documented (Rosenburg & Sutton-Smith, 1968) that sex-role learning involves sibling-sibling and child-parent effects as well as parent-child effects. Sex-role attributes were found to be influenced by the dynamic family constellation among daughter, mother, father, and sibling.

Teacher Sex and Sex-Typing: Impressionistic Literature

It is generally recognized that early sex-typing is augmented by the demands of socializing agents other than

the parents (Fagot & Patterson, 1969); however, there remains a paucity of information in regard to early educational settings where there is teacher contact at an early age.

Among the investigations contrasting males and females as teachers of young children, the majority has utilized elementary school teachers. The variables of concern usually have been the effects of teacher's sex upon school performance of the child (Arnold, 1968; Brophy & Good, 1973a; 1974; Brophy & Laosa, 1971; Davis & Slobodian, 1967; Good & Brophy, 1971; McFarland, 1969; Smith, 1970; Tolbert, 1968). Generally, the studies have utilized female teachers as subjects. In those inquiries where males were compared, it was concluded (Brophy & Good, 1973a) that sex of teacher per se is of little importance in terms of student performance. There was little evidence to support the common assumption that male teachers can improve academic performance of boys or that females are less capable of teaching boys (Brophy & Good, 1974; Tolbert, 1968).

While the extant research investigating the sex-typing propensities of male and female teachers was scant, that which was available is largely impressionistic. The impressionistic reports on hand were highly contradictory. There were some (Chasen, 1974; Greenleaf, 1972; Rossi, 1964) who assailed that female day care teachers promulgated sex-typed behaviors by expecting, encouraging, and rewarding assertiveness in boys and dependency in girls. There were others, on the other hand, who claimed that in schools all children

are being "feminized" rather than being responded to in sex-typed ways (Brophy & Good, 1973a; 1973b; Kagan, 1964b; Kellogg, 1969; Lee, 1973; Sexton, 1969; Smith, 1973; Triplett, 1968; Vairo, 1969).

Sexton (1969) lodged that schools are feminized from top to bottom, from nursery school to graduate school. It is women who set the standards for behavior, and most were said to favor male and female students who most conform to being polite, clean, obedient, neat, and nice. As a result, she continued that boys have a more difficult time in school than do girls. Triplett (1968) dubbed elementary education as a woman's world and cited that a preponderant number of women to men are found in these jobs. As a result, he expressed concern for the plight of the young boys in our country.

Yee (1973) was in alignment with the observation that American schools reflect feminine values and practices, and Lee (1973) confirmed that early school experiences promote traditional sex-role behaviors in girls and are foreign to the boy's repertoire of sex-typed behaviors. Passive, docile, subdued, compliant and teacher-centered behaviors on the part of children were the most favored. Lee (1973) also cited studies revealing that boys performed more poorly in school than girls as a result of the "feminized" environment.

There were a few studies which validated these allegations. Perhaps the classic study was by Kagan (1964b). This author had a group of second and third grade school

children to conceptualize common objects in the classroom as masculine or feminine. Nonsense syllables were used to represent the concepts of masculine, feminine, and farm. A training period followed in which 10 consecutive reports were accrued in the association of nonsense syllables with one of the three concepts. There was a total of 19 pictures utilized in the actual labeling process. Pictures of a blackboard, book, page of arithmetic, and school desk were labeled feminine more often than masculine by the second grade subjects. Second graders especially perceived the classroom objects as more feminine than masculine; consequently, the author continued, the boy stigmatizes school as a feminine activity, and more girls view their school activities to be congruent with their sex-role and are equipped to perform at an accelerated rate.

Kellogg (1969) sought to extend Kagan's (1964b) premise but implemented a more direct means of ascertaining data, foregoing the use of nonsense syllables. Fourth grade students were employed for study. The children were presented a list of 24 common objects and were asked to label the items masculine or feminine. Two columns were available in which the child checked the appropriate sex. Of the items eight were traditionally masculine, eight traditionally feminine, and eight were school-related. The girls rated desk, book, blackboard, library, chalk, and school as feminine more so than masculine. Boys labeled four of the same items as feminine that girls had previously labeled feminine

(i.e., book, blackboard, chalk, library). Furthermore, desk, map, pencil, and school were classified as masculine. Both sexes of children viewed map and pencil as masculine. Girls were more inclined than boys to view the school environment as feminine.

A study by McCracken (1973) attempted to discern whether the feminized conceptualization of school was a result of a feminine environment. His subjects were obtained from grades one through three and all were taught by female teachers. One group of boys attended all-male classes while a second attended coeducational classes. Each subject was asked to sort 35 items into female or male groups. Eighteen of the items were sex-typed, seven were miscellaneous children's items, and 10 of the key items were directly related to reading (e.g., library card, reader phonics workbook). Boys in the all-male classes associated reading-related items with males more so than boys in coeducational classes. The author concluded that the school environment was more likely to be seen by boys as a male one in an exclusive boy's school as compared to the boys who attended coeducational classes. Group differences were greatest in the first grades.

There was a pervasive belief that the tendency of children of both sexes to view school as primarily a female institution would disappear if more male teachers were employed in the early years of education (Brophy & Good, 1974). Many educators (Burtt, 1965; Fagot & Patterson, 1969; Johnston, 1970; Kendall, 1972; Kyselka, 1966; Milgram, 1972;

Peltier, 1968; Raines et al., 1974; Sciarra, 1971; 1972; Sexton, 1969; Smith, 1973; Triplett, 1968; Vairo, 1969; Williams, 1970) furthermore espoused the need for males in early education to provide appropriate role models and role contrasts for children. However, almost all of these observations were impressionistic ones.

It was purported (Topp, 1954) that males in early education would afford the masculine influence so prerequisite in the development of young children. Kendall (1972) described men whom she observed as providing more traditionally masculine experiences for all children. She contended that the men in her program fostered more independence and, contrary to the females, did not reward typically desirable female qualities, i.e., being quiet, still, and passive. She expounded upon her ideas thus:

> They (men) are rarely passive and rarely allow children to be passive long. Men teachers are usually more aggressive and physical as they interact with the children than women. They delight children by tossing them in the air or giving piggy-back rides (p. 159).

In a separate anecdotal record (Sciarra, 1971), the writer depicted the radical changes in the behavior of two fatherless boys who had been constant concerns of the teachers. One overly aggressive child developed better self-control, while a second acquiescent child became more assertive in his behavior. The teachers attributed the change to the initiation of a volunteer program from men in a local business firm and the models which these men availed for the boys.

Johnston (1970) also raised the need for men teachers to provide models for boys and contrasts for girls. A second advantage he cited was to provide a male surrogate for the children of the many suburban fathers entrenched in the commuting and business demands and who have few hours to give their children. He pinpointed a difference in attitude between female and male teachers of the young. He insisted that females strive for more order, structure, and quiet in their classes than males. Furthermore, males react differently to crisis than females, with the latter tending to panic or become fearful. He believed that males avail "feminine" and "masculine" activities for children while women teachers tend to provide solely for the roles of girls. As a result, boys are left to fend for themselves or "put on a dress and go play in the housekeeping corner." (p. 147).

Vairo (1969) further envisioned the need for males in education due to the disintegration of the family structure and the urbanization and concomitant disappearance of the male image from the American scene. He conceived of the male teacher as a surrogate for those from impoverished father-absent backgrounds. He further attributed the rise of adolescent delinquency in recent years to inappropriate role models with which young boys can identify. Others (Bagford, 1966; Biedenkapp & Goering, 1971; Smith, 1973; Triplett, 1968) endorsed the increment of the male to female teacher ratio for optimal socialization of boys and girls during the crucial early years.

Bagford (1966) espoused the need for changing the image of early childhood education from a feminine image to one which would attract capable young men to the ranks. He further attributed the growing negative influence on the development of teaching as a full-grown profession to be due to the inability to attract and retain more males. Topp (1954) went a step further by delineating a list of maneuvers to make the field of early education more palatable for men to encourage their proselytism.

Others (Milgram, 1972; Sciarra, 1972) suggested alternatives to male teachers until such time as more men are employed in childhood education. Suggested alternatives were the use of retired men, senior citizens, local military men, local businessmen, fathers, male relatives, custodians and school workmen, college students, and off-duty policemen and firemen. Field trips to the places of employment of the aforementioned, appropriate props for dramatic play, and visitors' bringing the tools of their trades were suggested to combat feminization in the preschools (Sciarra, 1972).

Hence, as can be seen, a deluge of articles appeared in the educational literature portraying as a panacea the implementation of additional males in early education. Milgram and Sciarra (1974) admitted that the male nursery school teacher is sought after as much as the black Ph.D. The presence of males was said to prevent children from conceiving of school as a feminine environment, to avail

appropriate role models and role contrasts, to improve school performance in boys, to counteract urbanization and family disintegration problems, to augment sex-typing, to prevent juvenile delinquency, and to change the image of the profession of early childhood education. Despite these impassioned pleas, however, there was a dearth of empirical support to corroborate them.

One of the few substantiations was a doctoral dissertation by Smith (1970). He examined the intervening effects of having a male or female teacher upon the sex-role preference, general self-concept, and science and mathematics achievement in fifth-grade boys. As subjects, 20 male and 21 female fifth-grade teachers were matched on age, marital status, psychological femininity, years of teaching experience, years of teaching fifth grade, and professional credentials. Teacher classes were also matched by age, intelligence, class size, sex balance of students, and parent educational level. It was discovered that boys instructed by males scored lower in psychological femininity and higher on scores of school-related self-concept measures; moreover, they tended to out-perform control boys in mathematical problem-solving. The investigator concluded that male teacher exposure for young boys did improve their school environment.

In a rebuttal to Smith's (1970; 1973) assertions, Brophy and Good (1973b) argued that although the schools are feminized, women teachers are not to blame. Instead, other variables are operating which must be scrutinized. They

further maintained that the presence of more males in the early grades is not the answer. They reminded us that the passive student role which has been labeled "feminine" was originally established in the earlier decades when schools were taught exclusively by males.

Lee (1973) contributed a lucid analysis which demonstrated that the sex of the teacher does not operate as an isolated factor; on the contrary, he contended that teacher sex is grounded by the more pervasive constraint systems of our educational institutions. He delimited three types of constraints. First were the constraints of the school as an institution and teaching as a profession. He described both male and female teachers as having been "schooled" or molded to conform to the functions and controls of the school environment. Because of a constraint of behavioral options of teachers, a "feminizing" orientation is portrayed. Two other constraints complicated the state of affairs. There were constraints of the child's emerging sex-role identification and constraints of the teacher's sex-role identity. Lee (1973) expounded upon Brophy and Good's (1973b) thesis in this way:

> It is a mistake to expect male or female teachers to accomplish what can be done only through substantive change in the institutional constraint system. Thus, until such evidence is available, there is no firm basis for projecting what effect male teachers would have in the context of the school (p. 98).

Supporting the concept of the educational constraint systems, Seifert (1974) depicted the degree to which men in

day care have contradicted conventional sex roles:

> In a preschool classroom a male teacher must do what women have traditionally done: he must, for example, arrange small art projects, or sing simple songs, or take little children to the bathroom. The male teacher does not make his role much more "masculine" even by playing with toy trucks more than usual, or by roughhousing more than usual. He is still doing these things to benefit young children, conventionally a "woman's concern" (p. 300).

In a separate work, Yee (1973) maintained that it is an oversimplification to attribute the feminization of schools to women teachers. He held that it is more relevant to study composites like personality of the teacher, male or female, and not sex per se to explain the feminizing trend. Yee (1973) elaborated his ideas thus:

> Focusing just on the recruitment of female or male teachers without concentration upon teacher types and the revolutionary change of schools as institutions would be supercilious in tone and misleading in purpose (p. 132).

In the pages that follow, the relevance of these impressionistic reports was considered in more detail. As shall be shown, subsequent researches confirmed that, not unlike their female counterparts, even where males were employed, they offered similar sex-typed contingencies to children.

Teacher Sex and Sex-Typing: Substantive Literature

Empirical research regarding the presence of males and females in early education and their sex-typing effects was very rare indeed. For purposes of clarity the current writer has separated these studies into two types. A few take the

form of intervention studies in which modeling effects of the males were assessed indirectly through behavior indices of the children (Brophy & Laosa, 1971; Madsen, 1968; Raines et al., 1974; Sciarra, 1970). A second group of studies implemented more direct procedures for ascertaining data. These behavioral assessments involved the scrutiny of the contingency behaviors of male and female teachers and caregivers through direct observation (Etaugh, Collins, & Gerson, 1975; Fagot & Patterson, 1969; Lee & Wolinsky, 1973; McCandless & Bush, 1975) or responses on a questionnaire (Etaugh & Hughes, 1975; Feshbach, 1969; Good & Grouws, 1972; Levitin & Chananie, 1972).

An experimental study by Madsen (1968) examined the modeling value of male teachers for nursery school children. No effects of male nurturance on the imitation of modeled aggression were found. There were no significant differences between nurturant and non-nurturant groups after six weeks of exposure. The nurturant variables did not serve to enhance either the modeling of novel aggression or to decrease the amount of time spent on preferred toys. On the other hand, it was found that boys imitated the aggressive behavior of familiar male teachers more than girls. Girls, however, converted their aggressive behaviors into more acceptable sex-appropriate forms such as pinching and shoving rather than punching and hitting.

A later study by Sciarra (1970) investigated the effects of introducing male role models in a preschool

classroom upon the behavior of disadvantaged children, especially boys. Male role models were procured from a nearby business firm which had volunteered its services to the day care center. It was hypothesized that the male models would have a stabilizing effect by reducing aggression in boys and susceptibility to peer groups and by enhancing their school interest; furthermore, it was believed that the male models would exert relatively little influence upon the girls. The subjects were predominantly black children. A total of 17 boys and 16 girls were utilized in the study (ages three to five). Three female teachers were employed to collect daily data on the three variables of interest (i.e., aggression, interest in school, and susceptibility to peer groups pressures).

The study extended a duration of eight weeks. During this time two groups had males randomly assigned to their rooms while a third group served as a control group. The third group contained female teachers only. Analysis of data rendered no statistically significant differences across groups. No stabilizing changes were noted in the boys' behavior (hypothesis rejected) or the girls' behavior (hypothesis supported). Non-significant trends in the data were contrary to expectations. The aggressive behaviors of boys were exacerbated during the intervention time; furthermore, susceptibility to peer group pressures showed a concomitant increment while interest in school dropped.

A second study which tested the logic of employing males in early education to counterbalance feminizing trends was launched by Brophy and Laosa (1971). They sought to test three theories in regard to the presence of a male figure: a masculinizing influence on both boys and girls, increased sex-typing in both sexes, or no effect on children of either sex. The investigation compared children in a traditional female-taught kindergarten with children taught by a husband and wife team. Two environments were used. The feminized environment consisted of materials appropriate for sociodramatic play and for the development of fine motor and handicraft tasks. A second more "masculinized" environment provided the usual equipment in addition to equipment more conducive to the development of gross motor and mechanical tasks (e.g., ropes, ladders, workbench and tools). The study embraced a period of two years in which the husband and wife randomly split teaching duties. The husband deliberately read aloud to the children in a concerted attempt to associate reading with the masculine role. In the masculine environment the typical curriculum was supplemented with science experiments, taking apart clocks and appliances, building simple machines, and competitive sports. At the end of the first year three types of data were ascertained: (1) interviews regarding sex-typing in toy, game, peer, job, and TV program preferences (2) observations of sociometric play patterns (3) administration of the Primary Mental Abilities Tests (Form K-1). Results revealed no significant

group differences in the first two areas of concern; however, a marked inferiority on spatial ability was noted in both sexes among those taught in the exclusively female-taught kindergarten. The study was replicated during the second year utilizing identical environments but with new subjects. The former results were confirmed except that the PMA spatial findings were replicated in a direction without attaining statistical significance. Consequently, empirical evidence for "masculinizing" the early educational environment for young children was not tenable. No significant differences in sex-typed behaviors occurred after having a male teacher; furthermore, the writers reported that the presence of a male teacher was of minor significance.

Of the two studies contrasting male and female caregivers known to the current writer, one was by Raines et al. (1974). The subjects (five black and three white) were young, inexperienced high school adolescents receiving academic credit and two dollars per hour for participating in the research. The study assessed changes in the men caregivers and in the children exposed to these males over a two-year period. Eight high school students were chosen to participate in one of two experimental day care centers, one of which serviced upper socio-economic level (SEL) children and the other lower SEL children. Two additional centers with all female staff served as controls for the experimental centers. The first year was used to integrate the males into the routines and pace of day care and to

evaluate tests and other observational tools to be used during the second phase of the study. The actual research data were compiled during the second year of study. To assess behavior changes all males were given pre- and post-tests on the following items:

(1) The Peabody Vocabulary Test

(2) The Adjective Check List

(3) The Terman-Miles Masculinity-Femininity Test

(4) The Miller Locus of Evaluation and Control Scale

(5) The Black Intelligence Test of Cultural Homogeneity

(6) A questionnaire developed by the project staff

(7) Interviews with the project director

(8) Ratings and evaluations by the lead teachers and center directors

A number of findings accrued. At the end of the experimental period, males evaluated themselves as being more competent, more responsible, and more emotionally secure than previously. Evaluations by their colleagues and superiors revealed them to exemplify identical behaviors. Test results yielded male caregivers to be higher in masculinity and field-independence and more analytical in terms of cognitive style. Contrasting the masculine environment structured by the males, the authors noted counterbalancing "feminized" proclivities from female caregivers which were believed to attenuate the modeling potential of the males. Males expressed a higher tolerance level for adventurous behavior which was said to conflict with the female teachers' more traditional standards.

Changes in sex-typed behaviors were also assessed for the children. It was found that all children in the lower SEL center showed a significant increase in masculinity (assessed by the Rabban Toy Preference Test). Surprisingly, the girls in the lower SEL were most influenced by the presence of the males, reflecting increased masculine preferences. Concomitantly, girls in the upper SEL experimental center reflected gains in masculinity and assertiveness while the boys in the lower SEL experimental center were unaffected. The authors explained this lack of effect on the possible availability of "street-corner fathers" for the lower SEL boys. It was observed that a distinguished difference existed between male and female caregivers in sex-typed contingency behaviors. Females reinforced both sexes for feminine behaviors, while males dispensed differential reinforcements for sex-appropriate behavior.

It was further purported that the male caregivers produced greater trust in most of the children. This trust was reflected through the use of a modified version of the Comfortable Interpersonal Distance Scale. Those girls without fathers in the experimental centers showed marked changes in trust and at the end of the project became more trusting than girls from father-present homes. Father-absent boys in these centers became less trusting. These investigators surmised that the increased assertiveness demonstrated by all the children where males were present was indicative of an adaptive social pattern to assist both

boys and girls in coping in our competitive American way of life.

A modest amount of empirical research was available on the sex-typed contingencies dispensed by male and female teachers. Three studies (Fagot & Patterson, 1969; Feshbach, 1969; Levitin & Chananie, 1972) confined their inquiries to the behaviors of the female teachers. Out of the scores of articles appearing in the literature contrasting the sex-typing contingencies of male and female teachers, the writer was able to discern only six studies which rendered an empirical analysis. Of those concerning men, one study looked at male and female student teachers (Good & Grouws, 1972). Two contrasted male and female elementary school teachers (Etaugh & Hughes, 1975; Lee & Wolinsky, 1973), one contrasted nursery school teachers (Etaugh, Collins, & Gerson, 1975), and the remaining study contrasted male and female caregivers (McCandless & Bush, 1975). The results of these studies were inconsistent.

Empirical Studies Employing Female Teachers

Fagot and Patterson (1969) investigated the sex-typing effects of female teachers upon the behaviors of nursery schoolers. Two nursery schools were used for observation. A behavior checklist was developed which included all possible play behaviors (28 behaviors) and social consequences by the female teacher or a peer that would adequately summarize the subjects' behavior. Children were observed for a period of

70 minutes in a free play situation for a brief interval every five minutes. During the intervals, ongoing behaviors and the consequences for each behavior were recorded. Each child was rated 12 times on the behavior checklist. To test for sex differences, assessment was made of the amount of time engaged in each of the 28 behaviors. Boys were found to spend more time with blocks and transportation toys while girls preferred painting and art work. In addition, female teachers were found to reinforce both sexes for feminine behaviors. Out of 232 reinforcements for sex-preferred behaviors, 199 were for feminine predilections for boys. For girls, 353 out of 363 sex-preferred behaviors were feminine. Hence, feminine-preferred behaviors constituted 83 per cent of the sex-preferred behaviors that received reinforcement. Despite this fact, boys perseverated in masculine behaviors. Thus, both teachers and peers were found to reinforce same-sex behaviors in this study. Peer reinforcement of masculine activities seemed to supplant the teachers' reinforcements of feminine behaviors so that masculine behavior was perpetuated in boys.

Analogous results with female elementary school teachers were revealed by Levitin and Chananie (1972). To assess their approval of sex-typed behavior, all subjects were administered a 10-minute questionnaire. The measures of dependency and aggression were used as indices of sex-typing and were shown to be the major referents for assessing sex-typed behaviors. Each teacher rated two hypothetical children

who were described as performing one of three different behaviors -- dependency, aggression, or achievement. A 2 X 2 factorial design was used to analyze the results of dependency-aggression (Sex of Child X Behavior of Child). Ten teachers were randomly assigned to each of these four sex/behavior pairings. A second hypothetical child was described as performing achievement behaviors. One-half of the 10 teachers in each of the four groups were assigned to a female name/achievement-behavior group while the remainder were placed in the male name/achievement-behavior group. Each item was measured by a seven-point scale (e.g., ranging from "greatly approve" to "greatly disapprove"). Responses were recorded so that high scores represented approval, liking, or typicality and low scores disapproval, dislike, or atypicality. Based on results from an analysis of variance (Sex X Behavior), main effects were found for dependency-aggression behavior. Female teachers exhibited significantly more approval for dependent behaviors, regardless of the sex of the hypothetical child. Achievement behavior (a non-sex-typed behavior) was viewed as typical of both boys and girls and met with equal disapproval.

A study by Feshbach (1969) quizzed student teachers with the Situation Test to assess those attributes regarded most favorably by teachers. Group I was comprised of 151 female subjects during their initial assignment as student teachers. Group II was composed of 89 females beginning their second student teaching assignment. The subjects were

presented with 16 hypothetical situations which portrayed elementary school children in relevant classroom situations. Based on the situations presented, the subjects rated the child involved on five behavioral dimensions: intelligence, grades, generosity, popularity, and how much the subject would like to have the child in her class. The results strongly upheld that the teachers preferred children who were cautious, conforming, and controlled. For three of the individual dimensions (i.e., popularity, generosity, and preferred child in the classroom), teachers gave preference to the behaviors of rigidity, conformity, orderliness, dependency, passivity, and acquiescence. The least preferred group were the independent, active, and assertive students. These differences were significant at the .01 confidence level. Assuming that the attitudes of female student teachers are concomitant with the typical elementary classroom teacher, it can be surmised that those qualities most desirable in students are those associated with the female sex role and those most rejected are indicative of the male sex role.

Empirical Studies Employing Male Teachers

The Feshbach (1969) study was replicated by Good and Grouws (1972) utilizing both male and female teachers. The same 16 hypothetical situations were administered to 22 male and 55 female student teachers. Passive and compliant students were preferred to the more independent ones. Generally, the males indicated identical preference patterns as females.

Brophy and Good (1974) cited this finding as only one within a larger pattern which revealed that male teachers have basically the same preferences and classroom interaction patterns toward boys and girls as female teachers.

Lee and Wolinsky (1973) investigated the differential effects of male and female teachers in 18 classrooms from preschool through second grade. Contradicting the findings of Brophy and Laosa (1971), these researchers reported that the male teacher did have a masculinizing influence and contributed to a greater sex-role balance in the lives of young children. Observations were conducted out of 18 classrooms of which six had two female teachers, six had a male and female teacher, and the remainder was taught by three teams consisting of male and female lead teachers. An event-sampling technique was used to record differential teacher behaviors. Teacher behaviors included reinforcements and punishments dispensed, assignment of leadership positions to boys and girls, grouping procedures, and types of sex-typed activities initiated or responded to in the classroom. A fifth dimension was assessed from the children to determine if having a male or female teacher would result in different attitudes. It was found that females dispensed twice as many reinforcements as did males. Male and female teachers disapproved of boys about equally, but males were very approving of boys while females approved more of girls. Secondly, there was a significant propensity of teachers to assign leadership roles to members of their same sex more than to the opposite

sex. Thirdly, an interaction between teacher sex and sex composition of groups was apparent. Male teachers tended to relate to single sex groups more often than female teachers. Males and females related to children in groups about equally. Male teachers were less salient for the children and more reticent to initiate activities and groups, whereas females initiated activities more often. Fourth, although female teachers had more salience for the children, boys responded that they preferred the male teacher to the female; girls responded equally in favor of the male and female teacher. Moreover, both boys and girls felt that their male teachers liked them better than their female teachers. Lastly, male and female graduate students were implemented as judges to determine which of the investigators' collected classroom activities were masculine, feminine, or neuter.

Males either initiated or joined 42 per cent male-typed activities, 11 per cent female-typed activities, and 47 per cent neuter-typed activities. Females initiated or responded to 14 per cent female-typed activities, 69 per cent neuter-typed activities, and 17 per cent male-typed activities. The researchers exposed a marked relationship between sex of teacher and sex type of activity. A recapitulation showed male teachers related to male-typed activities, female teachers to neuter-typed activities, and both sexes to little involvement in female-typed activities. These puzzling results may be explained by a confounding of IQ, education, and possible socio-economic status. The validity of using

the judgments of a handful of advanced graduate students as representative of the sex-typed proclivities of the status quo is questionable. One would expect to find more liberal concepts of "maleness" and "femaleness" among this population than that which is the standard. This would account for the unusually large percentage of neuter-typed activities by both male (47 per cent) and female (69 per cent) activities. This question of validity coupled with sampling problems would suggest that the results of a masculinizing influence on classroom activities be interpreted with restraint. In light of their findings Lee and Wolinsky (1973) cautioned us that there is as yet no hard evidence that male teachers structure or provide a more "masculine" environment for young children.

As a follow-up to the Levitin and Chananie (1972) study, Etaugh and Hughes (1975) tested the hypothesis that male teachers would be less likely than females to reinforce feminine behaviors and more likely to reinforce differential sex-role behaviors. Utilizing the same questionnaire developed by Levitin and Chananie (1972), Etaugh and Hughes (1975) queried 64 female and 64 male school teachers of grades five through eight. The roles of teacher sex and school setting in relation to teacher response to hypothetical portrayal of children's sex-typed behaviors were assessed. The procedure was basically the same as in the Levitin and Chananie (1972) study except that two additional variables were added: teacher sex and school setting (i.e., middle-class versus

lower-class schools). Hence, data were analyzed by a Teacher Sex X Child Sex X School Setting X Behavior analysis of variance. Dependency was approved of more than aggression between both sexes of teacher; moreover, the dependent child was liked more than the aggressive one. Dependency in boys was approved of more than in girls. While both disapproved of aggression, males approved of dependency more than did females. Significant Teacher Sex X School Setting interactions indicated that male teachers in middle-class schools liked children in all three behavior categories more than did their female counterparts. In the lower-class schools, aggressive children were liked more by females than by males. Thus, these data indicated that male teachers were behaving very similarly to female teachers by reinforcing a traditionally feminine behavior. The writers concluded that further inquiry should examine the actual classroom behaviors of the teachers to validate teacher responses to a questionnaire.

A study by Etaugh, Collins, and Gerson (1975) sought to examine sex differences in the play preferences of two-year-olds and to discern to what extent teachers reinforce female sex-typed behaviors as do teachers of older preschoolers. Operationally, sex-typed activities were sex differences observed in play preferences. One male and four female college students with prior teacher experiences served as the teachers in this study. By means of t tests significant differences were found in play behaviors. Girls tended to paint, help the teacher, and read books or listen to stories,

whereas, boys preferred to hammer and manipulate transportation toys. Teachers reinforced both girls and boys for a preponderant number of feminine behaviors as opposed to masculine behaviors. These data were consistent with data dealing with older preschoolers. In contrast to Fagot and Patterson's (1969) study, the peer reinforcement with these younger subjects was infrequent. Thus, it was believed that teacher and maternal influences impinge upon the child at this young age. The male teacher dispensed 33 per cent of all rewards given for masculine behaviors compared to an average of 17 per cent for each female teacher. These findings supported those of Fagot and Patterson (1969) that teachers reinforce for same-sex behaviors. However, here again the important variable of sex-role adoption (actual employment of the male as nursery school teacher) was missing.

The only day care study measuring sex-typed contingencies was an unpublished one by McCandless and Bush (1975). High school males were used for subjects and received money and course credit for their work and training. This study was very similar to the Fagot and Patterson (1969) study except that the later study employed eight male caregivers as well as seven females. Attempts were made to discern the reinforcing contingencies given by caregivers and peers for sex-characteristic behavior. The study lasted a duration of two years in which the males received in-service training, whereas the females were experienced early childhood teachers.

A total of five observers utilized The Fagot-Patterson Check-list (1969), which included 28 child behaviors and 10 teacher consequences with two additional child categories added by the later investigators. The children were observed in a randomly predetermined order during free play, and data on the differences in the proportion of time spent by each sex in each of the 30 behaviors were ascertained. Boys spent more time playing with transportation toys, blocks, and other sex-appropriate items, while girls enjoyed cutting, pasting, and playing with dolls. It was again found that peers reinforced same-sex peers more often than opposite-sex peers. Out of 95 male-child reinforcements, 87 per cent were dispensed to other boys; furthermore, out of a possible 64 female-child reinforcements girls received 78 per cent. These findings were congruent to those of Fagot and Patterson (1969). Boys tended to reinforce other boys for masculine activities while girls reinforced female peers predominantly for feminine proclivities. Likewise, differences were noted in the contingency behaviors of the male and female caregivers. Males tended to differentially reinforce children for sex-typed behaviors. Seventy-four per cent of reinforcements given to the average boy were for masculine behaviors, whereas the average girl was given 81 per cent reinforcements for feminine behaviors. Females, on the other hand, reinforced all children more for feminine behaviors than masculine behaviors. On the average they dispensed a total of 64 per cent reinforcements to boys for feminine

behaviors, while concomitantly administering 93 per cent feminine behaviors to girls. Feminine-preferred behaviors constituted 81 per cent of the sex-preferred behaviors of female reinforcement. By contrast the males were egalitarian in their dispensation of reinforcement for masculine-preferred (49 per cent) and feminine-preferred (51 per cent) behaviors.

It is the contention of this writer that subjects in the previously cited day care studies (McCandless & Bush, 1975; Raines et al., 1974) were not representative of men actually employed in day care. Secondly, the 1974 study mostly assessed the modeling effects of aggression and assertiveness by males. It is possible to obtain other sex-related variables as well. Pilot work launched in the spring of 1975 by the current writer (Robinson, 1975) revealed some contradictory findings similar to those of others (Etaugh & Hughes, 1975; Fagot & Patterson, 1969; Good & Grouws, 1972; Levitin & Chananie, 1972). The subjects were older men who one would assume have launched themselves into the profession of day care (mean age 26.8 years) (see Appendix A for a better description of the sample). Moreover, these men were well educated with a mean length of education of 15.2 years. The subjects participating in the study were seven male and seven female caregivers employed in a total of seven day care centers in Greensboro, Monroe, and Charlotte, North Carolina. An attempt was made to delimit exhaustively all possible masculine and feminine traditional

behaviors for which young children could be either punished or reinforced by caregivers. A list of 16 categories (eight masculine and eight feminine behaviors) was charted for assessment in the study (see Appendix A for Sex-Role Specific Behavior Scale). Each category was well documented by citations from the research literature. Caregivers were observed in situs in their verbal interactions with the children either during morning free play or afternoon play following nap time. An event-sampling technique was employed and lasted until 50 naturalistic observations were ascertained for each caregiver. This usually took from two to three hours per subject, and each observation was completed in one day. The total data collection period for all subjects extended a duration of three months. Each time the caregiver verbally punished or reinforced a child for a sex-specific behavior, the observer coded the sex of the caregiver offering the dispensation, the sex of the child being attended to, the consequence for each child, and the category of behavior involved. Means were computed for both male and female caregivers' dispensations of both positive reinforcers and punishers (see Appendix A).

Contrary to prior researches in which male students were scrutinized (Etaugh et al., 1975; McCandless & Bush, 1975; Raines et al., 1974), male caregivers were not egalitarian in their dispensation of reinforcement for masculine-preferred and feminine-preferred behaviors. Fifty-five per cent of all reinforcement was for feminine-preferred

behaviors while 45 per cent was for masculine-preferred behaviors. Males, furthermore, did not differentially reinforce children for sex-typed behaviors. They reinforced boys more often for feminine behaviors than they did for masculine behaviors (but not significantly more). Fifty-nine per cent of reinforcements given to the average boy were for feminine behaviors contrasted to only 26 per cent in the McCandless and Bush (1974) study. By the same token, the average girl received 51 per cent reinforcements for feminine behaviors compared to 81 per cent in the McCandless and Bush (1975) study.

Congruent to past findings (Etaugh et al., 1975; Etaugh & Hughes, 1975; Fagot & Patterson, 1969; Levitin & Chananie, 1972; McCandless & Bush, 1975), female caregivers approved more of feminine behaviors in all children. They reinforced boys significantly more for feminine behaviors ($\overline{X}$ = 12.6) than for masculine behaviors ($\overline{X}$ = 4.9) (t = 3.52; $p < .01$). Girls were, furthermore, reinforced more for feminine behaviors than masculine behaviors (t = 2.88; $p < .05$).

Male caregivers reinforced boys significantly more for feminine behaviors than they did girls (t = 2.61; p = < .05). With female caregivers, this trend was not significant, however (boys, $\overline{X}$ = 12.6; girls, $\overline{X}$ = 11.4). Boys and girls were reinforced about equally for feminine behaviors by females.

Male caregivers punished boys significantly more for masculine behaviors than for feminine behaviors (t = 7.53;

$p = < .01$). Girls were also punished more for masculine behaviors but not significantly more. Male caregivers punished boys significantly more for masculine behaviors than girls ($t = 3.42$; $p < .01$).

Both sexes of subjects failed to punish children for engaging in feminine behaviors. With the female caregivers, there were virtually no punishers administered to either boys or girls for feminine behaviors. Thus, not only did the female caregiver reinforce all children for feminine behaviors, but she inhibited punishers for feminine behaviors, allowing these behaviors to manifest themselves. This implied that as long as the child was quiet, passive, following the rules, and conforming to expectations, he or she would not be punished. The only punishers administered for feminine behaviors were admonitions by the male caregivers for affiliative and nurturant responses. These were most often crying behaviors.

Percentages were obtained on male and female contingency responses for the most frequently reinforced and punished behaviors (see Appendix A). For males 57 per cent of all punishers for masculine behaviors were given for physical aggression, roughhouse play, and independence; however, 39 per cent of all masculine reinforcers were given for these same behaviors. Other frequently occurring feminine contingency behaviors with the male subjects were for the development of fine motor and handicraft tasks (27 per cent) and use of feminine sex-typed toys (25 per cent), particularly

toys reflecting activities directed toward the home (e.g., cooking, cleaning, ironing, and caregiving).

Female caregivers dispensed 58 per cent of all reinforcers for masculine behaviors for games, stories, or songs typically considered masculine. Feminine behaviors which they reinforced were the development of skill and interest in fine motor and handicraft tasks (28 per cent) and conformity to proper social habits (26 per cent). The preponderance of punishers was given for roughhouse play and physical aggression (37 per cent).

Limitations in the pilot work must be emphasized. The sample was small and was not a random one; moreover, interobserver reliability was not established and only verbal reinforcers and punishers were assessed.

Summary

To summarize the literature, it was consistent that women in day care through the elementary school years were structuring traditional female environments for children (Etaugh et al., 1975; Etaugh & Hughes, 1975; Fagot & Patterson, 1969; Feshbach, 1969; Good & Grouws, 1972; Levitin & Chananie, 1972; McCandless & Bush, 1975; Raines et al., 1974; Robinson, 1975).

The behavior of males at these various levels, however, was more equivocal. Despite the impassioned pleas for more men in early education, the data supporting this need was said to be weak (Brophy & Good, 1974; Lee & Wolinsky, 1973),

sparse (Tolbert, 1968; Lee, 1973), and inconsistent(Brophy & Good, 1973a; Brophy & Laosa, 1971). Tolbert (1968) lucidly stated the debate thus:

> The truth is that very little empirical research has been conducted to prove the need of the male instructor in early schooling. Furthermore, for all its claims, the literature does not reveal any significant differences in teaching performed between male and female elementary teachers that would justify the employment of the male teacher on his ability to perform and on the contributions he makes to the student and to the school rather than on simply the merit of his sex or the lack of men in elementary education (p. 41).

Although male teachers provided some modeling value for children, there was some question as to the effects of a male model for short periods of time in an educational setting. The relatively brief time spans of six weeks (Madsen, 1968) to eight weeks (Sciarra, 1970) revealed little or no significant differences. The period of one year (Brophy & Laosa, 1971) was furthermore found to have no masculinizing impact upon children except for improved scores on spatial ability in the first group of subjects. This difference was not noted, however, in the replication of the study. The only inquiry purporting marked and significant gains in masculinity among children was a two-year duration with the same groups of children (Raines et al., 1974). Consequently, it appeared that for male teachers to have modeling value for children, the length of intervention is a crucial variable.

It appeared that the sex-typed contingency behaviors dispensed by males in early education were even more uncertain.

Some studies (McCandless & Bush, 1975; Raines et al., 1974) posited that men provide for and reinforce differential sex-typed experiences and behaviors appropriate to the sex of the child. In both instances, however, the subjects were students and the variable of sex-role adoption was not considered.

The preponderance of research may be interpreted within Patterson and Reid's (1969) paradigm which proposed that children are reinforced for those sex-typed behaviors that are highest in the personal repertoire of the dispensor. Studies substantiating this perspective revealed more masculine contingencies from males (Etaugh et al., 1975; Lee & Wolinsky, 1973) and more masculinized behaviors for both sexes of children after intervention (Raines et al., 1974). Moreover, this framework was used to explain the female teacher's propensity to reinforce feminine behaviors regardless of sex of child (Fagot & Patterson, 1969). This framework further explained why in the majority of studies, where sex-role adoption was considered (i.e., subjects were either employed in the field or currently receiving training in the field), male teachers and caregivers behaved similarly to female teachers (Etaugh & Hughes, 1975; Good & Grouws, 1972; Robinson, 1975). Regardless of teacher sex, it seemed that teachers preferred compliant, cooperative, and passive students (typically feminine qualities) to those who were independent and assertive (typically masculine qualities). An additional study showed no difference

between two groups of children in sex-typed consequences after having a male or female teacher (Brophy & Laosa, 1971). The only exception was the study by Lee and Wolinsky (1973) in which the results were attributed to procedural error.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

As a result of the equivocal findings reported in the survey of the literature on sex-typed behaviors of men in early education, the current study had as its purpose to further examine the contingency behaviors of males in day care. The differences in sex-typed attitudes and personality attributes of male caregivers were also contrasted to female caregivers and to men employed in a more traditionally "masculine" occupation. In Chapter III a more detailed description of the design of the study, the methods of procedure, and the analysis of data are presented.

Design of the Study

Subjects

The two extremities of the continuum of masculinity and femininity were established to operationalize sex-role adoption. The two extremes were most feminine (male caregivers) and most masculine (professional engineers). Caregiving has traditionally been a feminine occupation. This is contrasted to the male-dominated field of engineering, 99 per cent of which is occupied by men ("Drive To Open Up More Careers for Women," 1974). Of all occupational groups surveyed on the Terman-Miles M-F Test (Terman & Miles, 1936), professional engineers yielded the most masculine M-F scores

for male adults. Moreover, engineers were found to be the most masculine occupational groups on the Strong Vocational Interest Blank (Strong, 1943). Terman and Miles (1936) accounted for the exceptionally high masculine scores for engineers to be due to a positive correlation with mechanical ability and interests.

To obtain a list of male caregivers, the investigator wrote the eight day care consultants of the North Carolina Division of Social Services. The assistance of the consultants in providing the names of male caregivers whom they had encountered in their regional work was requested (see Appendix B for letter). As a result of this correspondence, one-half of the consultants responded. Two months later a second letter was mailed to the non-respondents emphasizing the importance of their reply (see Appendix B). This follow-up yielded two more responses. The two remaining non-respondents were contacted by telephone and their information was recorded with that of the other consultants to complete the list. From this list were excluded any work-study students or men in centers for handicapped children. Also, any men not serving in a direct caregiving capacity were deleted. The final list of male caregivers in the certified centers totaled 35. From this list 25 male caregivers were randomly selected for inclusion in this study. These men were employed caregivers working in certified centers and were caregivers of children between the ages of two and five.

A second group of 25 female caregivers were matched with the males by day care center. Other variables such as age, education level, and years of experience were matched as closely as possible.

A third group of subjects were male professional engineers. They were randomly chosen from the 1975 roster of the North Carolina State Board of Registration for Professional Engineers. A total of 75 engineers were selected. Over-sampling was utilized in this case because Kerlinger (1973) reports that a common return rate on mail questionnaires may be as low as 40 per cent. From those engineers responding, subjects were matched with the male caregivers as closely as possible in regard to age, education, and years of experience.

A contrasting samples survey design was employed because it reflects only the extremes of a distribution. According to Campbell and Katona (1953), it is possible to see more clearly the effects or correlates of a variable when situations are structured which provide the greatest extremes in the presence of this independent variable. Female caregivers were used as an additional contrast.

Materials

The survey materials consisted of three items. A face sheet was included to obtain demographic data (see Appendix C). Also included in the survey items were The Sex-Typed Attitude Checklist (see Appendix D) and The Adjective Check List (see

Appendix E for a sample test).

The Sex-Typed Attitude Checklist consisted of a total of 63 adjectives from The Adjective Check List, which were found to be sex-typed for either males or females, in a study by Williams and Bennett (1975). There were 33 male adjectives and 30 female adjectives on which at least 75 per cent of 50 male and 50 female college students agreed. Judgments by male and female subjects on the adjectives revealed a product-moment correlation of .89. These 63 adjectives were combined to constitute the total checklist of adjectives. The checklist was administered to each subject twice with two separate sets of directions, one for female preferences and one for male preferences (see Appendix D).

The Adjective Check List (Gough, 1952). The Need Scales on The Adjective Check List (ACL) were used to assess personality traits of the subjects. The checklist included 300 behavioral adjectives from which the subject selected the ones that were most self-descriptive. The checklist could be completed in 10 to 15 minutes, aroused little resistance or anxiety, and rendered information for personality assessment.

Reliability measures for this scale included test-retest reliability of the list of words, the reliability of the scales and scored variables, and the agreement among observers when the total check list was used for recording the observations of psychological assessors. For the total

list of words, test-retest reliability was assessed from a sample of 100 men who were administered the test six months apart. Phi coefficients were computed on the tests. Results showed test-retest reliability coefficients varying from + .01 to + .86 with a mean of + .54 (Gough & Heilbrun, 1965).

Test-retest reliability was also conducted on the 24 scales. Over a 10-week interval all scales showed high consistency with the exception of Lability and Succorance. The authors (Gough & Heilbrun, 1965) suggested that these two scales be interpreted with caution.

A third test of reliability indicated that The Adjective Check List was usable for trained observers to describe others being observed. Agreement among observers was satisfactory with reliability coefficients in five cases of .70, .63, .61, .75, and .61 (Gough & Heilbrun, 1965).

According to Gough and Heilbrun (1965), the ACL self-descriptions obtained from normally functioning persons yielded valid predictions of their actual social behaviors. Preliminary versions of the ACL need scales correlated + .60 with the ranking given by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (Edwards, 1954). Congruent validity has also been established between the ACL and Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory and The California Psychological Inventory (Gough & Heilbrun, 1965). Heilbrun (1959) has, furthermore, shown that five of the need scales (i.e., Achievement, Nurturance, Affiliation, Exhibition, and Abasement) significantly correlate to non-test indices of the same dimensions.

The Fagot-Patterson Checklist (1969) was used to assess the sex-typed contingency behaviors of the male and female caregivers. In its original form, this checklist included 28 child behaviors and 10 consequences, i.e., four teacher consequences and six child consequences (see Appendix F). The child behaviors and consequences were obtained in a pilot study in which an attempt was made to list exhaustively all the possible play behaviors and social consequences that could occur. The 28 child behaviors and 10 consequences selected for inclusion in The Fagot-Patterson Checklist were those which seemed to summarize adequately most of the subjects' behavior (Fagot & Patterson, 1969). For purposes of data assessment in the present study, however, use was made of only 20 of the 28 child behaviors from the scale. The child behaviors used in this study were derived from previous researches in which observed sex differences in play preferences were found using this same scale (Fagot & Patterson, 1969; McCandless & Bush, 1975; Etaugh et al., 1975). Table 1 summarizes how the 20 child behaviors were shown to be sex-typed. The remaining behaviors were not shown to be significantly either masculine or feminine and were, therefore, eliminated from the checklist.

Interview Schedule. A brief interview was conducted with the male caregivers (see Appendix G for interview schedule). Kerlinger (1973) pointed out that the personal interview helps in determining a respondent's motives for doing or believing something. The interview was employed here

TABLE 1

SEX-TYPED BEHAVIORS BASED ON THE USE OF THE FAGOT-PATTERSON CHECKLIST IN PREVIOUS STUDIES

Masculine Behaviors	Feminine Behaviors
1. Play at cornmeal table or sandbox outside (1)	10. Paint (1, 3)
2. Build blocks, build structures, set up farms and villages (1, 2)	11. Artwork: cutting, pasting, drawing with crayons or chalk (1, 2)
3. Hammer, pound (3)	12. Play with clay, play-doh, or other malleable substances (1)
4. Play with transportation toys (e.g., toy trucks, planes, boats, trains, tractors) (1, 2, 3)	13. Play in kitchen, large playhouse, or extended kitchen activities; rehearse domestic activities (1)
5. Play with steering wheel, dashboards, or parts of car (1, 2, 3)	14. Play with dollhouse (1)
6. Climb or hide in covered structures (e.g., pipes, barrels) (1)	15. Play with dolls (1, 2)
7. Ride trikes, cars, horses, skates, wagons, boats, and other moving transportation toys (1)	16. Look at books or listen to stories (1, 3)
8. Throw objects (e.g., ball, rocks), hit with an object, push, shove; run around room (2)	17. Sit; do nothing, wander, follow teacher around (2)
9. Use like-sex tools (2)	18. Help teacher (3)
	19. Swing, slide, play on teeter-totter, or bounce on tires (2)
	20. Dress in like-sex costume (2)

[1]Derived from Fagot-Patterson (1969)
[2]Derived from McCandless & Bush (1975)
[3]Derived from Etaugh et al. (1975)

to determine among other things the male caregiver's reasons for choosing day care as a field of work. This interview schedule was adapted from a report by Bush, Carden, and Raines (1975). A small, cassette tape recorder was used to record the interview sessions.

Procedure

Prior to the mailing of the survey indices, the director of each center in which the male caregiver was employed was contacted. At this time the investigator explained that he was conducting an investigation concerning male caregivers in the state, described the selection procedure, and requested permission to obtain the subject's participation in the study. He then explained that this would involve an observation and an interview at the day care center. Upon consent, the director was asked to name a female in the same center of comparable age, experience, and educational level to the male. Because the return rates and consent of the experimental subjects were crucial to the study, both male and female caregivers were contacted by telephone. The scope of the study was explained and their participation was requested. Following their consent to participate, the importance of the return of the forthcoming mailed items was emphasized. Appreciation was expressed for their cooperation, and they were told that they would be visited as soon as the mailed items had been returned.

Sample Survey

A sample survey was launched with a series of three mailings made to the caregivers. The first mailing included the face sheet, The Adjective Check List, and a cover letter thanking the subjects for agreeing to participate and explaining the details of the survey (see Appendix H for a copy of the cover letter). Instructions were included for completing the items and for returning them by mail. After these items were received by the investigator, a second mailing was made to the caregivers. The second mailing was structured so that one-half of the male caregivers and one-half of the female caregivers received The Sex-Typed Attitude Checklist on young girls and the other half received The Sex-Typed Attitude Checklist on young boys. After each subject's second checklist was returned, the third and final checklist was mailed. The order of the third mailing was reversed with each subject receiving his complementary half of the checklist either on young girls or young boys.

A sample survey was also mailed to the male professional engineers with a series of four mailings made to them. The first mailing included a letter requesting the professional engineers' participation in the study (see Appendix H for a copy of the letter) and an intent to participate form (see Appendix I). The scope of the study was explained and instructions were given in regard to their intent to participate. A second mailing was made to those respondents who agreed to participate by signing and returning the intent

form. The second mailing included the face sheet, The Adjective Check List, and a letter expressing appreciation for their cooperation in the study and giving them instructions for completing the enclosed items (see Appendix H). After these items were received by the investigator, a third mailing was made to the engineers. The third mailing was structured so that one-half of the engineers received The Sex-Typed Attitude Checklist on young girls and the other half received The Sex-Typed Attitude Checklist on young boys. This procedure was reversed on the fourth mailing with those returning the attitude checklist on young girls receiving the attitude checklist on young boys. Conversely, those who returned the attitude checklist on young boys received the attitude checklist on young girls. After all four mailings were received by the investigator, those respondents returning all four mailings and most closely resembling the male caregiver sample were chosen for inclusion in this study.

Event-Sampling Procedure

After all mailed items were returned by the caregivers, a convenient time was established for the investigator to visit the day care center of each subject. An event-sampling procedure was employed for data assessment using The Fagot-Patterson Checklist. Each caregiver was observed until 12 naturalistic observations were ascertained for each. The subject was observed in his or her interactions with the children either during morning free play or afternoon play following nap time. To avoid the promotion of unnatural

behaviors among the caregivers, they were simply asked to proceed with their normal daily activities while being observed.

The observer recorded the caregiver's contingency behaviors while remaining in the background as much as possible. The observer asked the caregivers to ignore him and avoided interacting with the children. When approached by a child, the observer responded as quickly as possible and transferred eye contact from the child. The total number of reinforcers and punishers dispensed by each caregiver for masculine- or feminine-typed behaviors was coded. Using the code numbers for the 20 child behaviors and the four teacher consequences, the observer simply coded the behavior engaged in by the child and the caregiver contingency for that behavior (see Appendix J for code sheet).

Inter-Observer Reliability

A number of observational sessions were conducted at Central Piedmont Community College's Demonstration Day Care Center to obtain observer reliability data. Two observers had to give exactly the same code number on each observation to be considered in agreement. The observations were judged completed when one of the two observers recorded a total of 127 observations on each of the two scales (i.e., child behaviors and teacher consequences). Agreement levels were scored by percentages. Ninety per cent agreement was considered acceptable on each of the two scales.

Interview

On the same day during which the observations were made, a time was set aside in which the investigator met with each male caregiver. The subject was interviewed in a location as free from extraneous variables as possible. The subject was briefly reminded of the purpose of the investigation as explained in the letter he had received. He was told that answers to a few questions would complete his participation in the study. The questions on the interview schedule were then posed to him. In order for the investigator to give his full attention to the interview process, each session was tape-recorded. After the interview had been administered, the subjects were thanked for their cooperation.

Analysis of the Data

The raw data of this study were comprised of three sets. The first set of data consisted of the means within the two caregiver groups on the total reinforcing and total punishing behaviors, obtained from The Fagot-Patterson Checklist. The mean differences of the masculine and feminine behaviors between each caregiver group were also computed.

A second set was the sex-typed attitudes derived from The Sex-Typed Attitude Checklist. Two attitudinal preference scores were obtained for each subject, an attitudinal score for boys and an attitudinal score for girls. This score was determined by subtracting the number of feminine adjective preferences from the number of masculine adjective preferences.

For each group of subjects, attitudinal preferences were expressed in terms of the mean ratings of boy attitudinal preferences and girl attitudinal preferences.

A third set of raw data was scores on the ACL. Each subject's set of raw data scores on the need scales were combined into a masculine (M) score and a feminine (F) score. An M-F score was then obtained by subtracting the F score from the M score. These scores were reported by an M-F mean for all three groups of subjects.

To determine whether a significant difference existed between the reinforcing contingencies and the punishing contingencies of male and female caregivers, use was made of repeated measures analysis of variance with one between subjects factor (i.e., sex of caregiver) and two repeated within subjects factors (i.e., contingency behavior and sex type of behavior). Two separate one-way analysis of variance tests were run on the male caregivers, the female caregivers, and the male engineers to determine the differences among the groups on sex-typed attitudes for boys and sex-typed attitudes for girls. A one-way analysis of variance was run on the male caregivers, the female caregivers, and the male engineers to determine the differences among the groups on personality traits. The Pearson correlation coefficient was used to determine the remaining relationships as follows:

1. Sex-typed attitudes $\underline{r}$ Sex-typed contingencies
2. Sex-typed attitudes $\underline{r}$ Personality traits
3. Sex-typed contingencies $\underline{r}$ Personality traits

These data and their statistical treatments are presented in Chapter IV and are summarized by the use of tables throughout the chapter.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter is arranged in terms of the findings in regard to the return rates and matching of the male caregivers, female caregivers, and male engineers. Demographic data are discussed followed by the analysis of variance tests and correlational data on the dependent measures.

Return Rates

Out of the returns on all three mailed items from male caregivers, 80 per cent were usable. Three subjects requested to be withdrawn from participation in the investigation and two other subjects did not meet the criteria for inclusion in the study. The rate of return on all mailed items from the female caregivers was 96 per cent. From these returns only those from females who corresponded to the day care center of the male caregivers were used.

Fifty-nine per cent of the 75 male engineers who were sampled responded by returning all four mailed items. This is somewhat lower than the return rate of the caregivers. This may have been due to the fact that the male engineers were never personally contacted by telephone and that more return items were demanded of the engineer sample.

Demographic Data

The means for male caregivers, female caregivers, and male engineers on age, education, and months of experience are shown in Table 2. It can be noted that all three groups were well matched in terms of age and education. However, both female caregivers and male engineers had a higher mean length of experience than the male caregivers. The average male engineer had ten years more experience in his field than the average male caregiver. This discrepancy was to be expected, however, since day care is such a new field for men and was considered not to be a variable affecting the dependent measures in the study.

TABLE 2

MEANS ON DEMOGRAPHIC DATA FOR MALE CAREGIVERS, FEMALE CAREGIVERS, AND MALE ENGINEERS

Subject	Age	Education	Experience in Months
Male Caregivers	30.2	15.95	31.85
Female Caregivers	32.3	15.3	41.3
Male Engineers	37.35	16.2	153.8

It was found that the majority of the male caregivers surveyed worked with older children. A trend was noted in the age level of the child and the percentage of males at

that age level. Fifty-five per cent worked with four- or five-year olds (i.e., 30 per cent worked with fives, 15 per cent with four and fives combined, and 10 per cent with four-year-olds only). Working with the three-year-old children were 30 per cent of the sample, and the remaining 15 per cent worked with two-year-olds.

Personality Characteristics

M-F Scores

The mean scores for the personality characteristics for each group are shown in Table 3. The results of the three-way analysis of variance of the masculine and feminine personality characteristics from the scores on The Adjective Check List are presented in Table 4.

It can be noted from Table 4 that there was a significant difference among the mean M-F scores for the three groups ($F = 3.56$, $p < .05$). Female caregivers scored most feminine in their personality traits of all three groups. The Newman-Keuls Test revealed that hypothesis 3b was confirmed in that the mean M-F scores between the female caregivers and male engineers were significantly different, with the male engineers scoring more masculine and the female caregivers more feminine on the scale totals.

Hypothesis 3c was rejected. Although both scored in a feminine direction, the difference between the male caregivers and female caregivers on personality characteristics was not significant. Hypothesis 3a was also not tenable.

TABLE 3

MEAN SCORES OF PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF MALE CAREGIVERS, FEMALE CAREGIVERS, AND MALE ENGINEERS ON THE ADJECTIVE CHECK LIST

Subjects	Masculine Characteristics				Feminine Characteristics					M-F Score
	ACH	DOM	END	AUT	ABA	NUR	AFF	SUC	DEF	
Male Caregivers	10.25	9.65	8.40	0.85	-0.15	19.80	21.80	-0.70	3.70	-15.30
Female Caregivers	10.40	10.20	8.65	-0.10	1.00	20.95	22.95	-0.35	6.80	-22.20
Male Engineers	14.60	14.60	12.55	1.25	-2.00	19.85	22.40	-2.40	3.55	1.60

TABLE 4

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MASCULINE AND FEMININE PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS

Source	ss	df	ms	F	P
Achievement	243.900	2	121.950	3.44	<.05
Error	2019.350	57	35.427		
Dominance	294.433	2	147.216	2.64	NS
Error	3172.550	57	55.658		
Endurance	216.633	2	108.316	3.69	<.05
Error	1670.300	57	29.303		
Autonomy	19.233	2	9.616	0.38	NS
Error	1442.100	57	25.300		
Abasement	91.633	2	45.816	1.956	NS
Error	1334.550	57	23.413		
Nurturance	16.900	2	8.450	0.232	NS
Error	2068.700	57	36.292		
Affiliation	13.233	2	6.616	0.151	NS
Error	2482.950	57	43.560		
Succorance	48.100	2	24.050	3.133	<.05
Error	437.550	57	7.676		
Deference	134.633	2	67.316	2.143	NS
Error	1790.350	57	31.409		
M-F Total Score	5997.733	2	2998.866	3.560	<.05
Error	48006.200	57	842.214		

Although the male caregivers scored more feminine in personality traits and male engineers more masculine, the difference between the two groups was not significant.

Need Scale Scores

In regard to the individualized need scales on The Adjective Check List, analysis of variance tests yielded significant differences on the Achievement, Endurance, and Succorance scales (see Table 4). Significant differences on the Achievement scale yielded results of $F = 3.44$, $p < .05$. The Newman-Keuls Test indicated that the male engineers scored significantly higher than the female caregivers. Further analysis with the Newman-Keuls Test revealed no significant differences on Achievement scores between the male caregivers and male engineers. Achievement scores for male and female caregivers were almost identical as evidenced from Table 3, with mean scores of 10.25 and 10.40, respectively.

Significant differences among the groups were also found on the Endurance scale ($F = 3.69$, $p < .05$). The Newman-Keuls Test revealed a significant difference between the male caregivers and male engineers with the male engineers scoring higher on this masculine trait; moreover, the Newman-Keuls Test reflected differences between the male engineers and the female caregivers with the latter group scoring significantly lower. No differences were noted between the male and female caregivers on Endurance. Again,

the lower Endurance scores for these two groups were similar with means for male caregivers, 8.40, and for female caregivers, 8.65.

It can be noted from Table 4 that the scores on the Succorance scale were significantly different across groups ($F = 3.13$, $p < .05$). However, the locus of significance could not be determined through the use of the Newman-Keuls Test. In Table 4 the data indicated there were no significant differences across groups among the remaining scales, i.e., Dominance, Autonomy, Abasement, Nurturance, Affiliation, and Deference.

Sex-Typed Attitudes

Differences Among Groups

The means for the sex-typed attitudes for each group are shown in Table 5. The results of the three-way analysis of variance of the masculine-feminine preferred behaviors from scores on The Sex-Typed Attitude Checklist were not significant. There were no significant differences among the three groups on masculine-feminine preferences for boys or girls.

Differences Within Groups

Paired t tests were run to test the differences of the sex-typed attitudes toward boys and girls within each group. The results are presented in Table 6.

Male caregivers were found to prefer significantly a greater number of masculine behaviors to feminine behaviors

TABLE 5

MEAN SCORES ON THE SEX-TYPED ATTITUDE CHECKLIST

Subjects	Masculine-Feminine Preferred Behaviors for Boys	Masculine-Feminine Preferred Behaviors for Girls
Male Caregivers	7.60	2.50
Female Caregivers	8.15	1.00
Male Engineers	8.50	0.65

TABLE 6

PAIRED *t* TESTS ON THE DIFFERENCES IN SEX-TYPED ATTITUDES TOWARD BOYS AND GIRLS IN EACH SAMPLE GROUP

Subject	Difference Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	*t* Value	*df*	*p*
Male Caregivers	5.10	7.12	1.59	3.21	19	<.01
Female Caregivers	7.15	5.71	1.28	5.60	19	<.001
Male Engineers	7.85	5.31	1.19	6.61	19	<.001

for boys as opposed to girls (t = 3.21; p < .01). Although slightly masculine in direction, the sex-typed attitude score for girls was just above zero which indicated a preference for both masculine and feminine behaviors in girls. Female caregivers were also found to exhibit a significantly greater amount of masculine attitudinal preferences toward boys over girls (t = 5.60; p < .001). The mean sex-typed score for girls was slightly above zero (1.00) which indicated a preference for both masculine and feminine behaviors for girls.

Male engineers preferred a significantly greater amount of masculine behaviors to feminine behaviors in boys but not in girls (t = 6.61; p < .001). The sex-typed mean score for girls was again slightly above zero (0.650). This reflected both masculine and feminine attitudinal preferences for girls.

Sex-Typed Contingency Behaviors

Inter-Observer Reliability

Four observational sessions were conducted at Central Piedmont Community College's Demonstration Day Care Center to establish reliability data. The percentage of agreement on the number of observed events was computed by dividing the smaller number of observed events by the larger number of observed events on both scales. Percentage of agreement on the number of observed events totaled 98 per cent. The percentage of agreement on each scale was computed by dividing the number of events agreed upon by the total number of

possible observations. The two observers were able to agree 90 per cent of the time on the child behaviors and 98 per cent of the time on teacher consequences.

Within-Group Differences

The mean sex-typed contingency behaviors within the male and female caregiver groups are presented in Table 7. The results of the repeated measures analysis of variance of the sex-typed contingency behaviors between male and female caregivers, assessed by The Fagot-Patterson Checklist, appear in Table 8.

TABLE 7

MEAN SEX-TYPED CONTINGENCY BEHAVIORS WITHIN THE MALE AND FEMALE CAREGIVER GROUPS

	Feminine Behaviors	Masculine Behaviors	Mean Total
Reinforcers	4.75	3.63	4.19
Punishers	1.05	2.58	1.81
Mean Total	2.90	3.10	

It can be noted from Table 8 that a significant difference existed in the combined contingency behaviors of the male and female caregivers ($F = 28.356$; $p < .001$). Overall, there were more dispensations in the form of reinforcing contingencies (mean of 4.19) than punishing contingencies

TABLE 8

REPEATED MEASURES ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE SEX-TYPED CONTINGENCY BEHAVIORS OF MALE AND FEMALE CAREGIVERS

Source	ss	df	ms	F	P
Contingency Behaviors	225.625	1	225.625	28.356	<.001
Error	.33004	38	.86854		
Sex-Typed Behaviors	1.60	1	1.60	0.169	NS
Error	.33004	38	.86854		
Caregiver Sex X Contingency Behaviors	9.025	1	9.025	1.134	NS
Error	302.342	38	7.956		
Caregiver Sex X Sex-Typed Behaviors	19.60	1	19.60	2.064	NS
Error	360.797	38	9.495		
Contingency Behaviors X Sex-Typed Behaviors	70.225	1	70.225	6.847	<.05
Error	389.731	38	10.256		
Caregiver Sex X Contingency Behaviors X Sex-Typed Behaviors	3.025	1	3.025	0.295	NS
Error	389.731	38	10.256		

(mean of 1.81). Furthermore, there was not a significant difference in the number of masculine behaviors and the number of feminine behaviors to which the caregivers attended (means of 3.10 and 2.90, respectively).

The data in Table 8 further indicate that a significant interaction existed between the masculine and feminine behaviors and the degree to which they were reinforced or punished across the two caregiver groups ($F = 6.847$; $p < .05$). There were significantly more overall feminine reinforcers (mean of 4.75) given than masculine reinforcers (mean of 3.63) but more masculine punishers (mean of 2.58) than feminine punishers (mean of 1.05).

Between-Group Differences

It was revealed by the data in Table 8 that when caregiver sex was considered in relation to sex-typed behaviors and the reinforcing and punishing contingencies (i.e., Caregiver Sex X Contingency Behaviors X Sex-Typed Behaviors), no significant differences were found. This indicated that a pattern similar to that discussed in the preceding paragraph was present in both male and female caregiver groups as shown in Table 9. That is, both male and female caregivers gave more feminine reinforcers and more masculine punishers. It was further noted from Table 8 that there was not a significant difference between male and female caregivers on the number of reinforcers (means of 3.95 and 4.43, respectively) or the number of punishers (means of 2.05 and 1.58, respectively) given. There was also no significant difference due

TABLE 9

MEAN SEX-TYPED CONTINGENCY BEHAVIORS BETWEEN

THE MALE AND FEMALE CAREGIVER GROUPS

	Male Caregivers			Female Caregivers		
	Feminine Behaviors	Masculine Behaviors	Mean Total	Feminine Behaviors	Masculine Behaviors	Mean Total
Reinforcers	5.00	2.90	3.95	4.50	4.35	4.43
Punishers	1.50	2.60	2.05	0.60	2.55	1.58
Mean Total	3.25	2.75		2.55	3.45	

to sex of caregiver on the number of masculine behaviors (male caregiver mean of 2.75, and female caregiver mean of 3.45) or feminine behaviors (male caregiver mean of 3.25, and female caregiver mean of 2.55).

These findings, therefore, support hypotheses 1a, 1b, and 1c. These hypotheses stated that no significant difference exists between the contingency behaviors of male and female caregivers, that both male and female caregivers reinforce children more for feminine behaviors than masculine behaviors, and that both male and female caregivers punish children more for masculine behaviors than feminine behaviors.

Correlational Patterning

Sex-Typed Attitudes r Sex-Typed Contingency Behaviors

The correlation coefficients among sex-typed attitudes and sex-typed contingency behaviors of male and female caregivers were not significant. There were no significant correlations among either masculine or feminine-preferred attitudes toward boys and any of the masculine or feminine contingencies. Furthermore, no significant relationships were noted among the sex-typed attitudes toward girls and any of the masculine or feminine contingencies. Thus, hypothesis number 4, which stated that the sex-typed attitudes of male and female caregivers correlated positively with their actual sex-typed contingency behaviors, was not tenable.

Sex-Typed Attitudes r Personality Characteristics

The correlation coefficients between sex-typed attitudes and personality characteristics of male caregivers, female caregivers, and male engineers are portrayed in Table 10. It can be observed that those subjects who maintained the highest masculine attitudinal preferences for boys also scored highest on the masculine scales of Achievement (r = .459; $p < .001$), Dominance (r = .367; $p < .01$), and Endurance (r = .459; $p < .001$). This trend was not noted, however, for those with masculine attitudes toward girls. Those subjects who held more masculine attitudinal preferences for girls also scored higher on the Autonomy scale (r = .419; $p < .01$); however, this was not true for attitudes toward boys.

Those subjects with more feminine-preferred attitudes toward girls scored higher on the Abasement scale (r = -.363; $p < .01$). This trend was not noted for sex-typed attitudes toward boys, however. Those subjects scoring high in Affiliation held more masculine attitudes for both boys (r = .300; $p < .05$) and girls (r = .252; $p < .05$). It was further found that those with feminine attitudinal preferences for boys also scored high on the Succorance scale (r = -.284; $p < .05$). This trend was not noted for girls. Those subjects who scored high in Deference tended to have more feminine attitudinal preferences for girls (r = -.462; $p < .001$) but not for boys. No significant correlational

TABLE 10

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN SEX-TYPED ATTITUDES

AND PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS

	Masculine-Feminine Preferred Attitudes Toward Boys	Masculine-Feminine Preferred Attitudes Toward Girls
Achievement	.459***	.190
Dominance	.367**	.236
Endurance	.459***	.126
Autonomy	.100	.419**
Abasement	-.204	-.363**
Nurturance	.158	-.028
Affiliation	.300*	.252*
Succorance	-.284*	-.230
Deference	-.161	-.462***
M-F Score	.284*	.311*

* Significant at α = .05 level
** Significant at α = .01 level
*** Significant at α = .001 level

patterning was detected on the Nurturance scale for either sex-typed attitudes toward boys or girls.

An overall correlation between the total M-F score of the subjects and their sex-typed attitudes was also computed. The higher the masculine personality score, the greater the tendency to maintain masculine-preferred attitudes for both boys (r = .284; p < .05) and girls (r = .311; p < .05).

Sex-Typed Contingency Behaviors r Personality Characteristics

No significant differences were found between the correlation coefficients of the sex-typed contingency behaviors and personality characteristics for male and female caregivers. It was noted that no significant relationships existed among any of the masculine or feminine contingency scores and the masculine and feminine scales from The Adjective Check List. Therefore, hypothesis number 6, which posited that a positive relationship exists between the degree to which the caregivers reinforce sex-typed behaviors and their masculine or feminine personality traits, was not upheld.

Interview Schedule

Reasons for Choosing Day Care

The reasons given by the male caregivers for choosing child care as a field of employment were divided into three categories: altruistic factors, economic factors, and job satisfaction. Fifty per cent of the respondents reported their reasons to be altruistic ones. This category included

such responses as love for children, enjoyment of working with children, satisfaction of intrinsic needs, feelings of doing something useful or making a contribution to this age child, and belief that the formative years are the most crucial ones for the development of a healthy adult.

Thirty per cent indicated that they had chosen day care for economic reasons. They related they had difficulty in finding jobs in other fields of endeavor and settled for a position in day care. Of those who chose day care for economic reasons, 15 per cent liked it so much that they planned to make a life career in the field. The remaining 15 per cent admitted that they planned to vacate the field as soon as something better came along. The latter group further stated that they would remain in the field anywhere from four months minimum to five years maximum.

Job satisfaction was the reason for the choice of day care by 20 per cent of the male caregiver sample. They were attracted to day care because of the nature of the work. Typical responses were these: appeal of the content of the day care program and curriculum, desire to work with and comfortableness with this age child, and absence of superfluous paper work characteristic of work in the higher grades.

Length of Time To Remain in Day Care

The male caregivers interviewed had been employed in their current jobs an average of 24.8 months or an average of two years and eight months. When asked how much longer they planned to remain in the day care field, 70 per cent

of the sample responded indefinitely. They stated that they would like to make some capacity of day care their life career. One subject was leaving the field immediately. The remaining 25 per cent speculated they would remain in day care anywhere from four months to five years.

Education

In regard to training to be a day care teacher, 95 per cent of all male caregivers had received at least two years of formal schooling beyond high school. Sixty-five per cent had at least a baccalaureate degree or master's degree. Of this 65 per cent, 10 per cent had a master's degree and 55 per cent had a baccalaureate degree. Ten per cent had an associate degree and the remaining 20 per cent had at least three years of college but no degree. Five per cent of the sample had no formal schooling past high school.

Major Areas of Training

Few men in day care had received formal training in the field. The areas of teacher training were quite diverse. None had a degree in child development or early childhood education, although two of those men with three years of schooling beyond high school had majored in early childhood education (10 per cent of the total sample). The preponderance of training across levels of schooling was found in elementary education (20 per cent). Fifteen per cent of teacher training was in history and political science. Ten per cent of all teacher training was found in each of the

following areas: sociology, psychology, and math. The remaining areas of teacher training, each occupying five per cent, were geography, physical education, science, and religion.

The majority of male day care teachers were initially trained in disciplines other than child development and early childhood education. However, of those with degrees out of field, 40 per cent reported they had gone on to complete courses in either child development or early childhood education. The other 60 per cent had participated in numerous in-service workshops, day care organizations, or had received close on-the-job instruction. Those without degrees of any kind or with training out-of-field reported either workshop participation or coursework in the area of child development or early childhood education.

Exposure to Male Instructors

Sixty per cent reported that they had never been exposed to a male instructor or professor in an area of instruction directly related to the care of children. The 40 per cent who had been exposed to a male instructor revealed that the exposure was usually in child psychology, developmental psychology, or elementary education courses.

Importance of Men in Day Care

When asked if it is important for men to work in day care, 100 per cent of the sample of male caregivers responded in the affirmative. Seventy-five per cent of the men believed

their presence is important to provide the necessary male image for the children. Twenty per cent did not see their primary function in being in day care as providing a male image. On the contrary, they viewed their "maleness" to be secondary to their "personness." They believed it is important for men to work in day care to break down stereotypes and to offer the children another perspective. They felt it is important for children to see that the caring of children is not strictly a female function and that it is important for them to see men in nurturant, warm, and intimate roles. These men viewed the relegation of males to the upper grades and females to the lower grades as a reversed typed of sexism. Five per cent of the sample believed males are important in day care for the maintenance of the physical facility.

Experiences Provided by Males

Ninety-five per cent of the sample believed that as males they could provide experiences for the children which the children would otherwise miss. Forty per cent mentioned the importance of the male-child relationship for the young child. An additional 55 per cent responded that they could provide experiences and activities which are traditionally labeled "masculine" activities. Among these were woodworking, more outside activities, science experiences, more roughhouse play, physical activities, and large muscle games. It was expressed by some male caregivers that men are more adventurous, curious, and tolerant of mess than women.

Working in a Female-Dominated Field

In regard to working in a field which has been and is still dominated by women, 70 per cent of the males said they had no reservations whatsoever. Thirty per cent expressed concern over being the only male among a majority of women. One of the reasons for discontent was tokenism either internally within the day care center or externally from acquaintances, parents, or the media. A number of men felt that as token males, they were not appreciated for the good job they performed, but were prized for being of the masculine gender. It was mentioned by the males that people from all walks of life go overboard in giving them positive reinforcement, simply because they are males working in a female-dominated field. Other reasons for discontent were more subtle, unspoken assumptions with which some men felt they had to deal daily. Only a few mentioned that a strain existed between them and their female counterparts and that there were things women shared among themselves which they did not share with the men.

Changes in Routines, Rules, and Procedures

When asked about changes in the routines, rules, and procedures of day care, 55 per cent responded that they would make changes and 45 per cent said they would not. Of those responding negatively, most felt that the rules, procedures, and routines were instituted independently of feminine influences and were not the result of a female-dominated field. Instead, they believed they were dictated by the

needs of young children. They held that identical procedures, rules, and routines would have evolved had the field been male-dominated. Among the 55 per cent who envisioned a needed change, the majority (40 per cent) advocated more outside and inside free play, and more active, physical, and free activities. Other changes mentioned were more emphasis on learning skills, less harsh discipline (e.g., allowing the child to talk back), and more "masculine" activities for boys like climbing or building.

Differential Contingencies of Male and Female Caregivers

When asked if male and female caregivers are different in the behaviors they reinforce and punish in children, 75 per cent answered "yes," 20 per cent "no," and five per cent "uncertain." Among those who agreed with this statement, one-half of them believed that males tend to overlook or ignore more behaviors than females. The belief was expressed that males allow children to be rough and adventurous or avoid intervention when children are shoving, scuffling, or sometimes fighting. On the other hand, it was believed that females tend to administer more precautions about getting hurt or admonitions for fighting or roughhousing. Other males claimed that men are more lenient when children talk back to them, that males offer more variety in the curriculum, and that males tolerate a higher noise level than females.

Noted Major Behavioral Differences Between Boys and Girls

Sixty-five per cent of the male caregivers reported that they had noted major behavioral differences between boys and girls. One-half of the males agreed that girls are more passive, easygoing, and quiescent in their play while boys are more active, aggressive, and loud. Others argued that girls are more cliquish, serious, and self-controlled than boys. Thirty-five per cent believed there are no discernable differences in the behaviors of boys and girls between the ages of two and five.

Differential Responses of Children to Male and Female Teachers

One hundred per cent of the male caregiver sample believed that boys and girls respond differently to male and female teachers. Ninety per cent maintained that children respond more quickly to a male caregiver or exhibit a desire to interact more with the male than with the female caregiver. Reasons given were the conceptualization of the male as an authority figure. It was expressed that children tend to react out of fear, projected by the man's deep voice and large stature. Others believed the male is a novelty to many of the children, especially to those from father-absent homes. Hence, the children were reportedly attracted to the men, surrounded them more, hung on to them more, and engaged in more physical and active play with them. Only 10 per cent reported that children responded more to the female caregiver

either in terms of showing affection or going to her for help.

Reaction of Adults and Children in Day Care Centers to Presence of Male

All the males interviewed felt they were favorably received by the children with whom they worked. Furthermore, 90 per cent claimed that they were favorably received by their female peers and supervisors. Only 10 per cent reported feelings of unacceptance. These few felt they were received with deference and tolerance. Others maintained that they were stereotyped with ideas of what males should do or should not do. At least 30 per cent of the males revealed that they received special treatment because they were the only men. It was also reported that females often sought out the male caregiver for advice before making important decisions or before following through on certain behaviors.

Reaction of Parents and Those Outside the Day Care Center to the Presence of Male Caregivers

The male caregivers generally felt they were favorably accepted by parents of the children in their centers. Ninety-five per cent reported a favorable parent-teacher relationship. Only five per cent noted any reluctance, intimidation, or distance on the part of parents because of their being males. At least 25 per cent of the sample felt the reaction by parents to their presence was more dramatic than to the

female caregivers' presence. Only 15 per cent of the sample admitted that they were viewed with suspicion by those outside the day care center because of the stigma attached to working in a traditionally female world.

Role of the Handy Man

Although it was not written into their job descriptions, 95 per cent of all male caregivers reported that they were looked upon as a handy man and were called upon to do heavy lifting, moving of objects, or repair work. Of these, 70 per cent reported they were pleased and did not mind doing the extra work. Some felt it was part of their jobs, and others even enjoyed doing the heavy work. It was reported by several respondents that they would rather do the heavy work than see a female hurt herself. The remaining 25 per cent resented being asked to do the extra chores and felt the women in some cases were not carrying their own loads. They felt such demands were a type of discrimination against them since they were in the minority.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The current study was an attempt to examine the sex-typed attitudes, sex-typed contingency behaviors, and the personality characteristics of male caregivers. Analyses were also conducted to scrutinize the correlational patterning among these dependent measures. The general hypothesis was that because the male caregivers had adopted a part of the feminine sex role (Lynn, 1959), they would appear more feminine in personality traits and sex-typed attitudes than men in a more masculine occupation (i.e., male engineers). It was further expected that the male caregivers' actual reinforcement and punishment for sex-role behaviors would be similar to the female caregivers' and in a feminine direction. The great majority of the findings were negative, however.

Personality Characteristics

Although they scored in a feminine direction, there was very little evidence that male caregivers have more feminine personalities than men in a more traditionally masculine occupation. Furthermore, there was no significant difference between the male and female caregivers on any of the personality scales. This indicated that the overall personality of the male caregiver more closely resembled that of the female caregiver when compared to the male engineer.

Although more masculine than the female personalities, the personalities of male engineers were not highly masculine. The mean score was just above zero (1.60). Utilizing Bem's paradigm (1974), it can be said that male engineers had more androgynous personalities, that is, they perceived themselves as having both masculine and feminine traits. The closer one's score approximates zero in terms of masculinity-femininity assessment, the more androgynous the personality. On the other hand, female caregivers were highly sex-typed or highly feminine in their personalities when compared to the male engineers because of their high negative score (-22.20). The male caregivers also showed a high negative trend (-15.30) in the feminine direction. This indicated that the male caregiver tended toward a cross-sex-typed personality but that male caregivers were not significantly more feminine than the male engineers.

According to Bem (1976), the androgynous person has the psychological freedom to engage in whatever behavior seems most effective at the moment, irrespective of stereotypical roles. On the other hand, the feminine sex-typed person and the masculine sex-typed person were so rigid that they could not display cross-sex behavior. Shepard and Hess (1975) have also discovered that men are generally more reluctant than women to assume household and child-caring tasks. Thus, it seemed that the trend towards the cross-sex-typed personalities of male caregivers enabled them to comfortably perform the task of caring for children. It appeared, therefore, that

the personality of the male caregiver more closely approximated the femininity of the female caregiver than the androgyny of the male engineer; however, the approximation was not enough to be considered significantly more feminine when compared to the personalities of the male engineers.

According to Bennett and Cohen (1959), adult women perceive themselves as more nurturant than their male counterparts. However, this trend was not noted in the present study. All three groups were equally nurturant; furthermore, all three groups were similar in all other feminine traits as well.

One difference noted between the female caregivers and engineers was that male engineers were more achievement-oriented than female caregivers. This difference was not noted between male caregivers and male engineers, however. Thus, there appeared to be a greater tendency on the part of male engineers as opposed to the female caregivers "to strive to be outstanding in pursuits of socially recognized significance" (Gough & Heilbrun, 1965).

A second difference between the caregiver samples and the engineers was on the Endurance scale. Male engineers were significantly higher in endurance than either male or female caregivers. High Endurance scores for male engineers indicated that they "persist in any task undertaken" (Gough & Heilbrun, 1965).

Day care is generally viewed as a rather noncompetitive, relaxed environment when compared to the engineering world. One would expect those entering day care to be somewhat less achievement-oriented than those in more strenuous fields where emphasis is placed on "getting ahead." Although endurance of a kind is demanded in working with young children, one would expect more endurance to be demanded from the stiff competition and pressures associated with the engineering field which are not typically present in day care.

Because at least one-half of the male caregivers chose day care for altruistic reasons, that is, showing an affective concern for the welfare of others, it can be said that they have chosen what Parsons and Bales (1955) call an expressive societal role which has generally been associated with the feminine role in our society. This is opposed to the instrumental role of the engineers which has more of a cognitive focus and is said to characterize the male's role in our society.

Sex-Typed Attitudes

There was no evidence to indicate that male caregivers held more feminine attitudes toward children as a result of having adopted a traditionally female job. On the contrary, attitudinal preferences for boys and girls were very similar among all three groups. All three occupational groups held highly masculine attitudinal preferences toward boys but not toward girls. The sex-typed attitudes toward girls in each

group clustered just above zero, indicating that, although only masculine behaviors were preferred in boys, both masculine and feminine behaviors were preferred in girls by all subjects.

This equal endorsement of both masculine and feminine attributes is best described as androgynous (Bem, 1974; 1975a; 1975b; 1976). Attitudes held toward boys were that they should be tough, courageous, aggressive, independent, assertive, etc., while girls should exhibit these behaviors as well as more feminine traits of being gentle, sensitive, affectionate, soft-hearted, etc. This finding that more narrowly prescribed sex roles were held for boys than girls by significant adults confirms other works (Brown, 1956; 1957; Hall & Keith, 1964; Lynn, 1959; Mussen & Rutherford, 1963; Schell & Silber, 1968; Ward, 1968) which have shown that boys preferred the masculine role over the feminine role; whereas, girls preferred the masculine role more than boys preferred the feminine role, particularly at the kindergarten age. These studies further revealed that boys formed a more rigid pattern of masculine preferences while girls made male-type choices and female-type choices equally as often. The greater variability of girls in sex-role preference was accounted for by the fact that our society allows increased flexibility for girls in sex-role development while delimiting a more stereotyped conceptualization for boys.

The pressures for little boys to behave in masculine ways seems to be a pervasive one. The expectation of parents

for the boy to demonstrate his "masculine identity" undergirds the child's preschool years (Fagot, 1973; 1974; Mischel, 1966; Rheingold & Cook, 1975). It is allowable for girls to be masculine as well as feminine (i.e., androgynous), yet boys can not be both masculine and feminine. Feminine behaviors in boys are taboo. Historically, such traits as tenderness, gentleness, and sensitivity have been dubbed as feminine. Little boys grow up to believe that the open expression of these traits is unacceptable for them.

Thus, it appears that on the one hand our society talks of sexual equality, while on the other, it continues to expect boys to behave in rigid sex-specific ways. Consequently, many a grown male is faced with obsolete ways of coping in a modern world. He finds himself ill-prepared to adapt to the roles of a complex and changing society (Bem, 1976).

Bem (1974) has shown that the androgynous person is one who freely engages in both masculine and feminine behaviors appropriate to the specific situation. Bem (1975a) suggested that rigid sex roles could seriously restrict behavior, especially for men. She, furthermore, showed that androgyny, not increased masculinity, better equipped one to deal in today's world. Bem said that androgyny expands the range of behavior open to everyone, permitting people to cope more effectively with diverse situations. Bem (1974) further maintained that rigid sex-role differentiation has outlived its utility and that the androgynous person is the one who will

come to define a more human standard of psychological health.

Thus, the finding in this study was that all subjects, especially caregivers of young children, had androgynous attitudinal preferences for girls and high masculine expectations for boys. This finding may have implications for child-rearing practices of parents and other significant adults in the child's life. As Bem (1974) concluded, "It seems clear that sex-typing does restrict one's behaviors in unnecessary and perhaps even dysfunctional ways." (p. 53).

Sex-Typed Contingency Behaviors

It was expected that because male caregivers had adopted a feminine sex role that their contingency behaviors would closely resemble those of their female counterparts. This resemblance was found to exist. Both male and female caregivers showed identical patterns of reinforcing and punishing contingencies. Both caregiver groups reinforced for feminine behaviors more than masculine behaviors and punished for masculine behaviors more than for feminine behaviors. These findings for females were congruent to those in previous inquiries (Etaugh et al., 1975; Fagot & Patterson, 1969; McCandless & Bush, 1975; Robinson, 1975). Thus, these consistent findings support the belief that females in early education have a propensity toward structuring more feminine environments for children.

The results for males, however, were contrary to those in other studies in which male students were used as subjects

(Etaugh et al., 1975; McCandless & Bush, 1975). In the McCandless and Bush (1975) study, the young male students were egalitarian in their dispensation of reinforcements for masculine-preferred and feminine-preferred behaviors; furthermore, they differentially reinforced children for sex-typed behaviors according to sex. Moreover, results from the Etaugh et al. (1975) study revealed that more masculine reinforcers than feminine reinforcers were offered by the male. Employed male caregivers in the current study, on the other hand, dispensed more reinforcers for feminine-preferred behaviors than masculine-preferred behaviors.

Both male and female caregivers punished masculine behaviors more than they punished feminine behaviors. The observation that children were not discouraged from engaging in feminine behaviors implied that these behaviors were allowed fruition. Possible explanations for these findings may be that generally "masculine" behaviors involve more noise, quick and rough movement, competitiveness, and sometimes risk of injury to the child. By discouraging these kinds of behaviors in favor of more quiescent, sedentary activities, a quieter, more pleasant atmosphere prevails for the caregivers. Thus, if a child were engaged in feminine behaviors, the teacher was more apt to join in the activity or comment favorably rather than criticize or initiate a new behavior. This finding corroborated previous works where, regardless of teacher sex, the teachers preferred compliant,

cooperative, and passive children to those who were independent and assertive (Etaugh & Hughes, 1975; Good & Grouws, 1972).

These findings supply data which reveal that male caregivers were behaving no differently from the female caregivers. The males surveyed in this sample reported that they could provide opportunities for young children which the children would otherwise miss. They saw themselves as providing more active, physical experiences for children. They also believed that the male image they provided was a valuable asset for the children. From the empirical data reported, however, it appeared that, not unlike females, the general trend was for males to reward children more for feminine behaviors and punish for masculine behaviors. Although male caregivers may have modeling value for children, this variable was not measured here; on the other hand, when their sex-typed contingency behaviors were considered, the empirical support invalidated the impressionistic claims that males are crucial in early education to augment the sex-typing of young children. These findings substantiated those of Brophy and Laosa (1971) that because the male teacher behaved similarly to the female teacher, his sex-typing augmenting ability was of minor significance. This further confirmed other assertions (Etaugh & Hughes, 1975; Brophy & Good, 1974; Good & Grouws, 1972) that male teachers had basically the same preferences and classroom interaction patterns toward boys and girls as female teachers.

Overall, male and female caregivers tended to be more rewarding than punitive in their contingency behaviors to children. They were more apt to join in a child's activity or comment favorably than to initiate a new behavior or criticize. This trend was also noted in the Fagot and Patterson (1969) study.

Correlational Patterning

It was expected that a positive correlation would exist between the sex-typed attitudes of the caregivers and their actual sex-typed contingencies. It was believed that as the feminine attitudinal preferences increased, there would be a concomitant increment in the dispensation of feminine contingencies. No relationship was found, however, between the two variables. This indicated that there was no congruence between the behaviors that caregivers said they preferred and the actual behaviors they reinforced or punished. Both male and female caregivers reported that they preferred masculine behaviors in boys and androgynous behaviors in girls; however, both dispensed a greater number of feminine contingencies than masculine contingencies. This lack of consistency has also been noted in the literature between the sex-typed attitudes of male teachers on a questionnaire (Etaugh & Hughes, 1975; Good & Grouws, 1972) and their actual sex-typed contingencies (Etaugh et al., 1975; Lee & Wolinsky, 1975; McCandless & Bush, 1975).

A further expectation was that a positive correlation existed between sex-typed attitudes and the personality characteristics of the subjects. It was expected that those who held feminine attitudinal preferences would have the most feminine personalities; likewise, those expressing masculine-preferred attitudes would have more masculine personalities. Significant correlations were noted. Generally it can be stated that the more masculine the personalities of the subjects, the more they tended to hold masculine-preferred attitudes towards children. Conversely, the more feminine personalities held more feminine attitudinal preferences.

Those who had traits of achievement, dominance, and endurance tended to hold masculine attitudes toward boys but not girls. Autonomous individuals tended to maintain masculine attitudes toward girls but not boys. Those who were affiliative maintained masculine attitudes towards both boys and girls. Among those who were high in succorance, there was more of a tendency to have feminine attitudes towards boys only. Lastly, those with traits of deference and abasement tended to hold feminine attitudes toward girls but not boys.

A relationship was expected between the personalities of the subjects and their sex-typed contingency behaviors. The more feminine subjects were expected to dispense more feminine contingencies. Conversely, the more masculine

personalities were predicted to prefer masculine contingencies. There were no significant correlations among any of the variables. Thus, it can be stated that the femininity or masculinity of the caregiver was not a factor in determining how he or she would respond toward children. Furthermore, because the sex-typed attitudes and personality traits of the subjects were unrelated to their contingency behaviors, it could not be predicted that the contingencies of the male engineers would in any way resemble their masculine sex-typed attitudes or their androgynous personalities.

Interview Schedule

It appeared that the majority (70 per cent) of male care-caregivers were in day care because of preferences for this type of work, that is, either for altruistic purposes, or for job satisfaction. At least 30 per cent, however, entered day care because of the difficulty in finding jobs in their major field of interest or specialty area. They settled for day care as a second choice. Although these economic factors were present with only a minority of males, this trend contradicts numerous other reports (Bagford, 1966; Milgram, 1972; Seifert, 1974; 1975) which contend that men avoid day care because of economic factors (e.g., poor salaries, fringe benefits).

It was interesting to note that 15 per cent of those men entering day care for economic reasons reported they would prefer to stay in the field. Thus, it seems that 85

per cent of all male caregivers surveyed remained in day care because they wished to and at least 70 per cent planned to make some capacity of day care their life career.

Although 90 per cent of the men in day care were trained out-of-field, as a group they were highly trained. Ninety-five per cent of all the male caregivers had at least three years of schooling beyond high school. At least 65 per cent of these men had a baccalaureate degree or more. It was reported in a 1971 report by the U. S. Senate Finance Committee that those working in child care centers nationwide are not well-educated. They reported that most teachers and directors do not have college degrees or special training in child development. This trend was not noted for male caregivers in certified centers in this state, however. The average male caregiver had a mean education of 15.95; furthermore, since being employed as day care teachers, all males without formal training had either taken additional coursework in one of these areas or had participated in workshops relating to day care teaching. This discrepancy between the 1971 report and the current findings may have been due to the economy's pushing more men into jobs formerly held by women and to the changing conceptualization of masculinity and femininity, which has enabled more men to adopt traditionally feminine sex roles.

The field of day care continues to be one dominated by women at every realm. Sixty per cent of the male caregivers

reported that they had never been exposed to a male instructor in any capacity directly related to the care of children. Thus, women occupy the field at the college level, in workshops, and in the actual on-the-job training. A study by Touhey (1974) revealed that increased participation by men in female-dominated fields increased the prestige and desirability of all occupations. Those fields where few males participated were lower in desirability and prestige. Simpson (1975) has further shown that the more a person conformed to sex stereotypes in choosing his occupational role, the higher the prestige afforded the person. The nonconformists were afforded less prestige than the conformists. Suchner and More (1975) have shown that females rate other females engaged in traditionally masculine occupations as far less likeable than males in these same jobs. Thus, the lack of male numbers in day care and the accompanying lack of prestige may explain the initial reluctance of 90 per cent of the present sample to enter an undergraduate child development or early childhood education program.

Nevertheless, despite these findings, 70 per cent of those males who did enter day care said they had no reservations about working with large numbers of women. This is contrary to the Bush et al. (1975) article in which the male students reported feeling less "masculine" to take directions from female teachers and that they had no intention of working in a female-oriented field. This discrepancy may be

explained in terms of the maturity of the subjects in the two studies. In the Bush et al. (1975) study, the males were high school adolescents; however, the male caregivers in the current sample had a mean age of 30.2. This increased maturity may also explain the presence of few males in undergraduate programs related to day care during college but subsequent entry into the field at a later age. It has been shown (Constanzo & Shaw, 1966) that after age thirteen, the amount of one's conformity tends to decrease with age. Hence, the prestige associated with conformity to occupational roles may be of less concern for older males who choose day care as a field of work.

All men in the caregiver sample believed it is important for men to work in day care. Seventy-five per cent of the male caregivers agreed with previous accounts in the literature (Burtt, 1965; Fagot & Patterson, 1969; Johnston, 1970; Kendall, 1972; Kyselka, 1966; Milgram, 1972; Peltier, 1968; Raines et al., 1974; Sciarra, 1971, 1972; Sexton, 1969; Smith, 1973; Topp, 1954; Triplett, 1968; Vairo, 1969; Williams, 1970) that their presence was important to provide the necessary male role model that a large portion of children do not get at home, especially those from father-absent families. Some also felt that their presence would counteract the "feminizing" of children at an early age.

They also felt that, as men, they could provide opportunities that the children would otherwise miss, for example,

more physically active, typically "masculine" activities. About one-half of the men were dissatisfied with the "feminine" structure of the rules, procedures, and routines of the day care program. This discontent may indicate that although males are attracted to day care because of its ways (e.g., job satisfaction and opportunity for altruism), once working in the environment they do not choose to conform to the predominantly matriarchal role.

Male caregivers tended to see girls and boys in stereotyped ways. Although some saw their mission as breaking down traditional stereotypes of males, the majority believed the traditional male role model was important too. Most of the men tended to view girls as quiet, easygoing, and passive, whereas boys were seen as more rowdy, aggressive, and loud.

A large majority of the males felt that they were favorably received by the children, peers, and parents within the day care center and by others outside the day care center. This finding was directly contrary to the impressions of Milgram and Sciarra (1974), who reported that a number of women teachers they interviewed found it difficult to accept the male day care teacher because he is engaged in a "woman's job." They wrote, "He is not totally accepted by his female colleagues regardless of his teaching skills." (p. 247). A separate study by Seifert (1976) further revealed that those working in early childhood education did not maintain prejudicial attitudes towards men. No significant differences

between men and women were envisioned in terms of problems encountered in teaching and reasons for entering the field.

Milgram and Sciarra (1974) have listed the role of the male as a "heavy" to be one of the major difficulties facing male day care teachers. However, the findings in the current study did not support this belief. As a group, the men reported they were pleased to be the "handy man," that is, lifting, moving objects, and doing repair work. Some considered it as part of their jobs and others reported they would rather do the heavy work than see a female injure herself.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It has been generally recognized that early sex-typing is augmented by the demands of socializing agents other than the parents (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974; Mischel, 1966). However, there remains a dearth of information explaining this secondary socializing process especially in education where teacher contact is present at an early age.

Review of the Literature

In those reports which have been written, subjects usually consisted of female elementary school teachers, and the results usually emanated from the subjective impressions of the writers. Generally, it has been maintained that children are being "feminized" by early education (Brophy & Good, 1973a; 1973b; Kagan, 1964b; Kellogg, 1969; Lee, 1973; Sexton, 1969; Smith, 1973; Triplett, 1968; Vairo, 1969; Yee, 1973). The preponderance of these studies has blamed the feminine environments structured by female teachers.

As a result, the current literature abounded with impressionistic claims of the counterbalancing effects of employing males in early education (Burtt, 1965; Johnston, 1970; Kendall, 1972; Kyselka, 1966; Milgram, 1972; Peltier, 1968; Sciarra, 1971; 1972; Sexton, 1969; Triplett, 1968; Vairo, 1969;

Williams, 1970). Very few studies existed in the substantive literature to give an empirical base to the impressionistic data. There were a handful of intervention studies (Brophy & Laosa, 1971; Madsen, 1968; Raines et al., 1974; Sciarra, 1970) most of which questioned or left unanswered the advantages of male role models. A few others implemented more direct measures for assessing sex-typing effects through the contingency behaviors of the male and female nursery school or day care teachers (Etaugh et al., 1975; Fagot & Patterson, 1969; Lee & Wolinsky, 1973; McCandless & Bush, 1975). Others (Etaugh & Hughes, 1975; Feshbach, 1969; Good & Grouws, 1972; Levitin & Chananie, 1972) used more indirect means of questionnaire assessment.

Those studies employing female teachers and assessing their sex-typed contingency behaviors have been rather consistent in their findings. Female nursery school and day care teachers seemed to approve more of feminine behaviors in all children (Etaugh & Hughes, 1975; Feshbach, 1969; Good & Grouws, 1972; Levitin & Chananie, 1972). Females also reinforced all children for engaging in feminine behaviors instead of masculine behaviors (Etaugh et al., 1975; Fagot & Patterson, 1969; McCandless & Bush, 1975).

Only six studies utilizing male teachers and rendering an empirical analysis could be found. One examined the behavioral preferences of male and female student teachers (Good & Grouws, 1972). Two others contrasted male and female

elementary school teachers (Etaugh & Hughes, 1975; Lee & Wolinsky, 1973), one contrasted nursery school teachers (Etaugh et al., 1975), and one contrasted male and female caregivers (McCandless & Bush, 1975). The results of these six studies were inconsistent. It seemed that on a questionnaire (Etaugh & Hughes, 1975; Good & Grouws, 1972) male teachers conformed to the feminine sex-typed preferences of the females for boys and girls. However, in the dispensation of their sex-typed contingencies (Etaugh et al., 1975; Lee & Wolinsky, 1973; McCandless & Bush, 1975), males tended to reveal more masculine contingencies when compared to their female counterparts.

Pilot work by the present investigator examined the sex-typed contingencies of permanently employed male caregivers. Unlike previous research, in which male students were scrutinized, men who were permanently employed in day care did not reinforce boys more for masculine behaviors and girls more for feminine behaviors. Instead, they reinforced boys and girls about as often for masculine behaviors as feminine behaviors. They, furthermore, punished boys significantly more for masculine than for feminine behaviors. The contingency behaviors of the female caregivers conformed to trends reported in past studies. They reinforced all children more for feminine behaviors. Neither male nor female caregivers punished children for feminine behaviors, allowing these behaviors to manifest themselves.

No other study was known to this researcher which utilized men actually employed as male caregivers. The only

other study investigating the contingency behaviors of males in day care known to the researcher was one by McCandless and Bush (1975) in which male high school students were employed. Thus, it was hypothesized that because these students had not actually adopted the role of caregiver as an occupation, their contingency behaviors were not a valid index of the actual trend.

Design of the Study

Consequently, as a result of past equivocal findings, the present investigation sought to further clarify the contingency behaviors of males in early education. The design attempted to combine into a single study the sex-typed attitudes assessed from a questionnaire and the actual contingencies emitted by these respondents. The assessment of these sex-typed attitudes of the male caregivers together with their personality characteristics were compared to those of men employed in a more "masculine" occupation, that of engineering.

The subjects were 20 employed male caregivers randomly selected from certified day care centers in the state of North Carolina. A group of 20 female caregivers was matched with the males by day care center, age, education level, and years of experience. A third group of 20 male engineers was matched with the male caregivers in regard to age, education level, and years of experience. A contrasting samples survey design was employed. The Sex-Typed Attitude Checklist was

used to determine the sex-typed attitudes, and The Adjective Checklist assessed the personality characteristics of all three subject groups. The Fagot-Patterson Checklist was implemented to assess the sex-typed contingency behaviors of the male and female caregivers. An interview schedule adapted from a report by Bush, Carden, and Raines (1975) was employed for use with the male caregivers only.

Analysis of the Data

The masculine or feminine personality characteristics of the subjects were determined by arriving at an M-F score for all subjects. This was accomplished by subtracting the feminine traits on the need scales in The Adjective Checklist from the masculine traits. An analysis of variance was conducted on the M-F means for all three groups.

A second set of raw data consisted of the sex-typed attitudes of the subjects. Two additional preference scores were obtained for each subject, an attitudinal preference score for boys and one for girls. This score was obtained by subtracting the number of feminine adjective preferences from the masculine adjective preferences. An analysis of variance was employed on the mean ratings of masculine-feminine preferred attitudes toward boys and toward girls for each group of subjects. Paired *t* tests on the differences of these sex-typed attitudes in regard to the sex of child were run on each group.

A third set of data took the form of the sex-typed contingency behaviors of the caregivers. Means were reported on the sex-typed contingency behaviors within the male and female caregiver groups and between the two groups. A repeated measures analysis of variance with one between subjects factor and two within subjects factors was run. Correlation coefficients were ascertained by means of the Pearson correlation coefficient, and the interview schedule was summarized in terms of percentages of responses.

Conclusions

The underlying hypothesis in this investigation was based upon Patterson and Reid's (1969) theory of reciprocity which held that one reinforces another for those responses which are highest in his own repertoire of behaviors. Thus, it was expected that because male caregivers have adopted the feminine role of caregiver they would also maintain feminine attitudinal preferences for boys and girls, score feminine in their personalities, and reinforce children for feminine behaviors and punish them for masculine behaviors. The conclusions which could be drawn from this investigation were the following:

1. Male caregivers had very similar personalities to their female counterparts. The personalities of the male caregivers tended toward a feminine direction but were no more feminine than the personalities of the male engineers which were equally masculine and feminine. The personalities

of the female caregivers, on the other hand, were significantly more feminine than the androgynous personalities of the male engineers. The similarities between male and female caregivers were such that they differed on none of the individual personality scales. However, female caregivers were less achievement-oriented and were less likely to strive for outstanding pursuits of socially recognized significance than male engineers. Both caregiver groups were lower in endurance. This meant that they were less likely than male engineers to persist at tasks.

2. Male caregivers, female caregivers, and male engineers were very similar in their sex-typed attitudes towards children. All three occupational groups maintained significantly more masculine attitudinal preferences for boys than girls. On the other hand, all three groups held androgynous attitudes towards girls (i.e., equally endorsed feminine and masculine behaviors).

3. The variable of sex-role adoption was found to be an important factor in the contingency behaviors of the male caregivers. Employed male caregivers in this study were very similar in their dispensations of sex-typed contingency behaviors as the female caregivers. Both male and female caregivers reinforced children more for feminine behaviors than for masculine behaviors. This was contrary to past findings (Etaugh et al., 1975; McCandless & Bush, 1975) in which young male students were utilized and more masculine

reinforcers were administered. The contingency behaviors of the female caregivers conformed to previous studies, however. Both male and female caregivers punished masculine behaviors more than they punished feminine behaviors. A possible explanation for this trend is that feminine behaviors are frequently those which allow for more order and quiet in the classroom. Thus, if a child were involved in a feminine activity, he would have less likely been punished than if he were involved in a masculine activity. Furthermore, the caregiver would have more than likely joined the activity or would have commented favorably rather than having criticized or initiated a new behavior. Generally, both male and female caregivers were significantly more rewarding than punitive in their interactions with the children.

4. Neither the personality of the caregivers nor their masculine or feminine attitudinal preferences were factors in predicting their actual sex-typed contingency behaviors. Consequently, it could not be predicted that the contingency behaviors of the male engineers would in any way resemble their masculine sex-typed attitudes or their androgynous personalities. Thus, the discrepancy noted in the literature between the sex-typed attitudes of male teachers on a questionnaire (Etaugh & Hughes, 1975; Good & Grouws, 1972) and their actual sex-typed contingencies (Lee & Wolinsky, 1973; McCandless & Bush, 1975) was also apparent in the current study.

5. Significant positive correlations existed between the personality of the subjects and their sex-typed attitudes. The more masculine personalities held masculine-preferred attitudes towards children. The more feminine personalities, on the other hand, held feminine-preferred attitudes towards children.

6. Unlike most men who choose occupations for economic reasons (Mason et al., 1959), most male caregivers entered day care for intrinsic purposes (i.e., altruism and job satisfaction) rather than for economic reasons. Only a minority were forced into jobs with children that they would not otherwise have chosen due to the economy. The majority of male caregivers planned to make this their career. Although trained in other fields, men in day care were generally well educated. Most had a college degree of some kind or had completed three years of college. They believed it is important for men to work in this area and felt that they could offer children experiences which they would otherwise miss. Male caregivers had no reservations about working in a female-dominated field; however, they felt that some types of changes should be made in routines, rules, and procedures of day care. They believed that males offered more masculine contingencies than females and described typical boy and girl behaviors in a stereotypical fashion. They further stated that children respond more quickly to and show a stronger desire for affiliation with male caregivers. The men reported that they were received

favorably by all those within the day care center and those outside the center with whom they came into contact. The males admitted that they were expected to perform the role of the handy man; yet, they were pleased with this role expectation.

Recommendations

It was mentioned at the outset of this study that the area of sex-role acquisition is in need of more extensive investigation. The way in which children acquire their sex roles and the manner in which they are endorsed by their significant adults provide an indication of the socialization practices of our society. Moreover, the types of roles which persons adopt have implications for their sex-role adaptability in later life (Bem, 1975b). The findings in this study offer promise for further research in the area of sex-role adoption and the relationship among sex-typed attitudes, sex-typed contingency behaviors, and personality characteristics. A number of recommendations have been made.

1. It was mentioned earlier that the contrasting samples design used in this study can only predict the differences in behaviors of the two extreme groups being contrasted. Thus, the design did not provide information of other occupational groups which might fall within the two extremes. It is therefore recommended that a continuum of occupational groupings be established from most masculine to most feminine. Sex-typed information can be obtained from both males

or females in these groups. A continuum study of occupations will enable a more adequate prediction of the locus of the variables throughout the total range of the continuum.

2. The present study investigated males in a "feminine" occupation. It is suggested that future research consider the sex-typed attitudes, personality traits, and contingency behaviors of females in a traditionally male-dominated occupation. This would avail information which can be contrasted to women involved in a traditionally female function, as were the female caregivers.

3. The current investigation confined itself to the study of men in certified day care centers. Thus, it was considered somewhat ideal in terms of standards when compared to licensed centers. The latter operate under fewer restrictions. Because of a lack of governmental funding, salaries are lower and educational requirements reduced for the caregiver. This state of affairs would naturally be reflected in the types of male and female caregivers employed at this level. An additional study might note the differences in personality types, contingency behaviors, and sex-typed attitudes of caregivers working in licensed centers. Other information similar in nature to that assessed by the interview schedule would provide a clearer picture of the differences in the types of men who seek employment at this level.

4. Additional research is urged for more efficacious indices for ascertaining sex-role behaviors. This has

consistently been a problem in the instruments used for assessing sex-role behaviors in children and adults. Because the concepts of masculinity and femininity are subject to change, it is important that measurements of these behaviors be modified to parallel the changes in order to secure more valid indices. It is recommended that future researchers investigating sex differences and sex roles allow for more flexible measures of androgynous traits in the human organism rather than limiting expectations to narrowly defined roles of masculinity and femininity. The Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) (1974) provides a more valid index of all these traits and is recommended in lieu of The Adjective Check List for assessing the masculine, feminine, or androgynous personality traits of the subjects.

5. Increasingly, there has been a trend in the socialization research from a unidirectional approach of studying the effects of adults upon children to a bidirectional one of the effects of children upon their significant adults. It is suggested that the behaviors of children have a profoud effect upon the way in which caregivers attend to them. It is further believed that the behavior of the child determines the amount of dispensations of sex-typed reinforcers and punishers by the caregiver. Thus, it is recommended that future studies consider the differential effects of children's behavior on the sex-typing behaviors of male and female caregivers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Altucher, N. Conflict in sex identification in boys. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1956. Cited by R. W. Moulton et al., Patterning of parental affection and disciplining dominance as a determinant of guilt and sex-typing. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, P. 358.

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

Arnold, R. D. The achievement of boys and girls taught by men and women teachers. Elementary School Journal, 1968, 68, 367-372.

Bagford, J. Quality teachers for our elementary schools. Journal of Teacher Education, 1966, 17, 307-311.

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. Adolescent aggression. New York: Ronald Press, 1959.

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

Bell, R. Q. & Costello, N. S. Three tests for sex differences in tactile sensation in the newborn. Biologia Neonatorium, 1964, 1, 335-347.

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

Bem, S. L. Androgyny vs. the tight little lives of fluffy women and chesty men. Psychology Today, September, 1975, 58-62. (a)

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

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

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

Bennett, E. M. & Cohen, L. R. Men and women: Personality patterns and contrasts. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1959, 60, 101-153.

Biber, H., Miller, L. B., & Dyer, J. L. Feminization in preschool. Developmental Psychology, 1972, 7, 86.

Biedenkapp, M. S. & Goering, J. D. How "masculine" are male elementary teachers? Phi Delta Kappan, 1971, 53, 115-117.

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, 1, 87-94.

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

Brophy, J. E. & Good, T. L. Feminization of American elementary schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 1973, 54, 564-566. (a)

Brophy, J. E. & Good, T. L. Of course the schools are feminine, but let's stop blaming women for it. Phi Delta Kappan, 1973, 54, 73-75. (b)

Brophy, J. E . & Good, T. L. Teacher-student relationships: Causes and consequences. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1974.

Brophy, J. E. & Laosa, L. M. Effect of a male teacher on the sex typing of kindergarten children. Proceedings of the 7th Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, 1971, 6, 169-170.

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

Burtt, M. The effect of a man teacher. Young Children, 1965, 21, 93-97.

Bush, C. T., Carden, A. I., & Raines, S. R. Males in day care: Effects on the males and the environment. Unpublished manuscript, Emory University, 1975.

Campbell, A. & Katona, G. The sample survey: A technique for social service research. In L. Festinger and D. Katz (eds.), Research methods in the behavioral sciences. New York: Dryden, 1953.

Charlesworth, R. & Hartup, W. W. Positive social reinforcement in the nursery school peer group. Child Development, 1967, 38, 993-1002.

Chasen, B. Sex-role stereotyping and prekindergarten teachers. Elementary School Journal, 1974, 74, 220-235.

Child Care Data and Materials. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Senate Finance Committee, 1971.

Cobb, H. V. Role wishes and general wishes of children and adolescents. Child Development, 1954, 25, 161-171.

Colombotos, J. Sex role and professionalism: A study of high-school teachers. School Review, 1963, 71, 27-40.

Constanzo, P. R. & Shaw, M. E. Conformity as a function of age level. Child Development, 1966, 37, 967-975.

Davis, O. L. & Slobodian, J. J. Teacher behavior toward boys and girls during first grade reading instruction. American Educational Research Journal, 1967, 4, 261-269.

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

Drive to open up more careers for women. U. S. News and World Report, January 14, 1974, 76, 69-70.

Edwards, A. L. Manual-Edwards personal preference schedule. New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1954.

Emmerich, W. Parental identification in young children. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1959, 60, 257-308.

Etaugh, C., Collins, G., & Gerson, A. Reinforcement of sex-typed behaviors of two-year-old children in a nursery school setting. Developmental Psychology, 1975, 11, 255.

Etaugh, C. & Hughes, V. Teachers' evaluations of sex-typed behaviors in children: The role of teacher sex and school setting. Developmental Psychology, 1975, 11, 394.

Fagot, B. I. The effect of sex of child upon social behavior in a nursery school setting. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1967.

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.

Fagot, B. I. & Patterson, G. R. An in vivo analysis of reinforcing contingencies for sex-role behaviors in the preschool child. Developmental Psychology, 1969, 1, 563-568.

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

Feshbach, N. D. Student teacher preferences for elementary school pupils varying in personality characteristics. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1969, 60, 126-132.

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

Freud, A. The ego and the mechanisms of defense. London: Hogarth, 1937.

Goldberg, S. & Lewis, M. Play behaviors in the year-old infant: Early sex differences. Child Development, 1969, 40, 21-31.

Good, T. L. & Brophy, J. E. Questioned equality for grade one boys and girls. Reading Teacher, 1971, 25, 247-252.

Good, T. & Grouws, D. Reaction of male and female teacher trainees to descriptions of elementary school pupils. (Technical Report No. 62) Columbia, Missouri: Center for Research in Social Behavior, University of Missouri, 1972.

Goodenough, F. W. Interest in persons and aspects of sex differences in the early years. Psychological Monographs, 1957, 55, 287-323.

Gough, H. G. The adjective check list. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1952.

Gough, H. G. & Heilbrun, A. B. Joint manual for the adjective check list and the need scales for ACL. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1965.

Greenleaf, P. T. Liberating young children from sex-role experiences in day care centers, play groups, and free schools. Somerville, Massachusetts: New England Press, 1972.

Hall, M. & Keith, R. A. Sex-role preference among children of upper and lower social class. Journal of Social Psychology, 1964, 62, 101-110.

Hartley, R. E. & Hardesty, F. P. Children's perceptions of sex roles in childhood. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1964, 105, 43-51.

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.

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

Heilbrun, A. B. Validation of a need scaling technique for the Adjective Check List. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1959, 23, 347-351.

Heilbrun, A. B. Perceived maternal attitudes, masculinity-femininity of the maternal model, and identification as related to incipient psychology in adolescent girls. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1964, 70, 33-40.

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

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. & Brackbill, Y. Etiology and covariation of obstinacy, orderliness and parsimony in young children. Child Development, 1963, 34, 919-944.

Hetherington, E. M. & Frankie, G. Effects of paternal 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.

Horowitz, F. D. Social reinforcement effects on child behavior. In W. W. Hartup & N. L. Smothergill (eds.), The young child: Reviews of research. Washington, D. C.: NAEYC, 1967.

Johnson, M. M. Sex-role learning in the nuclear family. Child Development, 1963, 34, 319-333.

Johnston, J. M. A symposium: Men in young children's lives. Part II. Childhood Education, 1970, 47, 144-147.

Kagan, J. The concept of identification. Psychological Review, 1958, 65, 296-305.

Kagan, J. Acquisition and significance of sex-typing and sex-role identity. In M. L. Hoffman & L. W. Hoffman (eds.), Review of Child Development. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964. (a)

Kagan, J. The child's sex-role classification of school objects. Child Development, 1964, 35, 1051-1056. (b)

Kellogg, R. A direct approach to the sex-role identification of school objects. Psychological Reports, 1969, 24, 839-841.

Kendall, E. We have men on the staff. Young children, 1972, 27, 358-362.

Kerlinger, F. N. Foundations of behavioral research (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1973.

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

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

Kyselka, W. Young men in a nursery school. Childhood Education, 1966, 42, 293-299.

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

Lee, P. C. Male and female teachers in elementary schools: An ecological analysis. Teachers College Record, 1973, 75, 79-98.

Lee, P. C. & Wolinsky, A. L. Male teachers of young children. Young Children, 1973, 28, 342-352.

Levitin, T. E. & Chananie, J. D. Responses of female primary school teachers to sex-typed behaviors in male and female children. Child Development, 1972, 43, 1309-1316.

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.

Lynn, N. B., Vaden, A. G., & Vaden, R. E. The challenges of men in a woman's world. Public Personnel Management, 1975, 4, 4-17.

Maccoby, E. E. Role-taking in childhood and its consequences for social learning. Child Development, 1959, 30, 239-252.

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

Madsen, C. Nurturance and modeling in preschoolers. Child Development, 1968, 39, 222-236.

Mandeville, J. L. Sex-role preference, adoption, and concepts. Honors Essays. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1972.

Mason, W. S., Dressel, R. J., & Bain, R. K. Sex role and the career orientations of beginning teachers. Harvard Educational Review, 1959, 29, 370-383.

McCandless, B. R. Children and adolescents: Behavior and development. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1961.

McCandless, B. R. Children's behavior and development. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1967.

McCandless, B. R. & Bush, C. Reinforcing contingencies for sex-role behaviors in preschool children. Unpublished manuscript, Emory University, 1975.

McCracken, J. H. Sex-typing of reading by boys attending all male classes. Developmental Psychology, 1973, 8, 148.

McFarland, W. J. Are girls really smarter? Elementary School Journal, 1969, 70, 14-19.

Milgram, J. I. Sources of manpower for the preschool classroom. Childhood Education, 1972, 49, 187-189.

Milgram, J. I. & Sciarra, D. J. Male preschool teacher: The realities of acceptance. The Educational Forum, 1974, 38, 245-247.

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.

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

Moulton, R. W., Burnstein, E., Liberty, P. G., & Altucher, N. Patterning of parental affection and disciplinary dominance as a determinant of guilt and sex-typing. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 356-363.

Mowrer, O. H. Learning theory and personality dynamics. New York: Ronald Press, 1950.

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

Mussen, P. H. & Distler, L. Masculinity, identification, and father-son relationships. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 59, 350-356.

Mussen, P. H. & Distler, L. Child-rearing antecedents of masculine identification in kindergarten boys. Child Development, 1960, 31, 89-100.

Mussen, P. H. & Parker, N. L. Mother nurturance and girl's incidental imitative learning. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2, 94-97.

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.

National Education Association, Research Division. NEA Research Bulletin. Washington, D. C.: The Association, 1965, 67.

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.

Patterson, G. R. & Reid, J. Reciprocity and coercion: Two facets of social systems. In Neuringer & J. Michaels (eds.), Behavior modification and clinical psychology. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969.

Payne, D. E. & Mussen, P. H. Parent-child relations and father identification among adolescent boys. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1956, 52, 358-362.

Peltier, G. I. Sex differences in the school: Problem and proposed solution. Phi Delta Kappan, 1968, 50, 182-185.

Pope, B. Socioeconomic contrasts in children's peer culture prestige values. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1953, 48, 157-220.

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

Raines, S. R., Bush, C. T., Carden, A. I., & McCandless, B. R. Interesting effects associated with having males as caregivers in day care centers. Paper presented at the meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association, Hollywood, Florida, May 3, 1974.

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

Robinson, B. E. Men in day care: A preliminary study. Unpublished manuscript, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1975.

Robinson, B. E. The liberation of little boys: Big boys do cry! Mother's Manual, in press.

Rosenburg, B. G. & Sutton-Smith, B. Family interaction effects on masculinity-femininity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 8, 117-120.

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.

Schein, V. E. Relationships between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics among female managers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 340-344.

Schell, R. E. & Silber, J. W. Sex-role discrimination among young children. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1968, 27, 379-389.

Sciarra, D. J. A study of the effects of male role models on children's behavior in a day care center. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Cincinnati, 1970.

Sciarra, D. J. Men in young children's lives make a difference. Child Care Quarterly, 1971, 1, 111-118.

Sciarra, D. J. What to do till the male man comes. Childhood Education, 1972, 49, 190-191.

Sears, P. S. Child rearing factors related to playing sex-typed roles. American Psychologist, 1953, 8, 431.

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

Seifert, K. Getting men to teach preschool. Contemporary Education, 1974, 45, 299-304.

Seifert, K. The best men for child care work. Child Care Quarterly, 1975, 4, 188-193.

Seifert, K. Attitudes about men in early childhood education. Unpublished manuscript, University of Manitoba, 1976.

Sexton, P. C. The feminized male. New York: Random House, 1969.

Shephard, W. O. & Hess, D. T. Attitudes in four age groups toward sex role division in adult occupations and activities. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1975, 6, 27-39.

Simpson, R. L. Sex stereotypes of secondary school teaching subjects: Male and female status gains and losses. Sociology of Education, 1974, 47, 388-398.

Smith, D. A study of the relationship of teacher sex to fifth grade boys' sex preference, general self-concept, and scholastic achievement in science and mathematics. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Miami, 1970.

Smith, D. Yes, American schools are feminized. Phi Delta Kappan, 1973, 54, 703-704.

Strong, E. K. Vocational interest of men and women. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1943.

Suchner, R. W. & More, D. M. Stereotypes of males and females in two occupations. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1975, 6, 1-8.

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.

Tolbert, R. N. Should you employ that male elementary teacher? National Elementary Principal, 1968, 47, 40-43.

Topp, R. F. Solving the "man problem" in elementary education. The Nation's Schools, 1954, 54, 49-51.

Touhey, J. C. Effects of additional men on prestige and desirability of occupations typically performed by women. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 1974, 4, 330-335.

Triplett, L. Elementary education: A man's world? The Instructor, 1968, 78, 50-52.

Vairo, P. D. Wanted: 20,000 male first-grade school teachers. Education, 1969, 89, 222-224.

Verner, A. M. & Snyder, C. A. The preschool child's awareness and anticipation of adult sex-roles. Sociometry, 1966, 29, 159-168.

Ward, W. D. Variance of sex-role preference among boys and girls. Psychological Reports, 1968, 23, 467-470.

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

Williams, B. M. A symposium: Men in young children's lives. Part I. Childhood Education, 1970, 47, 139-143.

Williams, J. E. & Bennett, S. M. The definition of sex stereotypes via the Adjective Check List. Sex Roles, 1975, 1, 327-337.

Wolfe, T. Effects of live modeled sex-inappropriate play behavior in a naturalistic setting. Developmental Psychology, 1973, 9, 120-123.

Yee, A. H. Are the schools a "feminized society"? Educational Leadership, 1973, 31, 128-133.

APPENDIX A

PILOT STUDY MATERIALS

SEX-ROLE SPECIFIC BEHAVIOR SCALE

TRADITIONAL MASCULINE BEHAVIORS	POSITIVE REINFORCER	PUNISHER	TRADITIONAL FEMININE BEHAVIORS	POSITIVE REINFORCER	PUNISHER
Development of skill and interest in gross motor and mechanical tasks			Development of skill and interest in fine motor and handicraft tasks		
Physical aggression, roughhouse play, and independence			Physical passivity and dependence		
Verbal aggression			Verbal passivity		
Verbal comments depicting child as big, strong, or rugged			Verbal comments depicting child as pretty, dainty, or fragile		
Non-affiliative and non-nurturant responses			Affiliative and nurturant responses		
Use of sex-typed toys, particularly toys reflecting activities directed away from home			Use of sex-typed toys, particularly toys reflecting activities directed toward the home		
Non-conformity to proper social habits			Conformity to proper social habits		
Structured activities (games, stories, and songs) typically considered masculine			Structured activities (games, stories, and songs) typically considered feminine		
TOTAL					

CONTINGENCY BEHAVIORS OF

MALE CAREGIVERS

POSITIVE REINFORCEMENT FOR MASCULINE BEHAVIORS

Subjects	Boys	Girls
A	6	3
B	12	5
C	14	9
D	5	7
E	15	9
F	12	9
G	0	0
	64	42
	$\overline{X}$ = 9.1	$\overline{X}$ = 4.7

PUNISHMENT FOR MASCULINE BEHAVIORS

Subjects	Boys	Girls
A	10	2
B	13	0
C	11	3
D	7	12
E	8	4
F	9	6
G	16	0
	74	27
	$\overline{X}$ = 10.5	$\overline{X}$ = 3.8

POSITIVE REINFORCEMENT FOR FEMININE BEHAVIORS

Subjects	Boys	Girls
A	17	8
B	15	5
C	10	3
D	14	3
E	6	7
F	6	6
G	22	12
	90	44
	$\overline{X}$ = 12.8	$\overline{X}$ = 6.2

PUNISHMENT FOR FEMININE BEHAVIORS

Subjects	Boys	Girls
A	4	0
B	0	0
C	0	0
D	0	2
E	0	1
F	1	1
G	0	0
	5	4
	$\overline{X}$ = .71	$\overline{X}$ = .66

CONTINGENCY BEHAVIORS OF

FEMALE CAREGIVERS

POSITIVE REINFORCEMENT FOR MASCULINE BEHAVIORS

Subjects	Boys	Girls
A	6	6
B	12	7
C	5	4
D	0	0
E	0	3
F	11	5
G	0	0
	34	25

$\overline{X}$ = 4.9 X = 3.6

PUNISHMENT FOR MASCULINE BEHAVIORS

Subjects	Boys	Girls
A	6	5
B	4	1
C	9	6
D	19	13
E	5	6
F	5	5
G	31	8
	79	44

$\overline{X}$ = 11.2 X = 6.3

POSITIVE REINFORCEMENT FOR FEMININE BEHAVIORS

Subjects	Boys	Girls
A	10	17
B	12	14
C	16	10
D	11	7
E	14	22
F	17	7
G	8	3
	88	80

$\overline{X}$ = 12.6 X = 11.4

PUNISHMENT FOR FEMININE BEHAVIORS

Subjects	Boys	Girls
A	0	0
B	0	0
C	0	0
D	0	0
E	0	0
F	0	0
G	0	0
	0	0

PERCENTAGE OF MALE CAREGIVER SEX-TYPED REINFORCERS
AND PUNISHERS DISPENSED TO BOYS AND GIRLS

TRADITIONAL MASCULINE BEHAVIORS	POSITIVE REINFORCER	PUNISHER	TRADITIONAL FEMININE BEHAVIORS	POSITIVE REINFORCER	PUNISHER
Development of skill and interest in gross motor and mechanical tasks	25	3	Development of skill and interest in fine motor and handicraft tasks	27	0
Physical aggression, roughhouse play, and independence	39	57	Physical passivity and dependence	8	0
Verbal aggression	0	19	Verbal passivity	17	0
Verbal comments depicting child as big, strong, or rugged	5	0	Verbal comments depicting child as pretty, dainty, or fragile	1	0
Non-affiliative and non-nurturant responses	1	2	Affiliative and nurturant responses	5	100
Use of sex-typed toys, particularly toys reflecting activities directed away from home	9	2	Use of sex-typed toys, particularly toys reflecting activities directed toward the home	25	0
Non-conformity to proper social habits	0	17	Conformity to proper social habits	8	0
Structured activities (games, stories, and songs) typically considered masculine	21	0	Structured activities (games, stories, and songs) typically considered feminine	9	0
TOTALS	100%	100%	TOTALS	100%	100%

PERCENTAGE OF FEMALE CAREGIVER SEX-TYPED REINFORCERS
AND PUNISHERS DISPENSED TO BOYS AND GIRLS

TRADITIONAL MASCULINE BEHAVIORS	POSITIVE REINFORCER	PUNISHER	TRADITIONAL FEMININE BEHAVIORS	POSITIVE REINFORCER	PUNISHER
Development of skill and interest in gross motor and mechanical tasks	3	5	Development of skill and interest in fine motor and handicraft tasks	28	0
Physical aggression, roughhouse play, and independence	19	37	Physical passivity and dependence	10	0
Verbal aggression	0	30	Verbal passivity	2	0
Verbal comments depicting child as big, strong, or rugged	15	0	Verbal comments depicting child as pretty, dainty, or fragile	0	0
Non-affiliative and non-nurturant responses	0	1	Affiliative and nurturant responses	2	0
Use of sex-typed toys, particularly toys reflecting activities directed away from home	5	2	Use of sex-typed toys, particularly toys reflecting activities directed toward the home	20	0
Non-conformity to proper social habits	0	24	Conformity to proper social habits	26	0
Structured activities (games, stories, and songs) typically considered masculine	58	0	Structured activities (games, stories, and songs) typically considered feminine	11	0
TOTALS	100%	100%	TOTALS	100%	0%

APPENDIX B

PRELIMINARY CORRESPONDENCE

Dear Consultant:

I am currently preparing to research the subject of "Men in Day Care." I am concerned with trying to learn more about male caregivers, trained and untrained, in North Carolina.

I would like very much to have your cooperation in this project which is being conducted out of the Department of Child Development and Family Relations at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Because no such list exists, I am seeking to establish a central list of men employed in day care centers in the state. I would like to ask that you jot down on the enclosed card the names of any men whom you have encountered in your regional work and the center(s) in which they are employed. Then, simply drop the stamped card into the mail. If you can not recall a particular man's name, the name and address of the center will be of help. If you know of no men in your region, even this would be valuable information.

I feel that this is an important area which is in need of investigation and that the findings will be beneficial to all of us in the field of Child Development particularly those who are involved in the care of children. I will be pleased to receive a positive reply from you. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Bryan E. Robinson
Doctoral student
Child Development-Family Relations
University of North Carolina
at Greensboro

Dear Day Care Consultant:

A while back, I mailed to you a letter requesting the names of male caregivers that you know of in your district. Since that time, half of the consultants have responded.

Please take a few minutes to write what information you have available and drop the card in the mail, so that I might get a comprehensive list of male caregivers in the state. Your cooperation is of utmost importance and is highly appreciated.

Thanks for your help,

Bryan E. Robinson
Doctoral Student
Department of Child Development-
Family Relations
University of North Carolina
at Greensboro

APPENDIX C

FACE SHEET

FACE SHEET

1. NAME _____

2. YEAR OF BIRTH _____

3. CIRCLE THE NUMBER OF YEARS OF SCHOOLING YOU HAVE COMPLETED:

   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

   12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21

4. NUMBER OF YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN CURRENT FIELD:

   YEARS _____ MONTHS _____

APPENDIX D

THE SEX-TYPED ATTITUDE CHECKLIST

ADJECTIVES ASSOCIATED WITH MEN BY AT LEAST THREE-QUARTERS OF SUBJECTS OF BOTH SEXES[1]

ADJECTIVES	% OF M SUBJECTS	% OF F SUBJECTS
adventurous	94	98
aggressive	94	98
ambitious	82	78
assertive	82	82
autocratic	86	86
boastful	88	92
coarse	96	94
confident	90	88
courageous	90	86
cruel	86	80
daring	88	94
disorderly	78	78
dominant	88	92
enterprising	82	82
forceful	98	98
handsome	94	94
independent	96	88
jolly	80	82
logical	82	88
loud	86	76
masculine	100	100
rational	88	76
realistic	78	78
robust	82	78
self-confident	86	78
severe	88	78
stable	82	82
steady	76	84
stern	96	92
strong	98	94
tough	96	98
unemotional	92	88
unexcitable	92	76

[1]From Williams and Bennett (1975).

ADJECTIVES ASSOCIATED WITH WOMEN BY AT LEAST THREE-QUARTERS OF SUBJECTS OF BOTH SEXES[1]

ADJECTIVES	% OF M SUBJECTS	% OF F SUBJECTS
affected	82	82
affectionate	92	98
appreciative	84	92
attractive	96	74
charming	82	78
complaining	78	88
dependent	82	92
dreamy	90	80
emotional	98	100
excitable	90	82
feminine	98	96
fickle	94	86
flirtatious	90	90
frivolous	86	90
fussy	92	94
gentle	82	78
high-strung	76	82
meek	80	88
mild	82	82
nagging	94	96
prudish	88	92
rattlebrained	84	78
sensitive	90	82
sentimental	94	96
soft-hearted	76	84
sophisticated	78	88
submissive	86	92
talkative	86	82
weak	82	86
whiny	88	90

[1]From Williams and Bennett (1975).

DIRECTIONS: This checklist contains a list of adjectives. Assume that these adjectives describe young children you have known. Please read them quickly and put an X beside each adjective which you most prefer in the behavior of little boys (i.e., ages 2-5). Do not worry about duplications, contradictions, and so forth. Try to be frank, work quickly, and do not spend too much time on any one adjective.

DIRECTIONS: This checklist contains a list of adjectives. Assume that these adjectives describe young children you have known. Please read them quickly and put an 0 beside each adjective which you most prefer in the behavior of little girls (i.e., ages 2-5). Do not worry about duplications, contradictions, and so forth. Try to be frank, work quickly, and do not spend too much time on any one adjective.

_____ adventurous
_____ affected
_____ affectionate
_____ aggressive
_____ ambitious
_____ appreciative
_____ assertive
_____ autocratic
_____ boastful
_____ charming
_____ coarse
_____ complaining
_____ confident
_____ courageous
_____ cruel
_____ daring
_____ dependent
_____ disorderly
_____ dominant
_____ dreamy
_____ emotional
_____ enterprising
_____ excitable
_____ feminine
_____ fickle
_____ flirtatious
_____ forceful
_____ frivolous
_____ fussy
_____ gentle
_____ handsome

_____ high-strung
_____ independent
_____ jolly
_____ logical
_____ loud
_____ masculine
_____ meek
_____ mild
_____ nagging
_____ prudish
_____ rational
_____ rattlebrained
_____ realistic
_____ robust
_____ self-confident
_____ sensitive
_____ sentimental
_____ severe
_____ soft-hearted
_____ sophisticated
_____ stable
_____ steady
_____ stern
_____ strong
_____ submissive
_____ talkative
_____ tough
_____ unemotional
_____ unexcitable
_____ weak
_____ whiny

APPENDIX E

THE ADJECTIVE CHECK LIST

The Adjective Check List

by

HARRISON G. GOUGH, Ph.D.

University of California (Berkeley)

Name .....

Date C

DIRECTIONS: This booklet . Please read them quickly and put an X one you would consider to be self-descriptive. about duplications, contradictions, and so forth. Work quickly and do not spend too much time on any one adjective. Try to be frank, and check those adjectives which describe you as you really are, not as you would like to be.

CONSULTING PSYCHOLOGISTS PRESS

577 College Ave., Palo Alto, Calif.

- ☐ absent-minded 1
- ☐ active 2
- ☐ adaptable 3
- ☐ adventurous 4
- ☐ affected 5
- ☐ affectionate 6
- ☐ aggressive 7
- ☐ alert 8
- ☐ aloof 9
- ☐ ambitious 10
- ☐ anxious 11
- ☐ apathetic 12
- ☐ appreciative 13
- ☐ argumentative 14
- ☐ arrogant 15
- ☐ artistic 16
- ☐ assertive 17
- ☐ attractive 18
- ☐ autocratic 19
- ☐ awkward 20
- ☐ bitter 21
- ☐ blustery 22
- ☐ boastful 23
- ☐ bossy 24
- ☐ calm 25
- ☐ capable 26
- ☐ careless 27
- ☐ cautious 28
- ☐ changeable 29
- ☐ charming 30
- ☐ cheerful 31
- ☐ civilized 32
- ☐ clear-thinking 33
- ☐ clever 34
- ☐ coarse 35
- ☐ cold 36
- ☐ commonplace 37
- ☐ complaining 38
- ☐ complicated 39
- ☐ conceit… 40
- ☐ …
- ☐ …
- ☐ …
- ☐ …
- ☐ cool 48
- ☐ cooperative 49
- ☐ courageous 50
- ☐ cowardly 51
- ☐ cruel 52
- ☐ curious 53
- ☐ cynical 54
- ☐ daring 55
- ☐ deceitful 56
- ☐ defensive 57
- ☐ deliberate 58
- ☐ demanding 59
- ☐ dependable 60
- ☐ dependent 61
- ☐ despondent 62
- ☐ determined 63
- ☐ dignified 64
- ☐ discreet 65
- ☐ disorderly 66
- ☐ dissatisfied 67
- ☐ distractible 68
- ☐ distrustful 69
- ☐ …ominant …
- ☐ …
- ☐ …
- ☐ …
- ☐ …al …
- ☐ …ergetic 78
- ☐ enterprising 79
- ☐ enthusiastic 80
- ☐ evasive 81
- ☐ excitable 82
- ☐ fair-minded 83
- ☐ fault-finding 84
- ☐ fearful 85
- ☐ feminine 86
- ☐ fickle 87
- ☐ flirtatious 88
- ☐ foolish 89
- ☐ forceful 90
- ☐ foresighted 91
- ☐ forgetful 92
- ☐ forgiving 93
- ☐ formal 94
- ☐ frank 95
- ☐ friendly 96
- ☐ frivolous 97
- ☐ fussy 98
- ☐ generous 99
- ☐ gentle 100
- ☐ gloomy 101
- ☐ good-looking 102
- ☐ good-natured 103
- ☐ greedy 104
- ☐ handsome 105
- ☐ hard-headed 106
- ☐ hard-hearted 107
- ☐ hasty 108
- ☐ headstrong 109
- ☐ healthy 110
- ☐ helpful 111
- ☐ high-strung 112
- ☐ honest 113
- ☐ hostile 114
- ☐ humorous 115
- ☐ hurried 116
- ☐ idealistic 117
- ☐ imaginative 118
- ☐ immature 119
- ☐ impatient 120
- ☐ impulsive 121
- ☐ independent 122
- ☐ indifferent 123
- ☐ individualistic 124
- ☐ industrious 125
- ☐ infantile 126
- ☐ informal 127
- ☐ ingenious 128
- ☐ inhibited 129
- ☐ initiative 130
- ☐ insightful 131
- ☐ intelligent 132
- ☐ interests narrow 133
- ☐ interests wide 134
- ☐ intolerant 135
- ☐ inventive 136
- ☐ irresponsible 137
- ☐ irritable 138
- ☐ jolly 139
- ☐ kind 140
- ☐ lazy 141
- ☐ leisurely 142
- ☐ logical 143
- ☐ loud 144
- ☐ loyal 145
- ☐ mannerly 146
- ☐ masculine 147
- ☐ mature 148
- ☐ meek 149
- ☐ methodical 150

DO NOT PRINT BELOW TH

+

−

- ☐ mild 151
- ☐ mischievous 152
- ☐ moderate 153
- ☐ modest 154
- ☐ moody 155
- ☐ nagging 156
- ☐ natural 157
- ☐ nervous 158
- ☐ noisy 159
- ☐ obliging 160
- ☐ obnoxious 161
- ☐ opinionated 162
- ☐ opportunistic 163
- ☐ optimistic 164
- ☐ organized 165
- ☐ original 166
- ☐ outgoing 167
- ☐ outspoken 168
- ☐ painstaking 169
- ☐ patient 170
- ☐ peaceable 171
- ☐ peculiar 172
- ☐ persevering 173
- ☐ persistent 174
- ☐ pessimistic 175
- ☐ planful 176
- ☐ pleasant 177
- ☐ pleasure-seeking 178
- ☐ poised 179
- ☐ polished 180
- ☐ practical 181
- ☐ praising 182
- ☐ precise 183
- ☐ prejudiced 184
- ☐ preoccupied 185
- ☐ progressive 186
- ☐ prudish 187
- ☐ quarrelsome 188
- ☐ queer 189
- ☐ quick 190
- ☐ quiet 191
- ☐ quitting 192
- ☐ rational 193
- ☐ rattlebrained 194
- ☐ realistic 195
- ☐ reasonable 196
- ☐ rebellious 197
- ☐ reckless 198
- ☐ reflective 199
- ☐ relaxed 200
- ☐ reliable 201
- ☐ resentful 202
- ☐ reserved 203
- ☐ resourceful 204
- ☐ responsible 205
- ☐ restless 206
- ☐ retiring 207
- ☐ rigid 208
- ☐ robust 209
- ☐ rude 210
- ☐ sarcastic 211
- ☐ self-centered 212
- ☐ self-confident 213
- ☐ self-controlled 214
- ☐ self-denying 215
- ☐ self-pitying 216
- ☐ self-punishing 217
- ☐ self-seeking 218
- ☐ selfish 219
- ☐ sensitive 220
- ☐ [illegible] 221
- ☐ [illegible] 222
- ☐ [illegible] 223
- ☐ [illegible] 224
- ☐ [illegible] 225
- ☐ [illegible] 226
- ☐ [illegible] 227
- ☐ [illegible] 228
- ☐ shrewd 229
- ☐ shy 230
- ☐ silent 231
- ☐ simple 232
- ☐ sincere 233
- ☐ slipshod 234
- ☐ slow 235
- ☐ sly 236
- ☐ smug 237
- ☐ snobbish 238
- ☐ sociable 239
- ☐ soft-hearted 240
- ☐ sophisticated 241
- ☐ spendthrift 242
- ☐ spineless 243
- ☐ spontaneous 244
- ☐ spunky 245
- ☐ stable 246
- ☐ steady 247
- ☐ stern 248
- ☐ stingy 249
- ☐ stolid 250
- ☐ [illegible] 251
- ☐ [illegible] 252
- ☐ [illegible] 253
- ☐ [illegible] 254
- ☐ [illegible] 255
- ☐ [illegible] 256
- ☐ [illegible] 257
- ☐ [illegible]mpathetic 258
- ☐ tactful 259
- ☐ tactless 260
- ☐ talkative 261
- ☐ temperamental 262
- ☐ tense 263
- ☐ thankless 264
- ☐ thorough 265
- ☐ thoughtful 266
- ☐ thrifty 267
- ☐ timid 268
- ☐ tolerant 269
- ☐ touchy 270
- ☐ tough 271
- ☐ trusting 272
- ☐ unaffected 273
- ☐ unambitious 274
- ☐ unassuming 275
- ☐ unconventional 276
- ☐ undependable 277
- ☐ understanding 278
- ☐ unemotional 279
- ☐ unexcitable 280
- ☐ unfriendly 281
- ☐ uninhibited 282
- ☐ unintelligent 283
- ☐ unkind 284
- ☐ unrealistic 285
- ☐ unscrupulous 286
- ☐ unselfish 287
- ☐ unstable 288
- ☐ vindictive 289
- ☐ versatile 290
- ☐ warm 291
- ☐ wary 292
- ☐ weak 293
- ☐ whiny 294
- ☐ wholesome 295
- ☐ wise 296
- ☐ withdrawn 297
- ☐ witty 298
- ☐ worrying 299
- ☐ zany 300

.OW THIS LINE

APPENDIX F

THE FAGOT-PATTERSON CHECKLIST

Fagot-Patterson Checklist (1969)

BEHAVIORS

1. Painting at easel.
2. Cutting, pasting, drawing with crayons or chalk.
3. Playing with clay.
4. Play at cornmeal table or sandbox outside.
5. Play with water, blowing bubbles.
6. Design board, puzzles, tinker toys, snakes, flannel boards, marble games.
7. String beads.
8. Build blocks, set up farms and villages.
9. Hammering.
10. Playing toy trucks, planes, boats, trains, tractors.
11. Play with steering wheel, dashboards.
12. Play in kitchen, large playhouse, or extended kitchen activities.
13. Play with dollhouse.
14. Play with dolls.
15. Dress in like-sex costume.
16. Dress in opposite-sex costume.
17. Use like-sex tools.
18. Use opposite-sex tools.
19. Sing, listen to records, play musical instruments.
20. Look at books or listen to story.
21. Science table, science observation, dinosaurs.
22. Play with live animals or toy animals.
23. Sit and do nothing, wander, follow teacher around.
24. Help teacher.
25. Climb or hide in pipes.
26. Ride trikes, cars, horses, skates, wagons, boats.
27. Swing, slides, teeter totter, or bounce on tires.
28. Throw rocks, hit with an object, push.

CONSEQUENCES

1. Teacher initiates new behavior.
2. Teacher comments favorably.
3. Teacher joins in activity.
4. Teacher criticizes.
5. Child imitates another child.
6. Child joins another child in parallel play.
7. Child joins another child in interactive play.
8. Child stands and watches another child.
9. Child continues alone.
10. Child criticizes another child.

APPENDIX G

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. What are your reasons for choosing child care as a field of employment?

2. How long have you been in your present job?
   years _____ months _____.

3. How much longer do you think you will remain in day care?

4. What type of training have you received to be a day care teacher?

5. Degree(s) held? _____.

6. Major areas of training? _____.

7. In your training did you ever have a male instructor or professor? If so, in what capacity did he train you?

8. Do you feel that it is important for men to work in day care?

9. Do you feel that you can provide experiences for the children which they would otherwise miss?

10. How do you feel about working in a profession which has been and is still dominated by women?

11. Are there things you would change about the routines, rules, and procedures of day care if you were not working in a female-dominated field?

12. Do you believe that male and female caregivers are very different in terms of the behaviors they reinforce and punish in boys and girls?

13. What major behavioral differences have you noted between boys and girls?

14. In your opinion, do boys and girls respond differently to male and female teachers?

15. As a male, how are you received by others in the day care center?

16. How are you received by parents?

17. Because you are the only male or one of few males in the day care center, are you ever called upon to perform the role of the "handy man" (i.e., to do heavy lifting, moving of objects, or repair work)? How do you feel about these requests?

APPENDIX H

LETTERS TO SUBJECTS

January, 1976

Dear Day Care Teacher:

I am conducting a study on the personality characteristics and attitudes of teachers in day care. It is believed that this is an important area which is in need of investigation and that the findings will be beneficial to all of us in the field of Child Development, particularly those who are involved in the care of young children.

I would like to thank you for agreeing to participate in this project which is conducted in the Department of Child Development and Family Relations at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. This will require a small amount of your time, but your cooperation is very important.

Let me assure you that your replies will be completely confidential and that this information will not lead to further contacts by any other organization. The responses from all participants will be combined to give an overall picture of individuals in various professional groups rather than of any particular individual member.

Please find enclosed a data sheet and The Adjective Check List. First, complete the brief data sheet; please fill in all blanks. Next, read and follow the directions for filling out The Adjective Check List. Finally, enclose all information in the stamped, self-addressed envelope, and drop it in the mail.

This is a first in a series of three checklists which will be mailed to you. Please do not discuss or compare your responses to these checklists with anyone else in your day care center. As soon as I have received all three checklists from you, I will contact you and arrange a convenient time to visit you at your center. Please return each checklist within one week from the day you receive it.

Your willingness to help me gather this information is greatly appreciated. Without your cooperation, I can not hope to provide the needed information to the child care field.

Very sincerely yours,

Bryan E. Robinson
Department of Child Development-Family Relations
University of North Carolina at Greensboro

January, 1976

Dear Engineer:

It is believed that the personality characteristics and attitudes of individuals in various professions are important areas and are in need of investigation. One of these professions in need is that of professional engineer. I am conducting a study in this area and wish to request your participation.

You have been selected by means of a representative selection procedure to participate in this study which is being conducted in the Department of Child Development and Family Relations at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Your cooperation in this project will be appreciated. Your participation in the project will require only a few minutes of your time. Three separate checklists will be mailed to you on each of three occasions. Each checklist will take no more than five to ten minutes to complete. An addressed, stamped envelope will be included for you to return each checklist. Please indicate on the enclosed form your intent to participate and return it in the envelope provided within a week after the receipt of this letter. Your signature is needed to confirm your intent to participate and to identify your return letter.

Let me assure you that your replies will be completely confidential and that this information will not lead to further contacts by any other organization. The responses from all the participants will be combined to give an overall picture of individuals in different professional groups rather than of any particular individual member.

Without your cooperation, I can not hope to get the facts or provide the needed information to the professions. Your willingness to help gather this information will be appreciated.

Very sincerely yours,

Bryan E. Robinson
Department of Child Development-Family Relations
School of Home Economics
University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Dear Engineer:

I would like to thank you for agreeing to participate in the research study being conducted in the Department of Child Development and Family Relations at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Please find enclosed a data sheet and The Adjective Check List. First, complete the brief data sheet; please fill in all blanks. Next, read and follow the directions for filling out The Adjective Check List. Finally, enclose all information in the stamped, self-addressed envelope, and drop it in the mail.

This is a first in a series of three checklists which will be mailed to you. Please do not discuss or compare your responses to these checklists with anyone. As soon as I have received the enclosed checklist, a second one will be mailed to you. Once the second checklist is received, you will be mailed your final checklist. Let me remind you to please return each checklist within one week from the day you receive it.

A brief summary of results will be mailed to those who indicate an interest in the findings of the study.

Very sincerely yours,

Bryan E. Robinson
Department of Child Development-Family Relations
School of Home Economics
University of North Carolina at Greensboro

APPENDIX I

INTENT TO PARTICIPATE FORM

Please indicate your intent to participate by signing your name under one of the statements below and returning in the enclosed envelope within a week after the receipt of this letter.

I agree to participate in the research study.

_____
Signature

I do not agree to participate in the research study.

_____
Signature

_____
Date

APPENDIX J

CODE SHEET

CAREGIVER NAME _____

CODE SHEET

EVENT	CHILD BEHAVIOR CODE	TEACHER CONSEQUENCE CODE	COMMENTS
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			