

THE INFLUENCE OF THE WOMEN'S LIBERATION MOVEMENT
ON THE SEX ROLE DEVELOPMENT
OF YOUNG CHILDREN

By

BERNITA LOUISE LUCE

Bachelor of Arts

Texas Christian University

Fort Worth, Texas

1958

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
May, 1975

Thesis
1975
L935v
cop. 2

SEP 12 1975

THE INFLUENCE OF THE WOMEN'S LIBERATION MOVEMENT
ON THE SEX ROLE DEVELOPMENT
OF YOUNG CHILDREN

Thesis Approved:

Frances Stromberg

Thesis Adviser

Atthea Wright

Judith A. Powell

N. N. Durbin

Dean of the Graduate College

916379

PREFACE

This study is concerned with measuring the effects of a widespread movement to change existing social patterns. Specifically, the purpose is to identify whether or not members of the Women's Liberation Movement (feminists) are affecting socialization of young children toward development of sex role flexibility. A test of sex role preference for young children is used to identify changes in sex role development.

Vicki Comer (1970) creatively describes the feminist view of sex roles for young children:

cats and snails
and puppy-dog tails

outside
with nature
curious
searching
breathing, smelling, feeling
alive

sugar and spice
and everything nice

in the kitchen
in a cupboard
behind a closed door
packaged, bottled, contained
resting in a dark space
to be added
to be supportive
never to be subject
always waiting to be used

The author cares to express gratitude to her major adviser, Dr. Frances Stromberg, for her support in developing and completing the study and for her influence as a role model who combines intellectual

and academic achievement with warmth and sensitivity. Appreciation is also expressed to Dr. Althea Wright and Dr. Judy Powell for their invaluable assistance in the preparation of the final manuscript.

The thirty-two friendly children and the families they live with were the joy in this work. The delightful experiences we shared depended on the use of a test which permits young children to respond freely and openly. The author expresses appreciation to Dr. Elizabeth K. Starkweather for the creation of such an instrument and for the opportunity to use the Starkweather Masculinity-Femininity Test. Through her research on creativity in young children, Dr. Starkweather has strengthened a child development philosophy which values children as individual people rather than as merely girls or boys.

To Randy Luce, thanks is given for a continual example of individuality that ignores and resists any form of stereotyped expectations. Thanks go to Greg Luce, who understands the restrictions of masculinity and gives trusted companionship, shared feelings, and a deep sensitivity to other people. Special appreciation is expressed to Terry Luce, for his humanistic values and for the support which grew from those values.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose	1
Feminist Goals	1
Sex Roles, Identity and Ideology	5
Hypotheses	9
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	10
Theories of Sex Differences	10
Theoretical Problems	10
Origin of Sex Differences	12
Development of Sex Differences	13
Sex Role Conflict Theories	16
Role and Role Strain	16
Cultural Role Strains	17
Research in Sex Role Development	21
Sex Role Stereotyped Behavior	21
Sex Role Flexibility	24
Early Childhood Research	26
Summary	28
III. METHOD AND PROCEDURE	29
Purpose	29
Subjects	29
Instrument	30
Collection of Data	31
Analysis of Data	31
Statistical Treatment	32
IV. RESULTS	34
Purpose	34
Differences Between the Groups	34
Summary of Findings	41
V. SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS	42
Purpose	42
Summary	42
Implications of the Study	43

Chapter	Page
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	50
APPENDIX A - FEMINIST PUBLICATIONS	58
APPENDIX B - THE STARKWEATHER MASCULINITY-FEMININITY TEST FOR PRESCHOOL CHILDREN	61

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Distribution of Subjects by Age and Sex	30
II. Distribution of Test Scores	35
III. Analysis of Differences in Distribution of Boys' Scores by the Median Test	36
IV. Analysis of Differences in Distribution of Girls' Scores by the Median Test	38
V. Changes in M-F Scores From Test to Retest	39
VI. Overlapping Scores of Boys and Girls	40

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

This study examined the sex role development of young children whose mothers are active members of the Women's Liberation Movement (feminists). Specifically, the study examined the degree to which masculine and feminine behavior of feminists' children varied from culturally accepted sex role standards, or sex role stereotypes. Masculinity and femininity was measured by the Starkweather Masculinity-Femininity Test (M-F Test), and the scores of young children enrolled in traditional nursery schools and kindergartens were used for comparative data.

Feminist Goals

The feminist perspective can bring about a universal and behavioral revolution, nothing less. It raises the fundamental question: What does it mean to be merely a woman or a man (Barnard, 1973, p. 19)?

When feminists predict in such powerful terms that they will create fundamental changes in human behavior, their assertions deserve serious examination. We need to determine what kind of changes they are attempting to create in what it means "to be merely a woman or a man." More importantly, we need to evaluate their actual attempts to create social change.

Goals and activities of the feminist movement begin with the belief

that women and men are equal in value and share the same capabilities (Freeman, 1971). Therefore, existing differences in value, or status, of women and men must be changed. The goal of changing present status inequalities between the sexes has required feminists to study and identify the antecedents of existing sex differences. They attribute most such differences to ideology, defined by sociologists as "a pattern of beliefs and concepts . . . which purport to explain complex phenomena with a view to directing and simplifying social and political choices of individuals and groups (Gould and Kolb, 1965, p. 315)."

Freeman (1971) defines and summarizes sexism, the ideology of devaluation and oppression of women:

The first core concept of sexist thought is that men do the important work in the world and the work done by men is what is important. (Therefore) men are more important than women, not necessarily superior--we are far too sophisticated these days than to use those tainted terms--but more important, more significant, more valuable, more worthwhile. It is the basis of the feeling by men that if women enter a particular occupation they will degrade it and that men must leave or be themselves degraded; and the feeling by women that they can raise the prestige of their professions by recruiting men, which they can do only by giving them the better jobs.

The second core concept of sexist thought is that women's identities are defined by their relationships to men and their social value by that of the men they are related to. This is what is meant when women are told that their role is complementary to that of men; that they should fulfill their natural 'feminine' functions; that they are 'different' from men and should not compete with them (p. 8).

Feminists attribute the strength of sexism to individuals' un-questioning, even unconscious, acceptance of inequalities between women and men (Bem and Bem, 1970); consequently, the movement emphasizes "consciousness raising" for individuals to become aware of sexist behavior. Although initial public activities focused on attacking evidences of sexism, efforts soon shifted to creating alternatives to

sexist beliefs and practices. Conceptually, the suggested alternatives group themselves into two broad views. One, the Emancipation View, recognizes a need for women to be freed from sex role behavior which maintains their minority status. The Human Liberation View avers, in addition, that the content of present sex roles must be changed for both women and men, since:

the social institutions which oppress women as women also oppress people as people and can be altered to make a more human existence for all. So much of our society is hung upon the framework of sex role stereotypes and their reciprocal functions that the dismantling of this structure will provide the opportunity for making a more viable life for everyone (Freeman, 1971, p. 10).

Although feminists are attempting to alter many social institutions which maintain sexist inequalities, they devote special attention to those institutions which socialize children into sexist behaviors and attitudes. Socialization has been described by scholars as "the process by which an individual learns to adjust to the group by acquiring social behaviors of which the group approves (Gould and Kolb, 1965, p. 672)." Feminist analysis of socialization describes the family (Gordon, 1970) and schools (Gersoni-Stavn, 1974; Stacey, Bereaud, and Daniels, 1974) as primary institutions responsible for sexist socialization.

Thus, altering socialization goals and practices in families and schools is a major area of feminist activity. Their aim is to permit children to develop more according to individual differences, rather than according to roles. Olof Palme (1972), prime minister of Sweden, calls sex roles "a sort of uniform which represses the individuality of the child (p. 240)." According to Steinem (1973),

the point is to enlarge personal choice, to produce for each child the fullest possible range of human experience without negating or limiting the choices already made by the adults closest to her or him (p. 30).

Kasten (1972) further explains:

Children must be appreciated for just being children. They should never be influenced to believe that their different sex organs are responsible for different capacities and roles Sex role stereotyping (makes) growth-choice very difficult for children (p. 35, p. 26).

To achieve the goal of enlarging children's sex role development beyond stereotyped versions of masculinity and femininity, feminists:

1. Analyze research on sex role differences (Bernard, 1972; Millett, 1970; Millman, 1971) and sex role socialization (Bardwick and Douvan, 1971; Chodorow, 1974; Hoffman, 1972; Howe, 1971; Pitcher, 1974).
2. Suggest alternative socialization practices (Greenleaf, 1972).
3. Evaluate curricula and develop instructional materials for nonsexist education (Greenleaf, 1972; Breitbart, 1970; Harrison, 1974).
4. Analyze preschool books and textbooks (Weitzman, Eifler, Hokada and Ross, 1972; Klapper, 1971) and provide alternatives (West Anne Grant, 1971; Little Miss Muffet Fights Back, n.d.).
5. Criticize children's television programming and films (Vogel, Broverman, and Evans-Gardner, 1974; Bergman, 1974).
6. Analyze the socialization impact of childrens' toys and suggest alternative uses (Pogrebin, 1974; Lyon, 1972).

Feminist socialization practices, which encourage unconventional sex role behavior, or role-innovative behavior, in young children may be what Bernard (1968) and Clavan (1970) call "nontypical behavior anticipating future norms." Clavan (1970) notes that the behavior and goals of many social movements first perceived as unconventional, deviant, or

radical, often are accepted eventually as norms for conventional behavior. If the presently non-typical feminist goal of liberating young children from sex roles is indeed "a behavior norm of the future," research should investigate the influence feminist mothers are having on their children's sex role development to predict the direction future sex role behavior may be taking. Such an examination would help to clarify and measure one social change feminists are attempting to cause.

Sex Roles, Identity and Ideology

Conventional sex role standards, or culturally approved and expected behavior for males and females, emphasize highly differentiated personalities for women and men. A series of attitude surveys by Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, and Rosenkrantz (1972), developed to determine "socially designated behaviors that differentiate between men and women (p. 60)," showed that diverse groups of American people endorse distinct male and female sex roles, with male traits clustering around "competency" (independent, objective, active, logical, decisive) and female traits clustering around "warmth-expressiveness" (emotional, tactful, gentle, sensitive). The questionnaire used in these studies included 122 items describing a wide range of behavior, arranged in bipolar fashion. Subjects indicated the extent to which each item described separately, a male, a female, and themselves.

Results showed a high degree of consensus concerning the different traits women and men should display. Agreement was indicated by subjects varying in age, sex, religion, education level and marital status. Additional findings about sex role standards were:

1. Masculine characteristics are more highly valued, and a greater

number of positive traits are associated with males than females.

2. Self-concepts of men and women incorporate accepted sex role standards.
3. Women incorporate into their self-concepts the larger number of negative traits associated with a female stereotype.
4. Stereotyped differences between women and men are approved of and idealized.
5. Mental health specialists (clinical psychologists, psychiatrists, and psychiatric social workers) concurred with other subjects' judgments about sex role standards. When these clinicians performed a separate procedure of describing a healthy male, a healthy female, and a healthy adult, their responses showed a high correlation between descriptions of a healthy adult and a healthy male. Their description of a healthy female did not correspond to their description of a healthy adult.

Feminists diverge from the general population's view of sex roles.

Greenleaf (1972) clearly states their view:

It is important to differentiate between sex roles and sexual identity. A role is social behavior that is prescribed and defined by tradition. The individual 'plays' her or his part in the play that has already been written. Identity relates to individuality, 'unity and persistence of personality' to quote Webster's dictionary. Having a positive sexual identity would mean feeling good about yourself, enjoying your body, respecting yourself as a person who is a female or male, and having the confidence and self-trust to express yourself in sexual relationships. In fact, 'role playing' will often come in conflict with a person's identity. For while identity relates to a person's self-concept, role relates to the behavior society expects from you on the basis of some category --be it sex type, race, age, income. Roles track us, and therefore cripple the development of personal identity.

In contrast to this feminist view of a conflict between roles and identity, an accepted social science view of identity incorporates the concept of roles:

(Identity is) the generalized position in society deriving from the statuses in the groups of which (an individual) is a member, the roles which stem from these statuses, and the social categories which the group members lead him to assign himself (Gould and Kolb, 1965, p. 315).

Prevailing views of childhood socialization also equate a healthy identity with adoption of sex role standard behavior. In fact, Mussen (1969), editor of a widely used child development text asserts:

Parents have two major tasks in promoting their child's sex typing Fortunately, most parents can perform these tasks without great difficulty because they themselves have absorbed and incorporated sex-appropriate responses, characteristics, and attitudes and they have clear conceptions of appropriate masculine and feminine behavior. They expect different responses from their sons and daughters, and from early childhood on, properly reward and encourage sex-appropriate responses. . . . Sex-inappropriate behavior, and attempts to imitate opposite-sex responses, are punished and discouraged (p. 728).

As Mussen (1969) admits, no adequate data exists to show a positive correlation between sex role stereotyped behavior and a healthy personality. However, the feminist position that sex roles restrict development of a healthy personality also lacks sufficient data. Both views, then, are ideologies. At present, parents, teachers, and child specialists choose sex role socialization techniques according to personal attraction to either a feminist or a traditional ideology. More scientific evidence is needed to clarify the relationship between sex roles and development of a healthy personality.

A major problem in research on sex role development is the reliance of most existing tests on traditional ideology. Their vocabulary reveals bias: "sex-appropriate," "sex reversed," "sex role deviation,"

and "sex role differentiation." These words show a preference for, or at least a positive acceptance of, test scores falling at extreme ends of bipolar scales. Traditionalists approve these scores as representing "sex role appropriate" behavior; feminists disapprove of them as indicating "sex role stereotyped" behavior.

In addition to bias, other problems exist with the underlying theory of many instruments. M. Lewis (1971), noting researchers' emphasis on personality differences between individuals, suggests that measuring similarities might reveal new information about personality and identity. Carlson (1972) criticizes the present conception of polarities in personality trait tests, with the tests being used to place individuals in one or another opposite category, such as dependent or independent; aggressive or passive; masculine or feminine. Research by Bem (1974) supports Carlson's (1972) statement, indicating that individuals may balance their masculine and feminine duality in varying degrees, that those individuals who vary from sex-stereotyped behavior may be healthier, and "that strongly sex-typed individuals might be seriously limited in the range of behaviors available to them as they move from situation to situation (p. 55)."

Measuring the degree of masculinity-femininity would avoid some of these specific problems. Through such measurement, test scores at bipolar ends of the masculinity-femininity scale could be termed "sex role stereotyped" scores; scores falling in the broad middle could denote "sex role flexibility." The Starkweather Masculinity-Femininity Test (M-F Test) does measure degree of masculinity and femininity in young children. This instrument also avoids a second difficulty in

testing sex roles in young children: the problem of adult bias:

The evaluation of what is masculine and what is feminine is based on the actual preferences of the children being tested. The assumption underlying this design is that the behavior of preschool boys is masculine and the behavior of young girls is feminine The designation of the degree of masculinity or femininity assigned to the pictures in the test booklets is based solely on a comparison of the boys' and girls' responses (Starkweather, 1974, p. 12).

A third unique feature of the Starkweather M-F Test is the use of a test-retest procedure to determine each child's stability of sex role preference, or the degree to which a child's test responses show a consistent, predictable pattern. In addition, validation studies, using test scores of young children in a nursery school population, independent of adult judgment, showed that polar scores of the young children (high feminine and high masculine) are in agreement with sex role standards in the general population.

Through the use of the Starkweather M-F Test, the degree of masculinity or femininity expressed by children of parents with conventional sex role expectations can be compared to the degree of masculinity or femininity expressed by children of feminists, who have unconventional sex role expectations for their children.

Hypotheses

1. There will be no differences in the degree of masculinity or femininity, as measured by the Starkweather M-F Test, expressed by young children, according to their feminist or non-feminist family background.

2. There will be no differences in the degree of stability of masculinity or femininity, as measured by the Starkweather M-F Test, expressed by young children, according to their feminist or non-feminist family background.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theories of Sex Differences

Theoretical Problems

Vroegh and Handrich's (1966) extensive summary of research on sex differences in early childhood concluded that "relatively few generalizations could be made with confidence. The lack of consistent definitions and a theory of sex role development has hindered synthesis of empirical data (p. 24)." Hoffman (1972), identifying problems in child development research pertinent to sex role studies, stated that contradictory data may result from measuring different phenomena under the same name. "Among the particularly troublesome concepts are (role) identification and dependency (pp. 132-133)."

Thus, decades of research into diverse theories of sex role differences and development of sex role differences have not led to any single, secure body of knowledge. Myrdal (1972), puzzling over such lack of progress in many areas of social science research, analyzes that:

The disturbing fact that research in the social sciences does not, as it advances, regularly result simply in new, commonly accepted knowledge, but that room is left for schools of competing thought, is related to the two . . . facts; . . . one, that our research is much more crucially dependent upon value premises than is research in the natural sciences; and two, that social scientists nevertheless have always tried to present their findings as merely factual, independent of valuation. They have concealed their valuations that have actually determined their approaches, observations, and analyses.

Indeed, they have successfully kept themselves unaware of them (p. 165).

As these hidden valuations are not openly declared they can be held general and vague. A space is then left for arbitrariness. It is within this field of indeterminateness that differences of basic concepts and models become possible. And it is by utilizing this space of arbitrariness that contending schools can preserve themselves to an extent unknown in the simpler natural sciences Even more important is the relative unity of bias prevailing in a particular society at a particular time (p. 165).

Feminist critics have amply documented the unity of masculine bias underlying much research into sex role development (Millett, 1970; Janeway, 1971; Millman, 1971). Millman (1971) claims that "much research into sex roles is seriously biased and misleading (p. 772)." Millet's (1970) Sexual Politics dissects the masculine bias underlying specific sex role socialization studies by Brim, Erikson, Kagan, and Barry, Bacon and Child.

Bringing the valuations--which are always with us, although mostly hidden--out in the open, dissolves the indeterminateness that makes biases possible. The only way of defending objectivity in research is to work with explicit, often alternative, specific value premises (Myrdal, 1972, p. 165).

The explicit value premise of this study is that differences between the sexes are important simply in relation to human sexuality and reproduction, and that outside these areas of personal behaviors, an individual's behavioral choices need not be contingent upon sex, but on individual capacity. Cultural emphasis on sex role flexibility, rather than sex role differentiation, will enlarge the range of individual choices. Theory, concepts, and interpretation of study results are all affected by this value premise.

Origin of Sex Differences

Every sex role ideology has its theory to explain existing differences between the sexes. The profusion of theories form two kinds of debate (Hochschild, 1973). Further confusion results from the fact that opponents frequently cite the same kind of evidence to support their contradictory theories. In the first debate, investigators claim either that sex role behavior is biologically-based or that it is learned; these are essentially theories of the origin of sex differences.

Opposing theorists attempting to explain the origin of sex differences offer four different sources of evidence to support their claims:

1. Sexual differentiation has a genetic basis (Ferguson, 1971); or, "the human organism at birth is still largely bipotential for dimorphism of gender identity differentiation (Money, 1971, p. 109)."
2. Hormonal activity forms the biological basis for behavior differences between sexes (Bardwick, 1971). Weisstein (1970), in rebuttal, cites studies in which different environments create changes in hormonal activity, suggesting that the direction of relationships between hormones and behavior is too uncertain for authoritative pronouncements.
3. Harlowe (Tavris, 1973), after years of studying primate behavior, claims definitively:

If you don't believe that God created women to be mothers and essentially nothing else, let me prove it to you The interests of the sexes are basically different, because of different innate capacities, which learning exaggerates rather than minimizes (p. 65, p. 67).

Contradicting this interpretation of primate behavior, other

researchers working in the same primate laboratory reported parenting ("mothering") behavior in male rhesus monkeys (Mitchell, Redican, and Gomber, 1974). In field observation studies, Lancaster (1973) noted achievement behavior in female monkeys.

4. Evolutionary theorists, relying on ethological and cross-cultural research, cite earlier statements by Darwin as proof of an evolutionary basis for sex differences. Freedman, Loving, and Markin (1967) claim: "We probably have our mammalian primate ancestry . . . and not some . . . makeshift social force to account for sex differences (p. 480)." Tobach (1971) denies that evolved social roles are fixed functions and answers the neo-Darwinians: "Changing social customs, traditions and roles is inherent in being human (p. 710)."

Development of Sex Differences

Theorists who agree that sex differences are acquired through some learning process diverge into two philosophical orientations. According to McCandless (1967), followers in one camp (identification) tend to see the individual as somewhat self-directing, with "natural" processes unfolding into visible behavior patterns. In the second camp (modeling), adherents believe that behavior is shaped largely by experiences.

Identification. Bronfenbrenner (1960) classifies the scattered and diverse writings on derivations of the Freudian concept of identification: 1) identification as motive, the disposition of a child to act like a model; 2) identification as a process, the sequential interplay

in internal and external forces impelling the child to take on the characteristics of a model; 3) identification as behavior, implying that a child behaves in the manner of a model. However, definitions and terms overlap; internalization, for example, may refer to process or behavior.

More recently, researchers in identification theory have sought to resolve the theoretical problems created by cultural role expectations. Kagan (1964) uses the term sex role standard to refer to the presumed cultural appropriateness of sex differentiated behavior. But Lynn (1966) distinguishes between cultural expectations and individual needs: "An individual adopts behavior characteristic of his own sex because it is expected, not because he prefers it nor because he is so identified (p. 469)." McKinzie (1966) describes the problem posed by differing cultural expectations to researchers in sex role development of young children:

Changes in the definition of appropriate sex role behavior pose a special problem in the study of masculinity-femininity in early childhood. The judgment of masculinity and femininity is based on the established values of adults in a culture; and yet, in reality, it is the attributes and behaviors of the young children that should serve as guides for what is to be labeled masculine or feminine (p. 3).

Modeling. Seeking clarification of the diffuse and overlapping definitions of identification, Bandura (1971) groups a number of terms, including identification, imitation, and matching behavior, under the concept of "modeling": "Much social learning occurs through the casual or directed observation of performances by real-life models (p. 41)." Bandura's social learning theory emphasizes the role of cognitive functioning:

In social learning theory, observers function as active agents who transform, classify, and organize modeling stimuli into

easily remembered schemes rather than as quiescent cameras or tape recorders that simply store . . . representations of modeled events (1971, p. 21).

Bandura's (1971) analysis of modeling further describes four inter-related processes:

1. Attentional--because a child's attention to models is limited to those she or he associates with, associational preferences or opportunities affect observational learning. Additional effects are created by the functional value of the behavior observed, and the interpersonal characteristics of a model (friendly, passive, dour, etc.).
2. Retentional--a child's observations of a model are sensory experiences which must be transformed and organized, by cognitive processes, into retrievable images or verbal codes. Such symbolic coding enables the child to remember the model's behavior for later enactment. In addition, the cognitive task of mental rehearsal (fantasy) of observed responses increases retention.
3. Motoric reproduction--re-enactment of remembered observations is affected by the child's existing level of physical skills, by physical limitations (e.g., size), and by accuracy of original observations, since many cues for a physical performance are inferred rather than directly observed.
4. Reinforcement and motivation--reinforcement affects all other modeling processes:
 - (a) positive reinforcement or negative sanctions influence the direction of a child's attentional processes;
 - (b) reinforcement also determines the degree and quality of

- general symbolic behavior and mental rehearsal;
- (c) development of motor skills is similarly controlled by reinforcers; and
- (d) overt reproduction of modeled behavior is also under the control of reinforcers.

Sex Role Conflict Theories

Role and Role Strain

A proposal to investigate the influence of a social movement on children's personality assumes that human development is under great control of environmental factors. As described by humanist psychologist Fromm (1957), ". . . personality develops in accordance with the opportunities that a particular society offers . . . (p. 129)."

Personality may be defined as the total repertory of behaviors acquired by individuals during development (Bijou and Baer, 1961). As humans acquire a repertory, their social experiences, through the processes of observational learning (modeling), encourage gradual organization of old and new behaviors into consistent patterns, or roles. Generalizations about role learning commonly accepted by role theorists (Sarbin, 1954; Angrist, 1969; Goode, 1960; Sarbin, 1968; Turner, 1968; Sieber, 1974) are:

1. When most members of a culture agree on a role prescription, or behavior content of a role, their agreement and consistency facilitate children's acquisition of the role.
2. Group consensus aids role development because expectations and reinforcements are predictable and because modeling for

role norms, or appropriate behaviors, is also consistent.

3. Children's role development may be affected negatively by two different sources of conflict:

(a) Cultural disagreement over role prescriptions (role strain or role conflict) may create unclear or even contradictory expectations, modeling, and reinforcements.

(b) Role prescriptions which are counter to personal needs may create what Maslow (1954) calls "pathogenic conflict" and what role theorists call "role dysfunction."

Cultural Role Strains

For several decades, social scientists have described cultural changes occurring in the behavior content of masculine and feminine roles, toward greater variability and less strict differentiation (Parsons and Bales, 1955; Seward and Williamson, 1970). Increasing isolation of the nuclear family--husband, wife, and children--from other members of an extended family have created a need for greater role flexibility, or the ability to perform behaviors outside the cultural role prescription. Since the emotional and task supports offered by more people in a larger, extended family are not available in the smaller nuclear family, husbands and wives may be forced to assume new tasks. Role strain occurs when existing role prescriptions do not easily permit individuals to acquire the behaviors needed for new task demands.

Minturn and Lambert's (1964) cross-cultural studies do show greater role interchange between husbands and wives in nuclear families in technologized societies, in which the extended family is decreasing. Knox

and Kupferer (1971) describe this interchange:

The urban or suburban wife today may have to be much more decisive and controlling, much more the task leader than was her perhaps stereotyped Victorian, rural, or small town precursor. The contemporary husband may yield much authority over day-to-day matters to his wife and may have to play roles of more intimacy and warmth than required of his forefathers (p. 255).

Female Role Strain. Parsons and Bales (1955) described stress on the female role before the rise of the feminist movement. With a decrease in the domestic role content, achieved through availability of labor-saving devices, the companion or glamour aspect of the feminine role received more emphasis. Veblen (1899), much earlier, pointed out the correlation between the feminine glamour role and a woman's function in industrial societies as the principal displayer of her husband's status. Empirical data, compiled by Boserup (1970) from cross-cultural comparisons, show an inverse correlation between industrialization and women's status. Industrialization thus creates role strain for women by first devaluating their role prescription and then by requiring women to display behaviors not included in the devalued role. Clavan (1970) therefore infers that the Women's Liberation Movement is a reaction to the negative consequences for females of industrialization or modernization of a society.

Sex differences in independence and achievement training in children (behaviors highly valuable in an industrial society), indicate some sources of role strain in the socialization process for girls. Hoffman's (1972) review of independence and achievement training established that girls receive:

1. Less encouragement for independence.

2. More parental protection.
3. Less reinforcement for cognitive performance.
4. Less social pressure for development of a separate identity.
5. Less mother-child conflict within that separation.

Hoffman attributes girls' lesser skills in "coping" to these early differences in independence training. Dependent and unconfident, the female child can allay her fears of helplessness and abandonment by maintaining effective ties with adults. She then receives greater encouragement and reinforcement for displaying role appropriate skills in interpersonal relations and "warmth," and matures into a sensitive, expressive individual lacking assertiveness, prepared to assume a submissive, minority status role.

Male Role Strain. Awareness of strains on the male role has been obscured by current emphasis on female equality and preoccupation with women's socialization into minority status behaviors, although Hartley (1959) earlier noted data showing sources of strain within the male role. Sources of role strain for males as well as females are related to the industrial structure of society. Socialization of males begins in infancy to prepare boys for future competition in an industrial society placing high value on autonomy and aggressiveness (M. Lewis, 1971). Preparation for autonomy and competition, however, neglects preparation for other adult tasks:

Male socialization in this society is still heavily laden with interrelated themes of power, aggression, independence and achievement . . . (but) this sacred syndrome of mastery . . . may have its undesirable consequences in shortcomings in interpersonal competence and sensitivity (Knox and Kupferer, 1971, p. 256).

Such shortcomings in interpersonal competence of adult males encourages a reliance on dominance in relationships (Farrell, 1973); inadequate preparation for comfortable play activities with females (Goldberg, 1973); and inability to perform the task of emotional support required in smaller nuclear families (Balswick and Peak, 1971). Pressure toward independence from the childhood family may often be excessive, resulting in compulsive independence from the adult family (Knox and Kupferer, 1971) and obsessive suppression of dependent and passive behaviors (Goldberg, 1973).

Thus, although changes in the family require more flexible personalities in adult males, childhood socialization does not include training in flexibility, and there are few cultural supports for resocialization. According to Knox and Kupferer (1971), some of the specific family and domestic tasks for which males are unprepared include:

infant-feeding, diapers, dishes, the laundromat, shopping and cooking (These) may well confront him with bewildering requirements for which he has no ready and easy solutions. Such activities could be so distasteful that he avoids them compulsively or is deeply ambivalent if he attempts them (p. 257).

Industrial society also affects male socialization by requiring fathers to be absent for long periods of each day. The subsequent vagueness of role models for boys either (1) skews socialization toward a negative avoidance of feminine characteristics and tasks (Knox and Kupferer, 1971); or (2) creates a "discontinuity" in males' socialization, in which they have to unlearn as adolescents their early identification with the more-present female model (Benedict, 1938; Lynn, 1966). In a slightly different interpretation, Money (1971) believes that boys and girls learn both sex roles because they observe both models; reinforcement and negative sanctions determine which role behaviors are

displayed and which suppressed. Father-absence may also limit attentional processes in observational learning of the male role; several authors believe boys are taught to compensate for insufficient observations of real male models by observing imaginary, stereotyped models from television and film media (Kagan, Hosken, and Watson, 1961; Bandura, 1971).

Thus, socialization ill-prepares boys for nurturant behaviors associated presently with a female role and thereby may weaken adult males' parenting abilities. Rejection of doll play for boys illustrates this point:

Certainly the . . . mama doll would be verboten, and note, there are no papa dolls. Through her doll play . . . the girl is gaining tutelage not just in the more external behaviors of manipulating the body, but in integrating these with the appropriate inner attitudes of emotional expression and nurturance. Her brother is not (Knox and Kupferer, 1971, pp. 257-58).

Research in Sex Role Development

Sex Role Stereotyped Behavior

Before knowing how big it will be, what kind of personality it will have, whether it will be healthy or not, the first and primary attribute of the child which parents attend to is labeling it as a function of its sex (M. Lewis, 1971, p. 3).

Parents anticipate that male and female infants will be different in appearance, and their observations match their anticipations, even when objective, medical records do not support their observations (Rubin, Provenzano, and Luria, 1974). When questioned by researchers, parents have described their newborn infants as possessing differences related to cultural sex role stereotypes, although the infants were not distinguishable by sex on characteristics of height, weight, and Apgar

scores (color, muscle tonicity, reflex orientation, heart and respiratory activities). Girls, for example, were described as softer, smaller, weaker, more inattentive, with finer features; boys were viewed as being better coordinated, more alert, and stronger. Fathers' descriptions were more extremely sex-stereotyped than were the mothers', but both agreed on the direction of sex differences. Such unconscious misperception of infant characteristics indicates, to the researchers, the power of sex role stereotyped expectations. Parents saw in their babies the characteristics they anticipated on the basis of cultural sex roles.

Other studies demonstrate that parents' unconscious sex role stereotyping further affects different treatment of infants by sex. Will, Self and Datan (1974) interviewed mothers of preschoolers, who claimed they encouraged role-innovative play in their children (doll play for males, physically active and rough play for females). Despite these mothers' awareness of sex role stereotyping and their attempts to avoid stereotyped treatment of children, field observation tests revealed that they unconsciously treated infants differently according to sex. Each of the eleven mothers was asked to play for eight minutes with a six-months-old infant. Three toys were provided: a fish, a train, and a doll. Five of the subjects played with "Adam," dressed in blue pants; six saw the same infant dressed in pink and called "Beth." "Adam" received the train more than did "Beth" and "Beth" received the doll more than did "Adam." Although these mothers did not recognize their sex-differentiating treatment, their behavior differed systematically as a function of the infants' perceived sex.

M. Lewis' (1971) several studies further demonstrate the

relationship between specific parental sex-differentiating behaviors and subsequent sex-stereotyped behavior in infants and young children. These studies are based on a classification of observed parent and infant behaviors into proximal behaviors (holding, touching, etc.) and distal behaviors, in which contact is less physical (smiling, looking at, etc.). While parents move both boy and girl infants from a proximal to a distal pattern of interaction, boys are moved more rapidly and more intensely than girls. Lewis attributes this difference in progression to a "differential concern for autonomy as a function of the sex of the child (pp. 12-13)." The Broverman et al (1972) findings that competency, independence, assertiveness, and activity are culturally desirable traits for men but not for women tend to support Lewis' interpretation.

The high degree of sex differentiation shown by young children in most sex role preference tests is usually interpreted as evidence of "sex-appropriate" behavior. However, an alternative interpretation is that children are socialized very effectively and very early into sex role stereotyped responses. Schlossberg and Goodman (1972) designed one test based on this alternative view. Five-year-old children from different socio-economic backgrounds categorized by sex a variety of occupational settings represented by photographs, and their responses were as highly sex-stereotyped as those of fifth graders. Similarly, although Ferguson (1971) infers a genetic basis for different sex roles, she also observed that parents of nursery school children, showing no differences in amount of praise given to boys and girls, did differ in the extent to which the praise was clearly contingent on a specific preceding action of the child. Her description shows that adults monitor children's actions to reinforce sex-appropriate, or stereotyped behavior.

As early as four years, boys show anxiety over being associated with female role characteristics. When nursery school teachers offered young boys a toy (for home use) usually associated with girls, boys showed significantly more anxiety and embarrassment than did girls who received similar cross-sexed toy offers (Ross and Ross, 1972). Many boys made excuses for the teachers: "She's been sick." "She's mixed up." Feinman (1974) analyzes that role-innovative behavior, actions outside one's sex role prescription, is encouraged in girls, who have a model for innovation in the "tomboy" role. Boys, however, have no such alternative model, such as a "janegirl" role, and are punished for role-innovative behavior. The difference in adult reactions toward role-innovative behavior in boys and girls may reflect the greater social value placed on behaviors in the stereotypical male role.

Sex Role Flexibility

Bandura's (1963) early studies on social learning showed children would change stereotyped behavior patterns when influenced by a significant model. A more recent study by Wolfe (1972) showed that nine-year-old boys and girls played significantly longer with opposite-sex toys when they had observed a same-sex model doing so, verifying the reinforcing power of a same-sex role-innovative model.

For women, more long-term effects of influence from role-innovative models has been noted by Hartley (1964) and Iglitzen (1972). In these studies, daughters of working women held positive attitudes toward women who work outside the home, and they rated women as more competent than did daughters of women who worked only in the home.

Tangri's study (1972) of role-innovative women, who planned to

enter fields occupied mainly by men, found women's innovative occupational choices were highly related to their mothers' being employed and to the degree of innovativeness in their mothers' jobs. Tidball's survey (1972) of female college graduates showed their achievement to be positively related to the number of female faculty members. Women's colleges, with twice the number of female professors as co-educational schools, showed a higher rate of achievement for women. Torrance (1963), during his series of creativity studies, discovered the power of reinforcement in enlarging the academic achievement repertory of girls. A year after Torrance alerted teachers and parents to the declining scores of elementary school girls in mathematics and science, the girls' scores rose.

Investigations of feminists' personality characteristics also show influence from role-innovative models. Non-feminists in Cherniss' (1972) study had lower self-images than feminists and less acceptance of self. Non-feminists all had housewife mothers who had married young. In contrast, feminists stated explicitly that their mothers were strong women who influenced their behavior; half of these mothers had careers. These feminists were characterized by a high degree of autonomy, assertiveness, and a strong sense of self, behaviors usually associated with a male role prescription. Comparison of feminist and non-feminist personality traits was obtained through lengthy, unstructured, and non-directive personal interviews.

Similar results were obtained in Sanger and Alker's (1972) use of the Rotter Scale with feminists and non-feminists. Both groups of women indicated high awareness of limited options and sex discrimination. Feminists, however, believed that "these forces can be overcome through

collective, social action, while the non-activists either (believed) that a personal approach is better or that the problem is insoluble (Sanger and Alker, 1972, p. 126)."

Few studies have examined role innovation in males. Komarovsky (1973) determined that college age men now reject the ideal of intellectual superiority but express anxiety over the new ideal of intellectual equality with women. Schleglen (1972) reports evidence that non-verbal communication patterns between young men and women show young males use fewer dominance gestures in comparison to older males. In addition, both young men and young women describe self-concepts which are less restricted than their views of expected roles (Elman, Press, and Rosenkrantz, 1970).

Finally, Vincent's (1966) re-analysis of masculine-feminine factors on the California Personality Inventory measures specific changes in sex role content, toward greater flexibility: females with low femininity scores and males with high femininity scores now have more favorable scores on a large portion of the Inventory. High feminine males, for example, scored highest of all males on the "dominance" and "responsibility" factors, and low feminine females scored highest of all females in "poise, ascendancy, and self-assurance (p. 198)."

Early Childhood Research

Research to date in the sex role behavior of young children "suggests a high stability of sex role differentiation, despite rapidity of change in other segments of American culture (Vener and Snyder, 1969, p. 166)." Oetzel's (1966) extensive annotated bibliography on early childhood research in sex differences was supplemented by Vroegh and

Handrich (1966) to summarize information on sex role preferences in the preschool years. The single finding consistent in all preference tests is that the majority of children make same-sex choices. Vener and Snyder (1966) believe this predominance of sex-typed choices "corroborates the crucial nature of the very early years of childhood (p. 165)."

Evidence exists, however, that investigators may not yet have tested a population of young children significantly affected by contemporary sex role changes. The traditional nursery school population which attracts researchers may not attract parents interested in encouraging non-sexist socialization for their children. Joffe (1973) observed several means by which nursery schools transmit and reinforce stereotyped sex role expectations. Klapper's (1971) content analysis of child development texts and an analysis of preschool literature by Weitzman, Eifler, Hokada, and Ross (1972) reveals an acceptance of existing role prescriptions. And nursery school teachers, in an informal poll, approved of the stereotyped sex role patterns depicted in "I'm Glad I'm a Boy! I'm Glad I'm a Girl!", a book for preschoolers (Greenleaf, 1972). The expectations and modeling to which most nursery school children are exposed therefore may differ from expectations and modeling for children of feminist mothers. The single study comparing children of feminists to children with traditional family backgrounds (selected from a population of Orthodox Jewish families), a field observation study of young children's play by Selcer (1972), showed children of feminist parents engaged in far less sex-stereotypical behavior in their play.

Summary

1. The variety of contradictory theories of sex differences and sex role development seems to be based on differing value premises and philosophies. The value premise of the present study is stated explicitly.
2. Role theory explains the possible effects of cultural values on role learning and personality development.
3. Evidence exists that role strains exist for women and men in societies undergoing industrialization; other researchers find sources of role strain in the socialization process.
4. Parents treat female and male infants and children differently, encouraging the sexes toward development of stereotyped sex role behavior.
5. Children are influenced toward development of sex role flexibility through the influence of same-sex models who exhibit role-innovative behavior.
6. Although preliminary evidence exists that adult males and females are developing greater sex role flexibility, early childhood research still shows a high degree of sex-typed behavior in young children.
7. The single investigation of feminists' children indicates that their play behavior is less sex-stereotypical than that of children from families with a traditional view of sex roles.

CHAPTER III

METHOD AND PROCEDURE

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine the influence of the Women's Liberation Movement on the sex role development of young children. This chapter describes the subjects in the experimental and comparison groups. A description of the instrument used to measure sex role development is included, with information regarding data analysis.

Subjects

Thirty-two children, ages three through five, of feminist mothers participated in this study. Thirty-one subjects were members of two-parent families, and one subject belonged to a single parent family. Therefore, the term "feminist families" is used. Names of feminists with young children were obtained from membership lists of the Tulsa, Oklahoma chapter of the National Organization for Women (NOW) and from a Dallas, Texas feminist group called Women for Change. Scores of 184 young children who participated in the Davidson (1973) sex role identification study were used for comparison, representing a group of children from the general population. These latter subjects were enrolled in kindergartens and nursery schools in Oklahoma City and Stillwater, Oklahoma. Table I presents the age distribution of subjects within each group.

TABLE I
DISTRIBUTION OF SUBJECTS BY AGE AND SEX

Age	Experimental Group (N=32)			Comparison Group (N=184)		
	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total
3	03	03	06	22	22	44
4	05	04	09	49	49	98
5	08	09	17	21	21	42
Total	16	16	32	92	92	184

Instrument

The Starkweather Masculinity-Femininity Test (M-F Test) used in this study measures the sex-role identification of preschool children. The test is designed so that the evaluation of what is masculine and what is feminine is based on the actual choices of the children being tested, rather than being based on adult interpretations of the children's behavior. The assumption underlying this design is that the behavior of boys is boy-behavior (masculine) and the behavior of girls is girl-behavior (feminine). Two comparable forms, called Form-A and Form-B, of the Starkweather M-F Test are used. The administration of the two forms, as a test and a retest with an interval of no more than one week between the two, provides (1) two M-F test scores, which indicate the extent to which a child's picture preferences are masculine or feminine, and (2) a stability score, which indicates the stability of a child's preferences from one test to the next and which is an index of

the extent to which a child has identified with the sex role suggested by his expressed masculinity or femininity. A detailed description of this test is presented in Appendix B.

Collection of Data

The Starkweather Masculinity-Femininity Test is designed for administration to individual children. Subjects in the experimental group were visited and tested in their homes. Every child anticipated the visit from the Experimenter as an opportunity to look at a picture book. During the test administration, most parents left the room; those who remained were asked to fill out a questionnaire on adult sex roles (this data may be used in a later study). Each child was asked where she or he wished to examine the pictures, and most subjects usually took the Experimenter into a living room or den, although a few preferred to use a private child's room. A second choice was to look at the booklets while sitting in chairs or while seated on the floor. Almost all children preferred to sprawl with the Experimenter on the floor. Procedures for administration of the test are described in Appendix B.

Analysis of Data

Standard scores for the Starkweather Masculinity-Femininity Test, developed through scoring refinement procedures in the Davidson (1973) study, are based on the 50 out of 184 scores of nursery school children with highest stability scores and highest masculinity or femininity scores. In other words, standard scores refer to test responses of those young boys and girls who most clearly differentiate themselves by sex and who were also most consistent in such differentiation from test

to retest (see Appendix B).

For each form of the M-F Test, individual children make 20 test responses out of a possible 60. Each of the possible 60 responses receives its masculine or feminine value from the responses of the most highly sex-differentiated children in the Davidson (1973) study. A child thus has 20 assigned scores for each form of the test. These scores are then added to provide a total masculinity-femininity score for each subject for each form of the test. Percentile rank scores for children in the experimental group were derived from conversion tables in Appendix B. When all the total M-F scores are ranked, separately by Form-A and Form-B, an individual child's change in rank between the two forms may be measured.

This change in rank, or location within a group, is considered a measure of stability of sex role identification. For example, a child whose masculinity score on Form-A ranks him as highly masculine but whose masculinity score on Form-B ranks him as low masculine has not yet developed a consistent sex role response pattern. However, degree of masculinity-femininity is not related to degree of stability. That is, a girl's rank on both Form-A and Form-B may be low feminine, but her stability score will be high because her rank changed little from test to retest.

Statistical Treatment

Test responses of the 32 children from feminist families were compared to responses of 184 children in the comparison group, using the two M-F scores and one stability score for each child. Median tests were used to determine relationships between scores of children of the

same sex. Sign tests were used to identify direction of changes from test to retest. In addition, a frequency distribution was prepared to describe the amount of overlapping choices between sexes within each group.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine the influence of the Women's Liberation Movement on the sex role development of young children. Sex role development, as measured in this study, was the degree of masculinity or femininity expressed by each child through scores on the Starkweather Masculinity-Femininity Test. The influence of the Women's Liberation Movement on children's sex role development was inferred by comparing the scores of young children from a feminist family background to the scores of young children from the general population, specifically, children enrolled in nursery schools and kindergartens.

Differences Between the Groups

Differences in test scores of masculinity-femininity and stability of sex role response should indicate the effects of different socialization techniques used by feminist parents. Table II shows distribution of test scores by medians and ranges for the two groups for both Form-A and Form-B scores. The generally broader range of distribution for the comparison group scores probably can be attributed to the larger size of the sample for the comparison group.

Results of the median tests, shown in Table III for boys and in

TABLE II
DISTRIBUTION OF TEST SCORES

Group	Scores		
	N	Median	Range
Experimental Group			
Boys:			
A Scores	16	+95	+218 to -112
B Scores	16	+54	+226 to -69
Stability	16	10.5	1 to 35
Girls:			
A Scores	16	-133	-238 to +004
B Scores	16	-98	-243 to +39
Stability	16	15.5	0 to 58
Comparison Group			
Boys:			
A Scores	92	+114.5	+254 to -129
B Scores	92	+87.5	+268 to -162
Stability	92	19	0 to 76
Girls:			
A Scores	92	-46.5	-241 to +147
B Scores	92	-87.5	-241 to +124
Stability	92	-12	0 to 53

TABLE III
ANALYSIS OF DIFFERENCES IN DISTRIBUTION OF
BOYS' SCORES BY THE MEDIAN TEST

	Experimental Group (N=32)	Comparison Group (N=184)	Total (N=216)
Form-A Scores			
Median (+092) and above	2	52	54
Below +093	14	40	54
Total	16	92	108
$X^2 = 10.565; p < .01$			
Form-B Scores			
Median (+072) and above	4	50	54
Below +072	12	42	54
Total	16	92	108
$X^2 = 4.695; p < .05$			
Stability Scores			
Median (17) and above	11	44	55
Below 17	5	48	53
Total	16	92	108
$X^2 = 2.386; p > .10$			

Table IV for girls, revealed that boys in the experimental group were significantly less sex-stereotyped in their test responses than boys in the comparison group. On Form-A scores this difference was significant at the .01 level and on Form-B at the .05 level. Girls in the feminist group, when compared to girls in the comparison group, showed no significant differences in their masculinity-femininity scores. Distribution of stability scores, also examined by median tests, showed no differences between girls in the two groups nor between boys in the two groups.

Sign tests (Table V) were performed for each group, by sex, to determine direction of changes from test to retest. Experimental boys, who have highly stable scores, predictably showed no significant change in test-retest ranked scores. Scores of boys and girls in the comparison group also showed no significant changes. This analysis did reveal a significant shift ($p < .02$) for the feminists' girls' scores, toward greater femininity on the retest.

A frequency distribution was prepared to describe the pattern of cross-sex choices, as shown in Table VI. Assuming that 000 is a dividing line between masculinity and femininity scores, thirty-one percent of the boys in the experimental group and 33 percent of the girls in the comparison group made cross-sex choices on Form-B. On Form-A their cross-sex choices were 12 percent and 35 percent, respectively. Cross-sex choices of girls in the feminist group and boys in the comparison group also were similar but much lower: 6 percent and 5 percent, respectively, on Form-A and 12 percent and 13 percent on Form-B. Measuring a larger number of children from feminist families would provide further information concerning this pattern.

TABLE IV
ANALYSIS OF DIFFERENCES IN DISTRIBUTION OF
GIRLS' SCORES BY THE MEDIAN TEST

	Experimental Group (N=32)	Comparison Group (N=184)	Total (N=216)
Form-A Scores			
Median (-54) and above	11	43	54
Below -54	05	49	54
Total	16	92	108
$X^2 = 2.64; p < .10$			
Form-B Scores			
Median (-94) and above	09	45	54
Below - 94	07	47	54
Total	16	92	108
$X^2 = 0.293; n.s.$			
Stability Scores			
Median (14) and above	07	53	60
Below 14	09	39	48
Total	16	92	108
$X^2 = 1.060; n.s.$			

TABLE V
 CHANGES IN M-F SCORES FROM TEST TO RETEST

Group	Change			Degree of Significance
	More Feminine	More Masculine	No Change	
Experimental				
Girls	12	03	1	$p < .02$
Boys	7	00	9	n.s.
Comparison				
Girls	44	04	44	n.s.
Boys	43	05	44	n.s.

TABLE VI
OVERLAPPING SCORES OF BOYS AND GIRLS

	<u>Masculine Scores</u>		<u>Feminine Scores</u>		
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	
Form-A					
Experimental Group					
Over +200	01			02	Over -200
+150 to +200	01			04	-150 to -200
+100 to +150	05		01	03	-100 to -150
+50 to +100	05			03	-50 to -100
000 to +50	02	01	01	03	000 to -50
Comparison Group					
Over +200	11			04	Over -200
+150 to +200	21			11	-150 to -200
+100 to +150	18	07	01	14	-100 to -150
+50 to +100	23	09	01	15	-50 to -100
000 to +50	14	17	03	15	000 to -50
Form-B					
Experimental Group					
Over +200	01			02	Over -200
+150 to +200				02	-150 to -200
+100 to +150	01			04	-100 to -150
+50 to +100	07		02	04	-50 to -100
000 to +50	02	02	03	02	000 to -50
Comparison Group					
Over +200	11			07	Over -200
+150 to +200	13		01	12	-150 to -200
+100 to +150	16	08		18	-100 to -150
+50 to +100	22	13	03	07	-50 to -100
000 to +50	18	10	08	17	000 to -50

Summary of Findings

1. Young boys reared by feminist parents, in comparison to boys reared by parents from the general population, make fewer high masculine, or sex-stereotyped, test responses.
2. Boys in the experimental group are highly stable in making fewer sex-stereotyped choices.
3. Scores of girls from feminist families become more feminine when measured from test to retest.
4. Neither group of boys nor the group of comparison girls showed changes from test to retest.
5. Children reared by feminists show no differences in degree of stability when compared to children in the general population.
6. A pattern is indicated of more cross-sex choices by feminists' boys and by comparison group girls.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine the influence of the Women's Liberation Movement on the sex role development of young children. Measures of sex role development were obtained through use of the Starkweather Masculinity-Femininity Test, providing scores for degree of masculinity or femininity and for stability of M-F response. Feminist influence on young children's sex role development was inferred from compared scores of children in feminist families and children in families from the general population.

Summary

Experimental subjects were 16 boys and 16 girls whose mothers were dues-paying members of organizations in Tulsa, Oklahoma and Dallas, Texas with activities reflecting a feminist ideology. These children ranged in age from three to five years. The 92 boys and 92 girls whose scores were used for comparison purposes also ranged in age from three to five years. These latter children, who attended nursery schools and kindergartens in Oklahoma City and Stillwater, Oklahoma, were presumed to represent a sample of the general population (Davidson, 1973).

Two masculinity-femininity test scores and a stability score were obtained for each subject, using the Starkweather Masculinity-Femininity

Test, a test of sex role identification in preschool children. Median tests and sign tests of the relationships among scores of the experimental and comparison groups showed these findings: (1) boys and girls from a feminist family background show less sex-stereotyping in their test responses; (2) boys reared by feminist-oriented parents were highly stable in their test responses; (3) scores of young girls reared by feminists shifted from test to retest in the direction of greater femininity; (4) girls from a feminist family background did not differ from girls in the general population in degree of stability of response; (5) boys from a feminist family background and girls in the general population made a larger number of cross-sex choices than opposite-sexed children within their own groups.

Implications of the Study

In comparison with children in the general population, young boys reared by feminist parents chose fewer test items associated with cultural sex role stereotypes. Thus, this study indicates that feminists are making measurable progress toward their goal of enlarging children's sex role development beyond stereotyped expectations of masculinity and femininity. The sons of feminists are free to make a broad range of choices based on individual preferences rather than to restrict themselves to a narrow range of choices the larger culture associates with biological sex groups.

The greater sex role flexibility expressed by male children of feminists may be attributed to the sex role socialization practices of feminist-oriented families. The children tested in this study are being reared by parents who consciously and deliberately attempt to display

non-stereotyped sex role behavior. Moreover, these parents, through their participation in organizations which provide information on non-sexist socialization, can give their children a broader range of materials and activities to encourage sex role flexibility. When these children themselves display role-innovative behavior, they are more likely to receive social approval and reinforcement than children in the general population.

Girls in feminist families initially expressed what might be considered a trend ($p < .10$) toward greater sex role flexibility than girls from the general population, but on a retest the feminists' girls were equally as feminine in their responses. This shift in scores was further supported by evidence from the sign test. There are alternative interpretations of this shift in scores of the young girls from feminist families. One explanation is that they are not secure in deviating from cultural sex role standards and therefore selected more "role appropriate" items on the retest, in order to avoid anxiety they may have experienced in making role-innovative choices on the first test. Such a subjective interpretation would be difficult to evaluate. Alternatively, it may be that differences between the role expectations within their families and the expectations of the larger community may expose daughters of feminists to contradictory role modeling and reinforcements. The shift in scores may thus reflect confusion or even role conflict.

A third explanation is that the shift in scores may represent another aspect of sex role flexibility. That is, children of feminists may be so free from the need to conform to any sex role expectation that their choices can on one test occasion reflect an interest in culturally accepted masculine items and on the second occasion their interest may

shift to more feminine items. If boys from feminist families also show a significant shift in scores with future uses of the Starkweather M-F Test, the possibility that sex role flexibility is associated with fluctuating scores would be strengthened.

If the retest scores are accepted as more indicative of children's preferred sex role choices, an additional interpretation based on feminist ideology is available. In the context of a male-biased culture, young girls who choose many low-feminine items may not be expressing sex role flexibility; they may instead be expressing rejection of the undervalued feminine role. But girls reared by feminist parents may be observing a more balanced valuation of the sexes than do girls in the general population. Consequently, they have less reason to reject feminine behavior. Yet they still have models for rejecting the restrictive, stereotyped feminine role. Consequently, their more feminine choices on Form-B may reflect a positive valuation of femininity.

Many parallels have been described between the Women's Liberation Movement and the Civil Rights Movement for Black people's liberation. The last interpretation discussed above provides still another. Several decades ago, researchers discovered that young black children preferred white dolls to black, rejecting their own racial identity (Clark and Clark, 1939). In the language used to describe race ideology, young black children raised in the context of a white supremacist culture preferred the greater status and power associated with being white. Since the rise of the Civil Rights Movement and the theme of "Black is Beautiful," young black children have changed their responses to the doll choice test, indicating a "significant increase in own-race preference and identification (Fox and Jordan, 1973, p. 282)."

The present study shows a similar influence of the Women's Liberation Movement on sex role identity of young girls, and has additional implications concerning the interpretations of previous research showing that fathers are more significant influencers of their daughters' sex role development (Biller and Weiss, 1970). The present study implies that the greater influence of fathers may be related to traditional sex role ideology, which values masculine characteristics more than it values feminine traits and which gives greater status and power to males.

In practice, a male-biased culture may affect girls' observational learning through the greater attention focused on male models. Imitating male power figures may be a highly reinforcing activity for girls, just as imitating white power figures once was reinforcing for black children. In a sexist culture, then, children of both sexes may be more likely to prefer the higher valued sex role model, and on a test of sex role preference, children will therefore show a preference for items associated with the cultural male role. In the present study, girls from the feminist group who chose more items associated with femininity on the retest could be expressing greater valuation of behaviors ascribed to women. Boys in the feminist group, by rejecting stereotyped masculinity, also show a greater valuation of "feminine" behavior.

Future studies of the sex role preferences of young children reared by feminists might profitably include an item analysis to determine which behaviors in the feminine role are more preferred by sons and daughters of feminist parents. If the several pictures of babies are indeed associated with nurturant behavior, researchers could examine whether boys from feminist families value nurturance more than boys in

the general population. Similar analysis could be done with other categories of items, so that test response patterns of individual children then could be compared to observed patterns of their behavior. Do young boys who choose pictures of babies actually display more nurturant behavior toward the life in their environments? Especially, is their play less destructive than that of boys from the general population? What is the actual behavior of girls who reject items associated with nurturance?

Affiliative behavior, another positive human trait culturally associated with the female role, could also be studied through item analysis. Several of the pictures in the Starkweather Masculinity-Femininity Test show children together. Do children from feminist families show a greater preference for such pictures than children from families in the general population? Is a preference for such pictures associated with observations of social interaction? What is the relationship between a high frequency of affiliative/nurturant behavior in young children and the frequency of assertive behavior or mastery behavior?

Information gained from research into the questions suggested above could assist parents and other adults in their task of socializing children. Every parent wants to promote development of a healthy personality in children; the feminist movement has raised serious doubts about existing conceptions of a healthy personality. Comparing scores and response patterns from the Starkweather Masculinity-Femininity Test to scores on other personality tests and to observed behavior can aid in answering the doubts raised by feminists and can contribute to an understanding of the relationships between sex role and identity, between sex role and a healthy personality.

However, since the present study is based on the responses of a small number of children, it should be considered a pilot study which indicates simply that children reared by feminist parents do differ in their sex role preferences from children reared by families in the general population. Additional research with a larger population of feminists' children is needed for stronger support of the conclusion that feminists are influencing the sex role development of their young children. And, as the study focused only on children, measuring the characteristics of parents also would provide more information concerning differential sex role socialization techniques of feminists. Finally, if a population of men actively involved in resocialization of the male role could be identified, additional changes in the sex role development of young children might be discovered.

If the described differences in sex role choices of feminists' children are anticipating future behavior norms, then future sex roles may be broader in behavioral content and healthier for personality development. Children socialized to avoid narrow, sex-stereotyped personalities may develop a broader range of alternatives for self-esteem. M. Lewis (1971) believes that having to cut ourselves off from human behaviors not included in our sex role prescription creates neurosis in all of us. The required suppression of affiliative and nurturant behavior in males results in a single-minded, unhealthy stress on mastery, says Lewis (ibid.) and similar suppression of achievement behavior in girls makes their emphasis on affiliative/nurturant behavior also an unhealthy pattern of behavior. Mednick and Tangri (1972), noting that a stereotyped feminine role is associated with large families and conspicuous consumption of goods, suggest that enlarging the female role

can influence a reduction in the world's population growth and limit consumption of the world's decreasing supplies. These authors also describe the over-socialization of males into sex-stereotyped behaviors of aggression, dominance, and control as having a negative impact on the world through exploitation of resources, group hostility, and wars.

Results of the present study give hope to feminists' desires for their children to be free from the restrictions of sex role stereotyping. Just as young girls cannot be healthy unless they acquire the "masculine" behaviors of assertiveness, independence and competency, young boys cannot be healthy unless they can value and display the human behaviors our culture calls "feminine"--emotionality, sensitivity, empathy, and nurturance. That feminists are influencing their sons' sex role choices in the direction of greater flexibility is particularly encouraging, since women's opportunities cannot be expanded beyond their present minority status unless men can avoid the "masculine" behaviors of dominance and control and learn to support autonomy in other people by valuing nurturant, "feminine," behavior in themselves. As Huber says, "At the heart of the women's movement lies a wish to share the delights and joys of motherhood (1973, p. 3)."

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Angrist, S. Study of sex roles. Journal of Social Issues. 1969, 25, 1, 219-222.
- Balswick, J. O. & Peek, C. W. The inexpressive male. Family Coordinator. 1971, 20, 4, 363-368.
- Bandura, A. (Ed.). Psychological Modeling. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton, 1971.
- Bandura, A., Ross, D. and Ross, S. A. A comparative test of status envy, social power, and the secondary reinforcement theories of identificatory learning. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. 1963, 67, 6, 527-534.
- Bardwick, J. Psychology of Women, a Study of Bio-Cultural Conflicts. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.
- Bardwick, J. M. & Douvan, E. Ambivalence: The socialization of women. In Gornick, V. & Moran, B. K. (Eds.). Woman in Sexist Society, Studies in Power and Powerlessness. New York: New American Library, 1971.
- Barnard, C. N. Wilma Scott Heide: The voice of NOW. Human Behavior, 1973, 2, 7, 17-20.
- Bem, S. L. The measurement of androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology. 1974, 42, 2, 155-162.
- Bem, S. L. and Bem, D. J. Training the woman to know her place: The power of a nonconscious ideology. In Bem, D. J. (Ed.). Beliefs, Attitudes and Human Affairs. Belmont, Calif.: Brooks-Cole, 1970.
- Benedict, R. Continuities and discontinuities in cultural conditioning. Psychiatry. 1938, 2, 161-167.
- Bergman, J. Are little girls being harmed by Sesame Street? In Stacey, J., Bereaud, S. and Daniels, J. (Eds.). And Jill Came Tumbling After: Sexism in American Education. New York: Dell Books, 1974.
- Bernard, J. The status of women in modern patterns of culture. American Academy of Political and Social Science, The Annals. 1968, 375, 3-14.

- Bernard, J. Sex differences: an overview. Paper presented at the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Washington, D. C., December, 1972.
- Bijou, S. W. & Baer, D. M. Child Development, Vol. I. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961.
- Biller, H. B. & Weiss, S. D. The father-daughter relationship and the personality development of the female. Journal of Genetic Psychology. 1970, 116, 79-93.
- Boserup, E. Women's Role in Economic Development. New York: St. Martin's, 1970.
- Breitbart, V. Day Care Who Cares? Somerville, Mass.: New England Free Press, 1970.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. Freudian theories of identification and their derivations. Child Development. 1960, 31, 15-40.
- Broverman, I., Vogel, S. R., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., and Rosenkrantz, P. S. Sex-role stereotypes: A current appraisal. Journal of Social Issues. 1972, 28, 2, 59-68.
- Carlson, R. Understanding women: implications for personality theory and research. Journal of Social Issues. 1972, 28, 2, 17-32.
- Cherniss, C. Personality and ideology: a personological study of women's liberation. Psychiatry. 1972, 35, 2, 109-125.
- Chodorow, N. Being and doing: a cross-cultural examination of the socialization of males and females. In Stacey, J., Bereaud, S., & Daniels, J. (Eds.). And Jill Came Tumbling After: Sexism in American Education. New York: Dell Books, 1974.
- Clark, K. B. & Clark, M. K. The development of consciousness of self and the emergence of racial identification in Negro preschool children. Journal of Social Psychology. 1939, 10, 591-599.
- Clavan, S. Women's liberation and the family. Family Coordinator. 1970, 19, 317-322.
- Comer, V. Poem. Women: A Journal of Liberation. 1970, 1, 4, p. 33.
- Davidson, S. K. Creativity in early childhood: The relationship between sex role identification and behavioral independence. Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1973.
- Elman, J., Press, A., & Rosenkrantz, P. Sex-roles and self-concepts: Real and ideal. Eric Documents, 1970. ED 043 073.
- Farrell, W. Men's liberation. Scholastic Teacher, supplement to Senior Scholastic. 1973, 103, 8, 14-17.

- Feinman, S. Approval of cross-sex behavior. Psychological Reports. 1974, 35, 1, Pt. 2, 643-648.
- Ferguson, L. R. Origins of sex-role development in infancy. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly. 1971, 17, 2, 119-137.
- Fox, D. J. & Jordan, V. B. Racial preference and identification of Black-American, Chinese, and White children. Genetic Psychology Monographs. 1973, 88, 2, 229-286.
- Freedman, D. G., Loving, C. B. & Markin, R. M. Emotional behavior and personality development. In Brackbill, Y. (Ed.). Infancy and Early Childhood. New York: Free Press, 1967.
- Freeman, J. The women's liberation movement: Its origins, structures, and ideas. Pittsburgh, Penna: KNOW, Inc., 1971.
- Fromm, E. Social psychological theories. In Hall, C. (Ed.). Theories of Personality. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1957.
- Gersoni-Stavn, D. (Ed.). Sexism and Youth. New York: R. R. Bowker & Co., 1974.
- Goldberg, H. Men's lib: The psychological pressures on the american male. Human Behavior. 1973, 2, 4, 72-75.
- Goode, W. J. A theory of role strain. American Sociological Review. 1960, 25, 4, 483-96.
- Gordon, L. Families. Somerville, Mass.: New England Free Press, 1970.
- Gould, J. & Kolb, W. L. (Ed.). A Dictionary of the Social Sciences. New York: United Nations Educational, Scientific, & Cultural Organization - Free Press, 1965.
- Greenleaf, P. T. Liberating Young Children From Sex Roles. Somerville, Mass.: New England Free Press, 1972.
- Harrison, B. Feminist experiment in education. The New Republic. 1972, 66, 11, 13-17.
- Hartley, R. A developmental view of feminine sex role definition and identification. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly. 1964, 10.
- Hartley, R. Sex role pressures and the socialization of the male child. Psychological Reports. 1959, 5, 457-468.
- Hochschild, A. R. A review of sex role research. In Huber, J. (Ed.). Changing Women in a Changing Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.
- Hoffman, L. W. Early childhood experiences and women's achievement motives. Journal of Social Issues. 1972, 28, 2, 129-156.

- Howe, F. Educating women: No more sugar and spice. Pittsburgh, Penna.: KNOW, INC., 1971.
- Huber, J. (Ed.). Changing Women in a Changing Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.
- Iglitzen, L. B. A child's eye view of sex roles. Today's Education. 1972, 61, 9, 23-25.
- Janeway, E. Man's World, Woman's Place: A Statement of Social Mythology. New York: William Morrow Co., 1971.
- Joffe, C. Sex role socialization and the nursery school: As the twig is bent. Journal of Marriage and the Family. 1971, 33, 3, 467-475.
- Kagan, J., Hosken, B., & Watson, S. Child's symbolic conceptualization of parents. Child Development. 1961, 32, 625-636.
- Kagan, J. Acquisition and significance of sex typing and sex role identity. In Hoffman, M. L. & Hoffman, L. W. (Eds.). Review of Child Development Research. New York: Russell Sage, 1964.
- Kasten, K. Toward a psychology of being: A masculine mystique. Journal of Humanistic Psychology. 1972, 12, 2, 23-43.
- Klapper, Z. The impact of women's liberation movement on child development books. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry. 1971, 41, 5, 725-731.
- Knox, W. E. & Kupferer, H. J. Discontinuity in the socialization of males in the U. S. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly. 1971, 17, 3, 251-261.
- Komarovsky, M. Cultural contradictions and sex roles: The masculine case. In Huber, J. (Ed.). Changing Women in a Changing Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.
- Lancaster, J. B. In praise of the achieving female monkey. Psychology Today. 1973, 7, 4, 30-36.
- Lewis, M. Sex stereotypical behavior in infants: An analysis of social-interpersonal relationships. ERIC Documents, 1971. ED 057 904.
- Little Miss Muffet Fights Back. New York: Feminists on Children's Media, 1969.
- Lynn, D. The process of learning parent and sex role identification. Journal of Marriage and Family. 1966, 28, 466-470.
- Lyon, N. A report on children's toys and socialization to sex roles. MS., 1972, 1, 6, p. 57.

- Marx, Karen G. Cross-cultural study of the relationship between preschool children's masculinity-femininity and their conformity to their mothers. Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1969.
- Maslow, A. H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper Bros., 1954.
- McCandless, B. R. Child Behavior and Development. Hinsdale, Ill.: Dryden Press, 1967.
- McKenzie, D. R. Cross-cultural comparison of masculinity-femininity in preschool children. Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1966.
- Mednick, M. S. & Tangri, S. S. New psychological perspectives on women. Journal of Social Issues, 1972. 28, 2, 1-16.
- Millett, K. Sexual Politics. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1970.
- Millman, M. Observations on sex role research. Journal of Marriage and Family. 1971, 33, 772-776.
- Minturn, L. & Lambert, W. Mothers of Six Cultures: Antecedents of Child-Rearing. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1964.
- Mitchell, G., Redican, W. K., & Gomber, J. Lessons from a primate: Males can raise babies. Psychology Today. 1971, 7, 10, 63-69.
- Money, J. Sexually dimorphic behavior, normal and abnormal. In Kretschmer, N. & Walker, D. N. (Eds.). Environmental Influences on Genetic Expression of Biological and Behavioral Aspects of Sexual Differentiation. Eric Documents, 19 . ED 062 641.
- Mussen, P. H. Early sex-role development. In Goslin, D. A. (Ed.). Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research. Chicago, Rand McNally & Co., 1969.
- Myrdal, G. How scientific are the social sciences? Journal of Social Issues. 1972, 28, 4, 151-170.
- Oetzel, R. Bibliography of sex role research. In Maccoby, E. (Ed.). Development of Sex Differences. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1966.
- Palme, O. The emancipation of men. Journal of Social Issues. 1972, 28, 2, 237-246.
- Parson, T. & Bales, R. Family Socialization and Interaction Process. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press of Glencoe, 1955.

- Pitcher, E. G. Male and female. In Stacey, J., Bereaud, S., & Daniels, J. (Eds.). And Jill Came Tumbling After: Sexism in American Education. New York: Dell Books, 1974.
- Pogrebin, L. C. Toys for free children. In Gersoni-Stavn, D. (Ed.). Sexism and Youth. New York: R. R. Bowker Co., 1974.
- Ross, D. M. & Ross, S. A. Resistance by preschool boys to sex-inappropriate behavior. Journal of Educational Psychology. 1972, 18, 4, 342-46.
- Rubin, J., Provenzano, F. & Luria, Z. The eye of the beholder: Parents' views on sex of newborns. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry. 1974, 44, 4, 512-519.
- Sanger, S. P. & Alker, H. A. Dimensions of internal-external locus of control and the women's liberation movement. Journal of Social Issues. 1972, 28, 4, 115-127.
- Sarbin, T. Role theory. In Lindzey, G. (Ed.). Handbook of Social Psychology. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison Wesley, 1954.
- Sarbin, T. Psychological aspects of role. In Sills, D. L. (Ed.). International Encyclopedia of Social Science. New York: MacMillan Co. - Free Press, 1968.
- Schleflen, A. E. Body Language and the Social Order. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.
- Schlossberg, N. K. & Goodman, J. A woman's place: Children's sex stereotyping of occupations. Vocational Guidance Quarterly. 1972, 20, 4, 266-270.
- Selcer, B. How liberated are "liberated" children? Radical Therapist. 1972, p. 14-15. In Stacey, J., Bereaud, S. & Daniels, J. (Eds.). And Jill Came Tumbling After: Sexism in American Education. New York: Dell Books, 1974.
- Seward, G. & Williamson, R. Sex Roles in Changing Society. New York: Random House, 1970.
- Sieber, S. D. Toward a theory of role accumulation. American Sociological Review. 1974, 39, 4, 567-78.
- Stacey, J. Bereaud, S. & Daniels, J. (Eds.). And Jill Came Tumbling After: Sexism in American Education. New York: Dell Books, 1974.
- Starkweather, E. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Family Relations and Child Development, Oklahoma State University, 1974.
- Steinem, G. How will we raise our children in the year 2000? Saturday Review of Education. 1973, 1, 2, p. 30.

- Tangri, S. S. Determinants of occupational role innovation among college women. Journal of Social Issues. 1972, 28, 2, 177-199.
- Tavris, C. A conversation with Harry Harlowe. Psychology Today. 1973, 6, 11, 64-77.
- Tidball, M. E. Perspectives of academic women and affirmative action. Educational Record. 1973, 54, 2, 130-135.
- Tobach, E. Some evolutionary aspects of human gender. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry. 1971, 41, 5, 710-715.
- Torrance, P. Changing reactions of preadolescent girls to tasks requiring creative scientific thinking. Journal of Genetic Psychology. 1973, 102, 2, 217-223.
- Turner, R. H. Sociological aspects of role. In Sills, D. L. (Ed.). International Encyclopedia of Social Science. New York: Macmillan Co. - Free Press, 1968.
- Veblen, T. The Theory of the Leisure Class. London: 1899. Reprinted by Augustus M. Kelley: Clifton, N. J.
- Vener, A. M. & Snyder, C. A. The preschool child's awareness of and anticipation of adult sex roles. Sociometry. 1966, 29, 2, 159-168.
- Vincent, C. E. Implications of changes in male-female role expectations for interpreting M-F scores. Journal of Marriage and Family. 1966, 28, 2, 196-199.
- Vogel, S., Broverman, I., & Evans-Gardner, J. Sesame Street and sex role stereotyping. In Gersoni-Stavn, D. (Ed.). Sexism and Youth. New York: R. R. Bowker Press, 1974.
- Vroegh, K. & Handrich, M. Sex role typing in the preschool years: An overview. Eric Documents, 1966. ED 026 134.
- Weisstein, N. "Kinde, kuche, Kirche" as scientific law: Psychology constructs the female. In Morgan, R. (Ed.). Sisterhood Is Powerful. New York: Random House, 1970.
- Weitzman, L. J., Eifler, D., Hokada, E., & Ross, C. Sex role socialization in picture books for preschool children. American Journal of Sociology. 1972, 77, 6, 1125-1150.
- West, A. G. Exploding the fairy princess and other myths. Scholastic Teacher, supplement to Senior Scholastic. 1971, 99, 7, 6-13.
- White, Sharon K. A study of masculinity-femininity and its relation to independent behavior in preschool children. Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1967.

Will, J., Self, P. & Datan, N. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association meeting, New Orleans, La., August, 1974.

Wolfe, T. A field experiment of live modeled sex-inappropriate play behavior. Paper presented at the Eastern Psychological Association Meeting, New York, April, 1972.

APPENDIX A

FEMINIST PUBLICATIONS

FEMINIST PUBLICATIONS

Children's Liberation Workshop
 P. O. Box 207
 Toronto, Canada

Writing nonsexist children's books. List available.

Feminists on Children's Media
 P. O. Box 4315
 Grand Central Station
 New York City, N. Y. 10017

List of materials available from various feminist organizations. Also, annotated bibliographies on children's books, and a list of nonsexist literature. Can provide a multimedia program.

The Feminist Press
 SUNY College at Old Westbury
 P. O. Box 334
 Old Westbury, New York 11568

Publishes nonsexist children's books. Bibliography of adult literature on women.

International Institute of Women Studies
 1615 Myrtle Street
 Washington, D. C. 20012

A scientific and educational institution designed to sponsor and encourage empirical and theoretical work on women's nature and behavior in all disciplines. Publishes CHITRA, a journal, and also a newsletter.

Journal of Sex Role Research
 Dr. Phyllis A. Katz
 CUNY - Graduate Center
 33 West 42nd Street
 New York City, N. Y. 10036

To begin publication in early 1975.

The Joyful World Press
 Shirley Boccaccio
 486 Belvedere Street
 San Francisco, Calif. 9417

Source for nonsexist books and publications.

KNOW, Inc.
 P. O. Box 10197
 Pittsburgh, Penna. 15221

Many inexpensive reprints of widely used articles on women, sex roles, feminist philosophy, and movement herstory. List available.

Lollipop Power, Inc.
 P. O. Box 1171
 Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27541

Publishes original nonsexist children's literature, especially for young children.

Resource Center on Sex Roles in Education
 1156 15th Street, N.W.
 Washington, D. C.

Originally a task force of National Education Association.

Up Haste Bookstore
 2506 B. Haste Street
 Berkeley, Calif. 94704

Publishes Children Are People, Too.

Women Studies Abstracts
 142 Farmcrest Drive
 Rush, New York 14543

A quarterly abstract service on research, writing, teaching about women.

Women on Words and Images
 P. O. Box 2163
 Princeton, New Jersey 08540

Another NOW Task Force. Published Dick and Jane As Victims, a content analysis of beginning readers' sexist orientation. Useful for all levels in its categorization of sexist behaviors modeled for young children.

APPENDIX B

THE STARKWEATHER MASCULINITY-FEMININITY TEST
FOR PRESCHOOL CHILDREN

STARKWEATHER MASCULINITY-FEMININITY TEST
FOR PRESCHOOL CHILDREN¹

A Test of Sex-Role Identification

developed by

Elizabeth K. Starkweather
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma

The Starkweather Masculinity-Femininity Test (M-F Test) measures the masculine and feminine preferences of preschool children. The test is designed so that the evaluation of what is masculine and what is feminine is based on the actual choices of the children being tested. The assumption underlying this design is that the behavior of boys is boy-behavior (masculine) and the behavior of girls is girl-behavior (feminine).

Two comparable forms of the Starkweather M-F Test have been developed, Form-A and Form-B. The materials for each form include a picture booklet of 20 pages (the test booklet) and individually mounted pictures, identical to those in the booklet. The pages in the test booklet are of colored hi-gloss paper approximately 3" x 8" in size. A variety of colors is available and no color is used for more than two pages in either booklet. On each page there are three pictures (gummed seals) which are arbitrarily selected as masculine, feminine, and neutral. This placement of masculine and feminine pictures on each page is done for the purpose of maximizing the power of the test to discriminate between the preferences of boys and girls. The pictures themselves are commercially produced gummed seals and are selected to include a variety of objects such as animals, cars, babies, flowers, cowboys, and Mother Goose figures. The individually mounted pictures are placed on small pieces of hi-gloss paper, approximately 2" x 3", which are the same color as the test booklet pages on which the pictures appear.

The administration of the two forms of the Starkweather M-F Test, as a test and a retest with an interval of no more than one week between the two, provides (1) two M-F test scores, which indicate the extent to which a child's picture preferences are masculine or feminine, and (2) a stability score, which indicates the stability of a child's preferences from one test to the next and which is an index of the extent to which a child has identified with the sex-role suggested by his expressed masculinity or femininity. These scores are illustrated in Table (Q).

¹The Starkweather M-F Test was developed as part of a creativity research program supported by the Research Foundation at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma.

TABLE (Q)

EXAMPLES OF STABILITY SCORES CALCULATED FROM
RESPONSES TO FORM-A AND FORM-B OF
THE STARKWEATHER M-F TEST

	Form-A		Form-B		Stability Score
	Score	Rank*	Score	Rank*	
<u>High Stability</u>					
Child M-2059	+224	04	+268	01	03
Child M-1915	+085	57	+059	56	01
Child F-1752	-216	03	-216	05	02
Child F-2046	-026	52	-053	58	06
<u>Low Stability</u>					
Child M-2008	+195	14	+039	65	51
Child M-1978	+053	70	+230	03	67
Child F-1958	-133	20	-019	66	46
Child F-1966	+010	66	-127	28	38

* Each child's rank is his or her position in a group of 92 like-sexed children.

Administration

The Starkweather M-F Test is designed for administration to individual children. Each child is introduced to the test by being told that he is going to make a picture booklet of her very own. She is then shown the first page of the test booklet and is asked, "Which one of these pictures do you want?" The child makes her selection and is then given an identical picture, one of the individually mounted pictures, as the first page for her own picture book. This procedure is repeated until the child has chosen one picture from each of the 20 pages in the test booklet.

The two forms of the M-F Test are administered during two separate sessions with the child. Form-A is always administered first, and then after an interval of no more than one week, Form-B is administered.

Scoring

The scoring of the Starkweather M-F Test is designed to eliminate the bias of adult judgments. Each picture in the test booklet is assigned a score, a masculine or feminine value, which is determined by the actual choices of the children in the study. For example, a picture chosen by a majority of the boys and by few of the girls is weighted heavily as masculine. The M-F score for an individual child is then calculated by adding the masculine and feminine values of all the pictures that she has chosen.

The original method of calculating the masculine and feminine values of individual pictures is illustrated in Table (R). The vertical columns in this table represent pictures from an M-F Test booklet used in several studies in which an equal number of boys and girls participated. When this was the case, the score values assigned to the pictures were calculated by subtracting the number of girls from the number of boys who chose each picture. In the 1968 DKM study, the pony, chosen by 63 boys and 23 girls, was assigned a masculine value of +40; and the baby, chosen by 15 boys and 46 girls, was assigned a feminine value of -31. These assigned values were only for use in scoring the M-F responses of the children who participated in that study. In the 1969 KGM study, the assigned numerical values for these same pictures were smaller because fewer children participated in the study; nevertheless, the relative values remained the same; the pony was masculine (+20) and the baby was feminine (-17). When an unequal number of boys and girls participated in the 1967 SKW study, weighting to correct for the inequality was achieved by multiplying the number of girls who chose each picture by 1.133; n.b., $17 \div = 1.133$.

Standard scores for the M-F Test were developed through the Davidson (1973) study. From the scores of 192 children, polar scores were selected. Polar scores represented preferences of boys and girls who differentiated themselves the most from children of the opposite sex.

TABLE (R)
 METHOD OF CALCULATING MASCULINE AND FEMININE
 VALUES FOR INDIVIDUAL PICTURES IN
 THE STARKWEATHER M-F TEST

<u>1967 SKW Study</u>	<u>Rooster</u>	<u>Chipmunk</u>	<u>Baby</u>
Boys (N = 17)	5	9	3
Girls (N = 15)	5	3	7
Girls (weighted)	<u>5.67</u>	<u>3.40</u>	<u>7.93</u>
Assigned Value	-0.67	+5.60	-4.93
<u>1968 DKM Study</u>	<u>Pony</u>	<u>Butterfly</u>	<u>Baby</u>
Boys (N = 90)	63	12	15
Girls (N = 90)	<u>23</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>46</u>
Assigned Value	+40	-09	-31
<u>1969 KGM Study</u>	<u>Pony</u>	<u>Butterfly</u>	<u>Baby</u>
Boys (N = 48)	35	09	04
Girls (N = 48)	<u>15</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>21</u>
Assigned Value	+20	-03	-17

These standard scores were further refined by identifying only those children whose polar scores on Form-A and Form-B were close enough to give them a high stability score. Thus, standard scores refer to highly stable, highly sex differentiated positions on a continuum of masculinity-femininity. Standard scores used for the present study are shown in Table (S).

The attached score sheet for Child F-3114 illustrates both the procedure for recording scores and the method of calculating the subject's total M-F score for one form of the test. Each of the 20 pages in the test booklets has three pictures. The high feminine girl whose responses are shown on the score sheet chose the kitten on page 10 of Form-A. By referring to the Table (S), her standard score of -15 for that response is identified and recorded. When each response has been scored, a total score is obtained and recorded. Child F-3114 received a total score of -194 for Form-A.

Tables (T and U) show conversion tables used to obtain stability scores of subjects in the Davidson (1973) study. These conversion tables are based on the combined and ranked scores of children from earlier studies which used the Starkweather M-F Test. The following procedure was used to obtain a subject's stability score. First, a subject's total score on Form-A was located in the Form-A column, then the adjacent percentile rank was located as her rank score for Form-A. Thus, if a girl in the Davidson study made a total score of -118 on Form-A, her rank for that form was 28. In the same way, her Form-B total score was located in the Form-B column and the adjacent percentile rank number was located as her rank score for that form. Thus, if her Form-B score was -098, her rank score was 46. The numerical difference between her two rank scores ($46 - 28 = 18$) gave her a stability score of 18. For the present study, new conversion tables were developed by adding scores of subjects from the Davidson (1973) study to Tables (T and U).

Reliability

A split-half correlation, using the Spearman-Brown modified formula, was used to check the reliability (internal consistency) of the two forms of the Starkweather M-F Test. In this analysis, for the first and last ten pages of the test booklets, scores were calculated which indicated the frequency with which a child chose pictures which were preferred by children of his own sex. For example, on Form-A of the test, Child F-1954 chose the picture preferred by girls five times during the first half of the test and eight times during the last half. This child's M-F score was -130, a moderately high-feminine score.

In Table (V), correlation coefficients for the two forms of the M-F Test are presented. Both forms show statistically significant reliability when the responses of the boys and girls are combined. However, when the data for boys and girls are analyzed separately, the correlation coefficients indicate that the test has greater reliability for the girls than for the boys.

TABLE (S)
 SCORE VALUES OF INDIVIDUAL PICTURES
 OF THE STARKWEATHER M-F TEST

Form-A				Form-B			
Page	Pictures			Page	Pictures		
1.	+11	-17	+06	1.	+08	-09	+01
2.	+08	+03	-11	2.	-13	-01	+14
3.	00	+14	-14	3.	+01	+13	-14
4.	+16	-04	-12	4.	+17	-01	-16
5.	-12	-19	+17	5.	-04	-13	+17
6.	+02	+05	-07	6.	-04	+14	-10
7.	+14	-19	-05	7.	+16	-13	-03
8.	-11	-05	+16	8.	-04	-12	+16
9.	-08	+05	+03	9.	-07	-06	+13
10.	+16	-01	-15	10.	+08	+03	-11
11.	+09	-17	+08	11.	+08	-22	+14
12.	-18	+13	+05	12.	-06	-02	+08
13.	+12	-08	-04	13.	+15	-20	+05
14.	-06	-02	+08	14.	-08	-11	+19
15.	-16	+18	-02	15.	+04	+11	-15
16.	+15	+04	-19	16.	+14	+01	-15
17.	+02	-13	+11	17.	+03	-18	+15
18.	-11	+22	-11	18.	-10	+15	-05
19.	+17	-10	-07	19.	+18	-12	-06
20.	-14	-01	+15	20.	-13	-07	+20

STARKWEATHER MASCULINITY-FEMININITY TEST
FOR PRESCHOOL CHILDREN

Name Child F 3114 No. F 3114
Date 9-16-74 Birthdate 5-6-70 Age 4
Testing Place Home Test Form A

	<u>Pictures</u>	<u>Score</u>		<u>Pictures</u>	<u>Score</u>
1.	<u>✓</u>	<u>-17</u>	11.	<u>✓</u>	<u>-17</u>
2.	<u>✓</u>	<u>+03</u>	12.	<u>✓</u>	<u>-18</u>
3.	<u>✓</u>	<u>-14</u>	13.	<u>✓</u>	<u>-08</u>
4.	<u>✓</u>	<u>+16</u>	14.	<u>✓</u>	<u>-02</u>
5.	<u>✓</u>	<u>-19</u>	15.	<u>✓</u>	<u>-16</u>
6.	<u>✓</u>	<u>-11</u>	16.	<u>✓</u>	<u>-19</u>
7.	<u>✓</u>	<u>+05</u>	17.	<u>✓</u>	<u>-13</u>
8.	<u>✓</u>	<u>-11</u>	18.	<u>✓</u>	<u>-11</u>
9.	<u>✓</u>	<u>+05</u>	19.	<u>✓</u>	<u>-07</u>
10.	<u>✓</u>	<u>-15</u>	20.	<u>✓</u>	<u>-14</u>

TOTAL: -194

TABLE (T)

STARKWEATHER MASCULINITY-FEMININITY TEST: CONVERSION TABLES
 USED TO ESTABLISH STABILITY SCORES FOR GIRLS

Rank	Form-A M-F Score	Form-B M-F Score	Rank	Form-A M-F Score	Form-B M-F Score
1	-255	-260	51	-046	-088
2	-241	-241	52	-044	-086
3	-227	-234	53	-041	-084
4	-213	-228	54	-038	-081
5	-199	-222	55	-035	-078
6	-193	-215	56	-031	-076
7	-188	-208	57	-027	-074
8	-183	-201	58	-023	-072
9	-178	-195	59	-018	-070
10	-173	-189	60	-013	-067
11	-170	-184	61	-011	-062
12	-167	-179	62	-008	-057
13	-165	-174	63	-005	-052
14	-163	-169	64	-002	-046
15	-161	-164	65	+001	-040
16	-155	-161	66	+002	-038
17	-149	-158	67	+004	-035
18	-144	-156	68	+006	-032
19	-139	-154	69	+008	-029
20	-134	-152	70	+010	-026
21	-132	-149	71	+014	-024
22	-130	-146	72	+018	-022
23	-128	-143	73	+022	-019
24	-126	-141	74	+026	-016
25	-124	-139	75	+030	-013
26	-122	-137	76	+032	-010
27	-120	-135	77	+034	-007
28	-118	-133	78	+036	-004
29	-116	-131	79	+039	-001
30	-115	-130	80	+042	+002
31	-108	-128	81	+046	+005
32	-102	-126	82	+050	+008
33	-096	-124	83	+054	+011
34	-090	-122	84	+058	+014
35	-084	-120	85	+062	+018
36	-083	-118	86	+067	+022
37	-082	-116	87	+073	+026
38	-081	-114	88	+079	+030
39	-080	-113	89	+085	+034
40	-079	-112	90	+091	+038
41	-074	-109	91	+099	+043
42	-069	-107	92	+107	+048
43	-064	-105	93	+115	+054
44	-060	-103	94	+123	+060
45	-056	-101	95	+131	+066
46	-054	-098	96	+135	+080
47	-052	-096	97	+139	+094
48	-050	-094	98	+143	+109
49	-049	-092	99	+147	+124
50	-048	-090	100	+262	+285

TABLE (U)

STARKWEATHER MASCULINITY-FEMININITY TEST: CONVERSION TABLES
 USED TO ESTABLISH STABILITY SCORES FOR BOYS

Rank	Form-A M-F Score	Form-B M-F Score	Rank	Form-A M-F Score	Form-B M-F Score
1	+262	+285	51	+112	+080
2	+254	+268	52	+109	+078
3	+243	+253	53	+106	+076
4	+232	+238	54	+103	+074
5	+221	+224	55	+099	+072
6	+217	+220	56	+097	+070
7	+213	+217	57	+095	+068
8	+209	+214	58	+093	+066
9	+206	+211	59	+091	+064
10	+203	+208	60	+089	+062
11	+201	+205	61	+088	+061
12	+199	+202	62	+087	+060
13	+197	+200	63	+086	+058
14	+196	+198	64	+085	+056
15	+195	+196	65	+083	+054
16	+193	+192	66	+080	+052
17	+191	+188	67	+077	+049
18	+189	+184	68	+074	+046
19	+188	+180	69	+070	+043
20	+187	+176	70	+066	+040
21	+182	+172	71	+064	+038
22	+178	+169	72	+062	+036
23	+174	+166	73	+060	+034
24	+170	+163	74	+057	+031
25	+166	+160	75	+055	+028
26	+164	+155	76	+054	+026
27	+162	+150	77	+053	+024
28	+160	+145	78	+052	+022
29	+158	+141	79	+051	+020
30	+157	+137	80	+050	+017
31	+156	+134	81	+049	+015
32	+155	+131	82	+048	+013
33	+154	+128	83	+047	+010
34	+153	+125	84	+045	+007
35	+152	+123	85	+043	+004
36	+149	+120	86	+041	+003
37	+147	+117	87	+038	+001
38	+145	+114	88	+035	-001
39	+143	+111	89	+032	-003
40	+141	+109	90	+029	-005
41	+137	+107	91	+023	-013
42	+133	+103	92	+017	-021
43	+129	+100	93	+011	-029
44	+125	+097	94	+005	-038
45	+121	+095	95	-001	-047
46	+119	+092	96	-033	-075
47	+118	+089	97	-065	-104
48	+117	+086	98	-097	-133
49	+116	+083	99	-129	-162
50	+115	+081	100	-255	-260

TABLE (V)

RELIABILITY OF THE STARKWEATHER M-F TEST: SPLIT-HALF CORRELATIONS BASED ON THE RESPONSES OF THE MORE STABLE CHILDREN IN THE STUDY

	N	rho	
M-F Test: Form-A			
Boys	24	+0.161	n.s.
Girls	24	+0.409	p < .05
Total	48	+0.304	p < .05
M-F Test: Form-B			
Boys	24	+0.434	p < .05
Girls	24	+0.609	p < .01
Total	48	+0.530	p < .01

These findings are interpreted as indicating a need for further refinement of the M-F Test with emphasis on the inclusion of more pictures for which boys show a strong preference. Commercial gummed seals, currently used in the test, seem to provide more sex-appropriate pictures for girls than for boys. On the other hand, it is possible that the sex differences which are evident in these findings may be a reflection of differences which exist in sex-role identification in early childhood.

Validity

A unique quality of the Starkweather M-F Test is that the bias of adult judgments is avoided in the scoring, an achievement which has not been possible when researchers have used other measuring devices. For the most part, where young children are concerned, masculinity and femininity are judged on the basis of behavior and appearance. A girl is judged to be a tomboy if her preferred activities and her appearance are more "appropriate" for boys than for girls. The rather common acceptance of judgments such as this suggested the possibility of designing a validation test which would measure masculinity and

femininity as culturally defined. The validity of the M-F Test would be demonstrated if the test scores, free of adult bias, were in agreement with the cultural expectations for young children.

A validation booklet was constructed similar in design to the M-F Test booklet. It consisted of 24 pages on which clothing and toys were pictured. The booklet was shown to 20 middle-class adults (10 men and 10 women) who were asked to indicate the most masculine and the most feminine picture on each page. The booklet was then shown to 90 middle-class children, 45 boys and 45 girls, who were asked to indicate their picture preference on each page.

The method of scoring the validation test was identical to the method of scoring the M-F Test. The masculine or feminine value of each picture was calculated from the adults' responses and again from the children's responses. These two sets of scores were then compared. Of the 24 pictures selected as masculine by the adults, the children selected 20 as masculine and 04 as neutral; and of the 24 pictures selected as feminine by the adults, the children selected 21 as feminine and 03 as neutral. Among these middle-class adults and children there was high agreement about the sex-appropriateness of the clothing and toys pictured in the validation booklet.

In order to validate the Starkweather M-F Test, i.e., in order to answer the question of whether the test actually does measure masculinity and femininity, the children's scores on the validation test were compared with their scores on both forms of the M-F Test. Spearman rank correlations between validation test scores and M-F Test scores are presented in Table (W). For the boys and for the girls, these correlations were statistically significant. Both forms of the Starkweather M-F Test are accepted as valid indicators of young children's masculinity and femininity.

TABLE (W)

SPEARMAN RANK CORRELATIONS BETWEEN M-F TEST
SCORES AND VALIDATION TEST SCORES

	N	Form-A	Form-B
Boys	45	+0.430 p < .01	+0.470 p < .01
Girls	45	+0.756 p < .001	+0.717 p < .001

Sex-Role Identification

When the masculinity or femininity expressed by a child is stable, that child has identified his particular sex-role. For example, the child who consistently shows low masculinity has identified his sex-role just as clearly as the child who consistently shows high masculinity. The role may change over a period of time, but the stability of the role at a given time implies something about the child's self-concept and the security he finds in the role at that time. On the other hand, the child who is inconsistent in his expression of masculinity or femininity cannot have identified a sex-role in which he feels comfortable and secure.

The Starkweather M-F Test measures a child's sex-role identification in terms of his expressed masculine or feminine preferences and the stability of these preferences from test to retest. This operational definition of sex-role identification can be illustrated by the test scores of specific children presented in Table (Q) page 63.

Child M-2059 was a child who had identified his sex-role as high-masculine. His M-F score of +224 on Form-A was high-masculine, as was his score of +268 on Form-B. The difference between his rank of 04 on Form-A and 01 on Form-B gave him a stability score of 03, indicating that he was stable in his high-masculine preferences from test to retest, or in other words, indicating high-masculine sex-role identification.

Child F-2046 was a child who had identified her sex-role as low-feminine. Her M-F score of -026 on Form-A was low-feminine, as was her score of -053 on Form-B. The difference between her rank of 52 on Form-A and 58 on Form-B gave her a stability score of 06, indicating that she was stable in her low-feminine preferences from test to retest, or in other words, indicating low-feminine sex-role identification.

Child M-2008 was a child who had not identified his sex-role. His score of +195 on Form-A was high-masculine and his score of +039 on Form-B was low-masculine. This lack of stability from test to retest was clearly indicated by his change in rank from 14 on Form-A to 65 on Form-B -- a change which resulted in a stability score of 51 and indicated a lack of sex-role identification.

2
VITA

Bernita Louise Luce

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: THE INFLUENCE OF THE WOMEN'S LIBERATION MOVEMENT ON THE SEX
ROLE DEVELOPMENT OF YOUNG CHILDREN

Major Field: Family Relations and Child Development

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Talihina, Oklahoma, September 30, 1936, the
daughter of Henry Neal Quoss and Lu Ellen Gann Quoss.

Education: Graduated from Sunset High School, Dallas, Texas, in
May, 1954; received Bachelor of Arts degree in English and
Education from Texas Christian University in 1958; completed
requirements for Master of Science degree at Oklahoma State
University in May, 1975.

Professional Experience: Elementary School Teacher, El Paso, Pub-
lic Schools, Texas, 1959-60; Special Education Teacher, Prince
Georges County, Maryland, Public Schools, 1960-1963; Diagnos-
tic Teacher, MARC Nursery School, Montgomery County, Maryland,
1966-1968; Teacher, Carolyn Rogers Nursery School, 1969-1972;
Director, Little Hurricane Day Care Center, 1972; planner,
Tulsa Housing Authority, 1974-75.