

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

**University  
Microfilms  
International**

300 N. Zeeb Road  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106



8504322

Guinn, Marcia Ann Fitzgerald

GENDER TYPE TOY PREFERENCES OF NATIVE AMERICAN, NON-NATIVE  
AMERICAN PRESCHOOL CHILDREN IN DAY CARE, NON-DAY CARE  
SETTINGS

*The University of Oklahoma*

Ed.D. 1984

University  
Microfilms  
International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Copyright 1984

by

Guinn, Marcia Ann Fitzgerald

All Rights Reserved



PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy.  
Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark ✓.

1. Glossy photographs or pages \_\_\_\_\_
2. Colored illustrations, paper or print \_\_\_\_\_
3. Photographs with dark background ✓
4. Illustrations are poor copy \_\_\_\_\_
5. Pages with black marks, not original copy \_\_\_\_\_
6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page \_\_\_\_\_
7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages \_\_\_\_\_
8. Print exceeds margin requirements \_\_\_\_\_
9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine \_\_\_\_\_
10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print \_\_\_\_\_
11. Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.
12. Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.
13. Two pages numbered \_\_\_\_\_. Text follows.
14. Curling and wrinkled pages \_\_\_\_\_
15. Other \_\_\_\_\_

University  
Microfilms  
International



THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA  
GRADUATE COLLEGE

GENDER TYPE TOY PREFERENCES OF NATIVE  
AMERICAN, NON-NATIVE AMERICAN  
PRESCHOOL CHILDREN IN DAY CARE,  
NON-DAY CARE SETTINGS

a dissertation

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the  
degree of  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

BY

MARCIA ANN FITZGERALD GUINN

Norman, Oklahoma

1984

GENDER TYPE TOY PREFERENCES OF NATIVE  
AMERICAN, NON-NATIVE AMERICAN  
PRESCHOOL CHILDREN IN DAY CARE,  
NON-DAY CARE SETTINGS

Approved by:

Charles King  
R. E. Ragland

R. E. Ragland  
D. E. Ragland

D. E. Ragland  
D. E. Ragland



©1984

MARCIA ANN FITZGERALD GUINN

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

## Acknowledgements

Several people have encouraged, supported, listened, and provided expertise in guiding this doctoral study through to completion.

Dr. Charlyce King deserves a special expression of gratitude. She knows how I feel about the wonderful attitude and terrific sense of humor she uses, just when it is needed, to inspire "the extra mile." Dr. King's expertise in guiding this study makes working with her an unforgettable learning experience.

I particularly want to thank my committee, Dr. Robert Bibens, Dr. Robert Ragland, Dr. Gerald Kidd, and Dr. George Henderson for their time and counsel as members of the committee.

I want to express my appreciation for the support, understanding, time and encouragement my husband, George, my daughters, Milynda and Lia have given me during this busy time.

I want to thank my parents Frank and Florence Fitzgerald, who have continuously believed in their daughter.

Thanks to David, Jo Ann, Cindy, Sascha and my friends for the effort and reassurance they have given me.

I would also like to thank Dr. Ed Porter for his special counseling in the statistical analysis of the data.

And last, but not least, special praise should go to the directors, teachers and children in the centers where the data was collected. The children and their delightful responses are what really made this dissertation complete.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                                       | Page |
|-------------------------------------------------------|------|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS                                      | iii  |
| LIST OF TABLES                                        | vi   |
| Chapter                                               |      |
| I. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM          | 1    |
| Background and Need for the Study                     | 5    |
| Statement of the Problem                              | 7    |
| Hypotheses Tested in the Study                        | 7    |
| Definition of Terms                                   | 9    |
| Limits of the Study                                   | 10   |
| II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE                      | 12   |
| Home as an Influence on Gender Identity               | 13   |
| Teen, Divorced, Unwed Parents as an Influence         | 15   |
| Childcare Centers/Schools as an Influence             | 19   |
| Peers and Siblings as an Influence                    | 21   |
| Books, Television, Clothing Selection as an Influence | 22   |
| Books                                                 | 23   |
| Clothing Selection                                    | 24   |
| Television                                            | 25   |
| Toy Selection for Young Children                      | 26   |
| Communication as an Influence                         | 29   |
| Native American Culture as an Influence               | 31   |
| III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES                           | 35   |
| Pre-experimental Procedures                           | 35   |
| Choice of Research Design                             | 36   |
| Experimental Procedure                                | 37   |
| Selection of Participants                             | 37   |
| Instruments Used in Data Collection                   | 39   |
| Post Experiment Procedures                            | 41   |
| Statistical Analysis                                  | 41   |

|            |                                                                                           |            |
|------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| IV.        | PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA                                                         | Page<br>43 |
|            | Preliminary Analysis of Data                                                              | 43         |
|            | Results of Testing Null Hypothesis Number One                                             | 44         |
|            | Results of Testing Null Hypothesis Number Two                                             | 46         |
|            | Results of Testing Null Hypothesis Number Three                                           | 46         |
|            | Results of Testing Null Hypothesis Number Four                                            | 48         |
|            | Results of Testing Null Hypothesis Number Five                                            | 50         |
|            | Results of Testing Null Hypothesis Number Six                                             | 53         |
|            | Results of Testing Null Hypothesis Number Seven                                           | 53         |
|            | Results of Testing Null Hypothesis Number Eight                                           | 56         |
|            | Results of Testing Null Hypothesis Number Nine                                            | 56         |
|            | Results of Testing Null Hypothesis Number Ten                                             | 59         |
|            | Ancillary Findings                                                                        | 59         |
|            | Summary of Results of Statistical Analysis                                                | 61         |
| V.         | SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND SUGGESTIONS<br>FOR FURTHER RESEARCH                            | 65         |
|            | Summary                                                                                   | 66         |
|            | Summary of Conclusions                                                                    | 68         |
|            | Suggestions for Further Research                                                          | 66         |
|            | REFERENCES                                                                                | 71         |
| Appendix A | LETTER REQUESTING OPPORTUNITY FOR<br>DATA COLLECTION                                      | 83         |
| Appendix B | PANEL OF EXPERTS                                                                          | 86         |
| Appendix C | CHILD DATA INFORMATION FORM                                                               | 90         |
| Appendix D | XEROXED COPIES OF ORIGINAL PHOTOGRAPHS<br>USED IN THE GENDER TYPED TOY<br>PREFERENCE TEST | 92         |

## LIST OF TABLES

| Table                                                                                                         | Page |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 1 Results of Testing Differences in Source of Influence on Male/Female Selection of Toys                      | 45   |
| 2 Results of Testing Differences in Source of Influence and Native American/Non-Native American Toy Choices   | 47   |
| 3 Results of Testing Differences in Source of Influence and Day Care/Non-Day Care Choices                     | 49   |
| 4 Results of Testing Differences in Source of Influence and Gender Typed Toy Selection                        | 51   |
| 5 Results of Testing Differences in Native American/Non-Native American and Male/Female Toy Selection         | 52   |
| 6 Results of Testing Differences in Day Care/Non-Day Care and Native American/Non-Native American Toy Choices | 54   |
| 7 Results of Testing Differences in Native American/Non-Native American and Gender Typed Toy Selections       | 55   |
| 8 Results of Testing Differences in Day Care/Non-Day Care/Male and Female Toy Choices                         | 57   |
| 9 Results of Testing Differences in Male/Female Gender Typed Toy Selection                                    | 58   |
| 10 Results of Testing Differences in Day Care/Non-Day Care and Gender Typed Toy Selection                     | 60   |
| 11 (Ancillary Findings) Summary of Gender Typed Toy Selection                                                 | 62   |
| 12 Summary of Results of Testing the Ten Null Hypotheses: The Statistical Results and Levels of Significance  | 63   |

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Researchers have spent many years studying the time period in which children acquire a sex role identity. Most experts agree on early childhood as the time in which a gender identity is formed.

Some believe this process begins at one (Lewis, 1984), some believe before birth (Erhardt and Baker, 1973), some believe children at two can say they are a boy or girl. (Smart and Smart, 1984; Berger, 1983, Bee, 1984) Most researchers agree that by age three children can identify themselves as a boy or girl. (Fischer, Lazerson, 1974; Thompson, 1975) There are still some that say that by five years of age children of both sexes are able to recognize sex role differences and express sex role preferences. (Brown, 1956)

How children formulate a gender identity is a big question among psychologists and child development professionals. There are several explanations available for consideration. These explanations are summarized as follows:

The Biological or Psychoanalytic theory is based on Freud's assumptions that human behavior is related to sexuality and reproduction. He emphasized that children identify with the parent of the same sex through the love, jealousy and fear of the parent. The child's success or failure in perceiving the parents wishes furthers the sex role identification. (Freud, 1960) Erikson (1952) indicates that psychological differences in males and females stem strictly from anatomy. This belief is referred to as "the anatomy is destiny doctrine." (Santrock, 1984) Another theory related to biological theory that needs

mentioning is a study by Erhardt and Baker (1973) in which expectant mothers prone to miscarriage were given androgen (a male hormone) and were described as producing more masculine male and female children when compared with others of the same sex in a family. This study, however, resulted in a need for cortizone therapy the rest of the subject's lives and is related, ultimately to research done on sex changes.

In the Cognitive Approach Lawrence Kohlberg (1966) concludes that young children gradually experience stages of development by being called a boy or a girl. The girl or boy says, "I am a boy so I'll do boy things," or "I am a girl so I'll do girl things." As the child develops, he or she strives for conformity in sex role behavior. Sex role is defined by Spence and Helmreich (1978) as "behaviors that are expected of children because they are either male or female." This concept was further developed into the concept of "androgyny." (Spence and Bem, 1974, 1977, 1978) "Andro" meaning male and "gyne" meaning female in Greek. Being androgenous means possessing both male and female behavioral characteristics and attitudes. Spence and Bem believe being masculine or feminine does not mean being opposites but identifying one's self after an intermingling of both sexes' characteristic behaviors to function better in today's society. (Spence, 1982)

Behavioral Learning theorists believe all patterns of gender type behaviors are learned instead of being biological. They also believe parents, teachers and society are primary influences on the child's behavior in the formation of gender identity.

Helen Bee (1981), in "The Developing Child," believes there are three separate gender development guidelines: (a) The development of the child's understanding that he or she is a boy or girl called Gender Concept. (Kohlberg,

1966) (b) The development of sex role stereotypes which are ideas of what boys and girls are to be like; and (c) The development of distinctly different patterns of behavior such as playing with "boy" toys and "girl" toys or choosing playmates of the same sex. Gender Concept consists 1) of gender identity which is an ability to label one's own sex correctly and to identify other people as men and women, boys or girls. (Spencer and Thompson (1975) state that 2½ year old children can do this.) 2) Next, of gender stability, the understanding that you stay the same gender throughout life. (Staby and Frey (1975) asked, "When you were a baby were you a little girl or little boy?" found that gender stability occurs at about age 4). And additionally there is the development of gender constancy which is similiar to Piaget's conservation theory. Gender constancy is a recognition that one's gender remains the same even though changes in hair length, clothing or toys may occur. (This occurs at about five or six years according to Slab and Frey, 1985; Marcus and Overton, 1978; Bee, 1981; Kohlberg, 1966,). "It is nearly impossible to change one's belief about what gender one is after the age of three" states L. W. Richardson (1981) in "The Dynamics of Sex and Gender".

The evidence from the studies of John Money, Anke Erhardt and their associates at John Hopkins University lends support to the hypothesis that "biology is not destiny" but child rearing techniques can certainly effect the outcome of gender role identity:

"A set of identical twins was born without any congenital malformations or sex assignment ambiguity. At seven months one of the twins lost his penis through a surgical error. (An overpowerful current of electricity during a routine electrocautery circumcision burned the entire tissue of the penis.) When the twin was seventeen months old, the decision was



reached to rear the child as a girl. The parents were given confidence that their child ... (could) be expected to differentiate a female gender identity, in agreement with her sex of rearing. (Money and Erhardt, 1975)

The first steps were changing the child's name, clothing and hairstyle, followed by plastic surgery to construct female genitalia. The mother reported she kept the girl in dresses and frilly blouses, that she emphasized neatness and encouraged her daughter to imitate her own domestic interests. By age five, the mother was happy to report that her daughter preferred dresses to slacks, was proud of her long hair, liked to be cleaned up and enjoyed imitating her mother's behavior patterns. The mother stated during an interview, 'One thing that really amazes me is that she is so feminine, I've never seen a little girl so neat and tidy ... She is very proud of herself, when she puts a dress on or I set her hair.' (Money and Erhardt, 1975)

The other twin did not exhibit these traits. According to the mother's report, he was active, messy, rejected housework, and liked to copy his father. Although these twins were identical males at birth, their gender rearing experiences differentiated them. One twin has the gender identity girl; the other the gender identity boy." (Money and Erhardt, 1975)

To summarize, the formation of sex role identity occurs in the preschool years. There are several significant theories in which experts disagree about how sex role identity occurs. In comparing theories, there are positive attributes in each. Whether one believes sexism is a problem to be counter-acted or a fact of life to be celebrated depends on one's own perspective and experience. (Berger, 1983)

People who are flexible in their sex roles and are able to display the best qualities of traditional stereotypes are generally more

competent and experience a higher degree of self-esteem than people who follow traditional sex role behavior. (Spence and Helmreich, 1978) It is beyond the scope of this study to compare theories on gender identity origin, but instead to subject to statistical analysis the sub-influences of the environment. More specifically, to compare day care/non-day care, Native American/non-Native Americans and their responses as measured by gender typed toy preferences of male and female children between the ages of three and five.

#### Background and Need for the Study

There are many assumptions about gender type role formation and how it occurs. These differences of opinion may lead to confusion among parents, teachers, administrators, and children. A child's sexuality and sex role identity should never be confused in the search for equality among the sexes.

If small children spend eight hours or more in a day care center, who will influence the child more in gender identity formation, the school (Day Care Center), or the parents (home, family); or, are there other significant influences? Is there a significant difference in gender type toy preferences in an eight hour program (day care) or a half-day, non-day care program, (nursery school, headstart, public school) which could enable parents to spend more time with children? Is there a significant difference in Native American or non-Native American gender type toy preferences, and if so, is this important to the Native American philosophy and goals for child rearing in a family and school setting?

Even more importantly, how does the child view his own gender type as measured by toy preferences? Under what conditions is the child influenced the most?

The State of Oklahoma Employment Security Commission Research and Planning Division in a cooperative agreement with the national census bureau reported (June, 1984) that there were 254,100 children under five years of age in the state of Oklahoma. They also have given the approximate figures for Native American children under five as 18,527.

This is a 9 percent increase in children under five, since 1980, of the total population in Oklahoma, and a 7.4 percent increase in Native American children under five. The Oklahoma State Licensing Service stated (June, 1984) that there were 52,915 children in 1200 day care centers in the state of Oklahoma if they were operating at full licensed capacity. If these day care centers were full (25% of them are full, and the others operate at 70% capacity), 52,915 children would be 20.8 percent of the children under five in this state. This population deserves attention.

Day care sexual misconduct and abuse have recently (May, 1984, Daily Oklahoman) received a great deal of notoriety in Oklahoma and other states. It is important to recognize that in order for parents and teachers to better meet the needs of young children, they must be informed and educated in preparing our children for equality in expectations, and security in their gender identity. The chance to experience a full range of roles enriches the knowledge of each sex, does not produce sexual perverts and ideally deepens understanding and empathy for the opposite sex. (Hendrick, 1984)

"Even though many of us want to enable children of both sexes to step beyond narrowly restricted ideas of sex roles and stereotypes that presently exist, we must be careful to help them value their basic sexuality. If we grow up with the idea that sexuality is unimportant or not valued, or worse yet that reproduction and sex are smutty and should

be investigated in secret, we may have unwittingly undone a nonsexist emphasis to teaching." (Hendrick, 1984)

This study is expected to contribute to the literature on gender identity formation and the factors involved as measured by male and female toy preferences of preschool children. The research conclusions will be made available to teacher education and training programs in Child Development and Special Education. The results of the study could contribute to program planning, adult attitudes, materials, and equipment purchases, as well as the self-esteem of young Native American/non-Native American children in day care and non-day care settings.

#### Statement of the Problem

The problem in this study was to determine significant basic influences on gender typed toy preferences of Native American/non-Native American preschool children in day care/non-day care child care settings. More specifically described as observable differences in:

1) Toy preferences of children, three through age five, with respect to gender type; 2) Toy preferences of Native American vs. non-Native American children according to gender type; 3) Day care vs. non-day care center toy preferences according to gender type and 4) Categorized responses of children with regard to source of influence in gender type toy preferences with attention to a) home and family, b) school, and c) "other" influences.

#### Hypotheses Tested in the Study

In order to accomplish the purposes of this study and to explore fully the research questions stated earlier, the following null hypotheses were tested for significance:

HO<sub>1</sub>: No statistically significant differences exist among the sources of influence on toy preferences by male and female children.

HO<sub>2</sub>: No statistically significant differences exist among the sources of influence on gender typed toy preferences of Native American and non-Native American children.

HO<sub>3</sub>: No statistically significant differences exist among the sources of influence on gender typed toy preferences of children in a day care/non-day care setting.

HO<sub>4</sub>: No statistically significant differences exist among the sources of influence on toy preferences with regard to male, female and neutral toys.

HO<sub>5</sub>: No statistically significant differences exist between Native American and non-Native American children's toy preferences with regard to being male or female.

HO<sub>6</sub>: No statistically significant difference exists between Native American and non-Native American children's gender typed toy preferences when they are compared with regard to day care and non-day care settings.

HO<sub>7</sub>: No statistically significant differences exist between Native American and non-Native American children's toy preferences with regard to male and female and neutral choices.

HO<sub>8</sub>: No statistically significant difference exists between male and female children's toy preferences when compared with regard to day care and non-day care setting.

HO<sub>9</sub>: No statistically significant difference exists between male and female children's gender typed toy preferences.

HO<sub>10</sub>: No statistically significant differences exist among the gender typed toy preferences by children in a day care/non-day care setting.

In addition to the ten hypotheses, a table of toy preferences of male and female children was provided in response to questions from teachers in centers where no guns were allowed. In all the centers and schools used in this research study there was a philosophical emphasis on non-violence by the teachers. This emphasis was meant to be perpetuated in the home.

#### Definition of the Terms

In order to avoid multiple interpretations, it is necessary to provide the following definitions for the purposes of this study.

1. Preschool child - children between the ages of three years and zero months and five years zero months involved in an early childhood education program outside the home.

2. Non-day care - a half day planned program for preschool children from homes of varied socioeconomic, educational, and cross-cultural backgrounds. This could include Headstart, nursery school, and public school pre-kindergarten programs.

3. Day Care Center - a full day (eight or more hours) planned program for preschool children from varied socioeconomic, cross-cultural, educational homes, who remain in the care of persons other than their parents and family for that period (8 or more hours) of time. In this case it may be an all Native American or a non-Native American center.

4. Native American - indicates birth or immediate origin in a specified place (For purposes of this study, the centers described as Native American Centers on Page 37 and 38.) without eliminating the possibility of foreign origin through an earlier generation or historical period: Native American (American Heritage, 1976).

5. Non-Native Americans - those subjects who are not Native American.

6. Home and family - those adult persons living in the home who are directly or indirectly in consistent contact with the child. This included extended family and their close friends, but excluded siblings.

7. School or Center - will include those adult persons in the child care center who are directly or indirectly in consistent contact with the child. This can include: cooks, bus drivers, teachers, administrators, toy purchasers, and cleaning persons, but excluded peers.

8. Other - influences on toy preferences other than school, home or family such as: libraries, televisions, store displays, movies, peers, and siblings.

9. Toys - Nine black and white photographs of toys selected by eleven expert judges chosen for their expertise and experience in the related fields of Early Childhood Education, Special Education and Human Development. There were five men and six women included in this group. These experts categorized the toys according to traditional standards of masculine, feminine, and neutral toys. (See Appendix B)

#### Limits of the Study

The following limits were placed on the study: Subjects included in the total population were limited to 155 three and four year old children. 1) 66 male, 69 female, 2) of Native American and non-Native American descent, 3) enrolled in a preschool day care/non-day care program between January, 1978 and June, 1984. The early childhood programs included: 1) four day care centers, 2) three half day programs (Headstart and nursery schools) and 3) one public school half day summer program.

Native American centers included, four Native American centers; three half day and two full day programs and four non-Native American centers: three full day and one half day programs. The centers were located in Norman, Shawnee, Midwest City, Del City, McLoud and Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

The stimulus cards used in this study were limited to the nine black and white photographs of toys presented in Appendix D. The Child Care Data forms used to record each subjects' response are presented in Appendix C.

The chapter that follows includes a review of literature encompassing influences on gender identity.



## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

It is a commonly accepted assumption in our society that parents are the primary source of influence on the gender identity of young children in America. However, recent diversification in childcare in the past few years reveals that there are 1200 childcare centers in the state of Oklahoma with approximately 52,915 children being cared for eight or more hours per day. One can readily see the possible influence day care centers might have on the gender identity of young children, whether they are Native American or non-Native American.

Eleanor Maccoby (1980) concluded that children's self-definition focuses on external characteristics, such as how they look, where they live and what activities they are involved in. A study of the literature revealed a lack of research found in relation to preferences of Native American preschool children, particularly with regard to sex role identity. This lack of data directed the researcher's attention in this study to the comparison of data involving home/family and school influences on toy selection as they correlate with the gender identity of young children in general but also with particular regard to Native American children. In the introductory chapter of this study; 1) theories of gender identity, and 2) when this identity is formed was discussed. It is important to begin the review of literature involving the child's perception of how he or she is influenced in gender type toy selection by home/family or school due to the amount of time spent by some children in a day care setting. The studies so far have been done by behavioral observation, on college students

(Oetzel, 1962), and classroom teachers and by parents and teacher interviews. Some of these responses were compared with those of young children (Pitcher, 1974). These observations also include children in different learning centers in a child care setting. (Kagan, 1964)

In a review of three theories that attempt to account for differences in sexual behavior a researcher stated,

"The biological components of gender identity and sex role behavior, while definitely of consequence, are relatively small by comparison with cultural differences." (Fagot, 1982)

The following is a review of surveys, observations, and inventories done involving parents, home and family, with particular focus on the formation of gender identity of young children.

#### Home as an Influence on Gender Identity Formation

At a child's birth, parents and family apply stereotypes of the behavior of boys and girls to the use of the colors pink and blue. (Jastrzembski, 1975) When a child is born, fathers distinguish more between boy and girl babies than mothers do. (Rubin, Provenzano and Luria, 1974) Fathers also touch and talk to newborn boys more than to newborn girls. (Parke, 1979) Mothers are more likely to breast feed girls than boys. (Ambron, 1984) Mothers tend to treat children less differently at birth than do fathers, and because of this fathers may have a greater influence (Power, 1981) on sex role identity.

In a recent Field's best seller "Like Father, Like Daughter," the author interviewed several hundred fathers and adult daughters in fifty states and reported on how crucial a father's influence is to each stage of a woman's life. (Fields, 1983) One study indicated that the opposite-sexed parent is usually more lenient, that fathers are more concerned with sex-typing and that mothers

treat children more alike than fathers, and fathers tend to allow both male and female children to be independent. (Maccoby, 1966) Alice Lake in a magazine article in 1975, reported that mothers tend to describe their newborn daughters as tiny, soft, delicate, fine-featured and described their sons as alert, strong, and well-coordinated. Fathers described their newborns in stereotypes of gender role. (Rubin et al., 1974) Mothers give more physical contact to boys and less to girls in the first three months, however, girls are talked to more. Nonverbal activity is the same with male and female three month old infants. (Moss, 1967) In the period following the sixth month, girls receive both more physical and non-physical contact than boys, Moss (1967) also reports. In the second year of the child's life, more interaction exists between father and son than between father and daughter. (Lamb, 1977)

Parents insist that they treat their children the same whether they are son or daughters. They want them to be equally neat, helpful, control their anger, be considerate, control their crying, be competitive and able to protect themselves (Maccoby and Jacklin, 1974; Brun-Golbmandsin, 1967) in a survey in Scandinavia, parents noted (in a recognized progressive society) insisted they treated their children equally with regard to sex role. Money and Ehrhardt (1975) disagree with the parental perception and state, "Most parents give children cues without conscious effort routinely." Some of the more salient differences in the way parents relate to sons and daughters are; more concern with the health of their daughters than that of their sons (Pederson and Robsin, 1969) and girls are treated as being more fragile than sons. (Maccoby and Jacklin, 1974) This particular research should be noted since males from birth have higher rates of mortality, and of most illnesses and defects. (Newman and Newman, 1978) Both parents discourage sex inappropriate behavior in their

sons. (Fling and Manosevitz, 1972) Parents reprimand boys more severely for acting in sex inappropriate ways, although fathers are more concerned than mothers about sex-typing. (Lynn, 1976) It has been suggested by Hartley (1974) that sex role anxiety is experienced in males, and by Weitzman (1979) that girls experience little or no anxiety over sex role identification.

It might also be noted that a long range effect of stereotyped thinking was investigated recently in a study which found that in families with shared childcare responsibilities, marital warmth and affection, and spousal compatibility were rated higher following observation of mother-father-infant interactions than in families in which fathers displayed little childcare involvement. (Dickie et al. 1981)

In reviewing literature concerned with teenage parenting, an early uncontrolled study of high school marriages indicated unrealistic expectations regarding developmental stages of behavior of young children. (DeLissovoy, 1973) This particular study indicated "too much too soon" while a more recent study done by Epstein (1979) indicated teenage parents expect "too little, too late." (Field, 1982 and Brown and Bakeman, 1977) found teenage mothers to be insensitive to behavioral cues. This population of parents is a very important aspect of parental influence which must be considered.

#### Teen Parents and Divorced or Unwed Parents as an Influence

In research related to preschool gender type formation involving teen parents revealed there is other related literature not yet mentioned. There is a growing number of single parents and unmarried teenage parents. Every hour 64 babies are born to teenage girls. (Auletta, 1984) That number (64) is projected into, 1,540 babies born to teen mothers per day. In 1980, there were 562,330 babies born to teen mothers in the United States, half of them were to

unmarried teens and nearly 10,000 to girls 14 and younger. In 1981, there were 686,605 births to unwed mothers this is up 72% since 1970. Nearly 40% of these births were to teenagers. (Auletta, 1984) There are 1.2 million children affected by the 2.4 million divorces granted each year. (Spanier and Glick, 1981) Households maintained by a man with children but no wife has increased by 60% since 1960 and those maintained by a woman with children but no husband has doubled. (U.S. Census Bureau, 1980) Households maintained by married couples declined to 62% of all households. Of the divorced couples, one-half remarry within three years (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1976), creating step-parenting influences on gender role identification. However, the proportion of all children living with their father and not their mother is below 2%. (Spanier and Glick, 1981) By contrast 17% live only with their mothers.

Single parents and low income families are disproportionately represented in day care centers and in family day care. In 1977, only one in five families considered single parent families, day care outside the home. (Belsky, Lerner, Spanier, 1984) There are 2.6 million families using in-home care, more than ten hours per week, 3.4 million rely on family day care, nationwide. Broken down by age, these data indicate 2.5 million toddlers and infants, and 3.7 million preschoolers use supplementary childcare. This again points to the 2.1 children per family ratio and one in five single parent families using supplemental childcare. It is important to note these statistics on single parenting; step parents and peers as possible affects on gender information.

The general nurturance and warmth that children experience from their parents seems to affect the degree with which children model and imitate behavior in their parent of the same sex. (Mussen, Rutherford, 1963; Payne and Mussen, 1956) In the case of girls, if the mother is regarded as more nurturant

by the female child the more the mother is imitated. (Mussen and Parker, 1965) The father's power and dominance when coupled with warmth and nurturance has been linked to the son's masculinity but seems to be unrelated to daughter's femininity. (Mussen and Distler, 1959; Biller, 1969, Hetherington, 1966) However in 1978, it was reported that in the case of sons and daughters fathers' masculinity seems to promote traditional sex roles in children of both genders. (Hetherington, Cox and Cox, 1978) Boys and girls differ in process of acquiring their sex role behavior. Exactly why boys and girls should learn their sex roles through different processes remains one of the unsolved mysteries of human development. (Belsky, Lerner, Spanier, 1984) Evidence that supports this notion comes from a study of children without fathers. Boys whose fathers leave (because of divorce, death or desertion) before they reach the age of five (but not after) grow up to be less traditionally masculine than do boys whose fathers are present and involved with them or whose fathers home after this critical age (Hetherington and Deur, 1971, Hetherington, 1966; LeCorgne and Laosa, 1976; Drake and McDougal, 1977) Belsky, Lerner, and Spanier (1984) report:

"... the detrimental affect of fathers absence is lessened if a strong alternate male role model (uncle, older brother, neighbor) is available to the male child. It is not the father's presence per se that is critical but the presence of a male role model. A father who is physically present but psychologically and behaviorally unavailable seems to develop in the same way as father absent children."

Richard Gardner in "The Parent's Book about Divorce" states, "the boy living alone with a mother is likely to be deprived of the intimate association with his father that is most conducive to his identifying with him. In addition,

living with his mother makes it more likely that feminine identification will take place. These two factors may contribute to a homosexual orientation." (Gardner, 1977) Smart and Smart (1982) state, "In single parent families when mothers are so burdened they are unlikely to be sensitive, responsive caregivers capable of being accessible and interacting verbally. Without the joy, stimulation, and male role behavior of a playful father the infant is doubly deprived. Boys who have had little or no interaction with fathers were lower in social responsiveness, lower on tests of sensorimotor intelligence and less interested in stimuli. Differences were not found between father absent and father present girls." (Smart and Smart, 1982) Herzog and Zredia (1973) state, "The findings reviewed do not provide conclusive and clear cut answers to questions about the sturdiness of the masculine identity of father absent boys as compared with that of boys in two parent homes", but suggest lower socio-economic status and financial resources may be a factor.

Hetherington, Cox and Cox (1978) suggested that boys whose fathers are absent prior to fifth grade adopt patterns of functioning more characteristic of daughters, and boys past the fifth grade in father absent homes have been linked to exaggerated super masculine styles of behaving. Girls appear to be unaffected until adolescence when behavior in father absent homes by the girls takes the form of sexual precociousness, finally choosing husbands who are considered "bad catches", and are at greater risk in divorce. (Hetherington, et al., 1978)

All studies indicate that most people prefer their first child to be a boy. (Markle and Nam, 1971) Couples more frequently want a son rather than a daughter (Hoffman, 1977) and couples who have had only daughters continue having children. (Hoffman, 1977) Etzioni (1968) stated if people could choose

the sex of their unborn child the resulting sex ratio would be 133 males for every 100 females. The child is born to a culture that has a preference for males. (Richardson, 1981)

In February, 1984, The Norman Transcript reported the results of a study on mother/child interaction done by Dr. Michael Lewis, a pediatric psychologist, at Rutgers Medical School, University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey. The Transcript quoted Dr. Lewis as saying,

"A child's later development is not related to whether he or she plays with sex role appropriate toys, but it is the parents attitude toward the sex appropriateness of the child's choice of toys that is critical to a child's later school adjustment and friendship patterns."

Dr. Lewis used the term "goodness of fit" between mothers (the study did not include fathers) and children and emphasized the importance of this factor to the child's later school adjustment. The study included a taping of 28 boys and girls at the age of two as they played with a set of toys rated according to sex appropriateness by a group of observers. The male children were observed and rated on masculine toys, the female on feminine toys and the time spent using them. Parents were given a standardized psychological test on sex role orientation. Following the study Lewis indicated parental attitude toward sex appropriate toy selection is more important than the toy itself as it relates to school adjustment. School adjustment was determined on a rating scale by the teachers of the children. The school is another influence explored in this chapter.

#### Child Care Centers/Schools as an Influence

Because of the amount of time young children spend in the care of others besides parents, and due to the necessity of adults working outside the home,



there has been considerable change in the past few years in the role of parents as the primary socializing agents, when it comes to sex role identification and the role of environmental influences.

Santrock (1984) in "Life-Span Development," states a de-emphasis on parents as the critical socializing agent. In giving attention to teachers and other authority figures in a school setting, the research points to the observation by Fagot and Patterson (1969), in which female teachers are more likely to reward feminine behavior in both sexes 83% of the time.

Very few men are employed as nursery school teachers. (Greenberg, 1977) The research on fathers (Power, 1981) or male adult influences perhaps indicates a need for balance in this area in the schools as in the home. (Hendrick, 1984)

A study by Chasen (1974) indicated teacher attitudes toward boys' and girls' behavior and sex role stereotyping is a very common occurrence in preschool.

In observing play in preschools, boys play with objects more and fight alot while girls spend more time in social interactions, playing with dolls and playing in the kitchen. (Edwards and Whiting, 1980) It is assumed that teachers perpetuate this activity. In a recent study in a nursery school in which two and three year old children were asked to describe what female and male paper dolls say and do, the children in this age range picked traditional and sterotyped activities for male and female children. (Kuhn 1978)

Although research has indicated that boys are not really better at analyzing problems and girls are not really better at nurturing and comforting others, many teachers continue to act as if these myths were true and plan curriculum and treat children accordingly thereby limiting both sexes. (Bacow, 1980)

Some nursery school teachers and child guidance professionals have expressed concern "if sons spend 'undue time' in the housekeeping area and female sex typed activities should be kept to a minimum." (Richardson, 1981)

### Peers and Siblings as an Influence

As the home and school are studied as an influencing factor in gender identity formation, peers and siblings must also be considered. There are two million "latchkey" children in our society. These are children who go home alone and wait until parent or parents return from work. There is limited adult supervision involved, 13% of these children are between seven and thirteen years of age and they are, "in charge", of younger siblings until the adults in the family come home. There is little research available in this area with regard to sex roles.

Fagot and Patterson (1969) observed that preschoolers are more likely to receive positive reinforcement from peers for sex appropriate behaviors and later found that girls are criticized less by their peers when they engage in masculine activities and boys are criticized by other boys even when teachers encourage activities such as cooking and self expressive art. (Fagot, 1977)

McGhee and Grodzetsky (1973) found that young children laughed at boys engaging in girls activities such as dressing a doll or frosting a cake.

"Although girls are geared to motherhood through various agents of preschool socialization, they are allowed greater freedom than boys to veer from the approved path. Girls may be cautioned and reprimanded for unfeminine behavior but they are not subject to the same condemnation that boys experience who would rather dress a doll than hit a ball." (Richardson, 1981) Nearly all 2½ and 3½ year olds studied (Kuhn et al., 1978) have different expectations for the two sexes but there was disagreement on how the sexes

differed. Both boys and girls thought that girls like to play with dolls, help mother, cook dinner, clean house, talk a lot, never hit and say, "I need some help" Both boys and girls thought that boys like to play with cars, like to help father, like to build things and say "I can hit you!" Girls saw girls looking nice, giving kisses, and never fighting; boys saw other boys working hard; girls saw boys as liking to fight and as mean and weak. Boys saw girls as crying and being slow. (Kuhn et al., 1978) These stereotypes match adult stereotypes. (Bee, 1981) It is clear that qualities attributed to the male are more highly valued than are female traits. (Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz and Vogel, 1970) It is "good" to be independent, logical, and strong. (Bee, 1981)

In a study of 43 children in first grade classes using re-learning to possible affect perceptions of sex roles, in relation to working/non-working mothers indicated, reporting a higher proportion of girls who planned to work than boys who might want their wives to work. (Krieg, 1977)

Other research influences in the culture are examined in reviewing the literature on books, television, movies, toy selection, and clothing made available to male and female children by adults.

#### Books, Television and Clothing Selection as an Influence

Bandura and Walters (1963) have shown that models who are powerful and have control over resources are more readily imitated than less powerful models. "To a great extent children's concepts of sex stereotypes are based on their own observations of society both in real life and in books, catalogs, television, and movies. Rigid as their thinking is, it is clear to children at an early age that men assume the more powerful roles in our culture. Modeling and powerful figure explains the development of masculinity but does not explain femininity" according to Ambron. (1984)

### Books

In books 'women' are often cast as housewives and schoolteachers; men play the role of soldier, police officers, athlete and politician. One study showed this example in grammar school readers. Twenty six "female" occupations were identified and 219 "male" occupations were listed (NOW, 1972). An analysis of gender roles in Caldecott Award Books and Little Golden Books so widely used in child care settings was done by Weitzman (et al., 1972). The Caldecott medal is awarded each year for the best children's picture book that year. The circulation of Caldecott medal book is assured world wide in libraries, children's section in bookstores, day care centers, Headstart centers and other child care settings. The researchers (Weitzman et al., 1972) found three major differences that were significant in gender roles in the preschool books that were analyzed:

- 1) Males dominated females by 261 to 23. If animals were used with male of female identities the ratio was 95 males to 1 female. Only 2 books were about girls.
- 2) The activities were different in that females were passive in the stories and males were involved in far out adventures demonstrating competence and an independence. The females remained near the home performing mostly sex typed roles.
- 3) The adult roles of men and women were very differently presented. Not one woman held a job or was a professional. The women were wives and mothers. The men were firemen, kings, pilots, judges, fathers, adventurers, etc. (Weitzman, et al., 1972)

In addition, more than fifty "how to" child care books are on the market. Two thirds of these do not recognize sex stereotyping as a problem. Of those

who do ninety percent favor differential treatment of males and female. (De Frain, 1977)

### Clothing

It has been mentioned before this study, the clear distinction between pink and blue baby garments used in the hospital nursery. (Jastrzembski, 1975) It can also be noted that there is a difference in styles and colors for male and female infants in cribs, potty seats, comfortors, changing tables, diaper pins and toys. (Richardson, 1981) Infant clothing also is differentiated according to sex. Female infant wear snaps from right to left and male left to right. Collars are pointed for males and peter pan with lace for females. Girls racks are princess dresses, granny gowns, pink satin pantsuits and bikinis. Boys are baseball uniforms, vests with pocket watches, astronaut pajamas and white dress shirts. Only diapers and christening dresses miss being gender typed. (Richardson, 1981) Gender Constancy does not occur until around five or six years of age. (Staby and Frey, 1975; Marcus and Alberton, 1978) This again is the realization that one's gender remains the same even with changes in appearances such as clothing or hair length. (Bee, 1981)

### Television

Researchers have found that male female role models are highly stereotyped on television programs with females rarely taking dominate roles in programming and commercials. (Stein and Friedrich, 1975; Tarvis and Offir, 1977) A child from birth to age seventeen spends 15,000 hours watching television. The average kindergarten child spends 5,000 hours and the average five year old spends thirty-three hours per week viewing television. Between the ages of one and seventeen the average child will view 350,000 commercials. There are 5.6 million children between two and eleven who are still watching

television at 10:30 at night. (Copperman, 1980) Bob Keeshan, also known as Captain Kangaroo of a children's television show which lasted approximately 30 years states, "Television is the great national babysitter. It's not a disease itself but a greater disease that exists between parent and child in the parent-child relationship. A parent today simply doesn't have time for the child, the child is a very low priority item." (Trelease, 1982)

Studies of the role of television in sex typing have found that children who are exposed to conventional stereotyped portrayals of male-female roles and tend to have more stereotyped perceptions of what these roles are and should be. (Tan, 1976) One study compared the time children spend watching television with the acquisition of traditional sex role expectations. The findings suggested television was not solely responsible but significantly related. (Frueh and McGhee, 1975)

"Cultural models provided on television, in books and in most of society tend to reinforce children's developing notions of behaviors attitudes and interests that are most appropriate for their sex." (Biller, 1977) Children who view stereotypical marriages on television no matter what their parents marriages are like evaluate traditional roles as "correct". (Cheles-Miller, 1987)

Women are more likely to be victims of physical violence on television who are unmarried, old, young, employed, lower class, foreign or non-white. (Gerbner and Gross, 1976) On children's programs the risk rate for violence has increased for women. "Good" women, old women and black women are powerless. (Gerbner, 1979) Old, foreign and lower class men get killed by "good guys" who protect "good women". White, rich, guys are the socially powerful who are in control and legitimize violence on television. (Richardson, 1981) Even if parents carefully control the television viewing of children, they

should know that young children under six cannot distinguish humans from puppets from cartoon characters on television. (Quaforth, 1979) Young children also cannot tell when the program ends and the commercial begins. (Palmer and McDowell, 1979) The media which includes television socializes children and adults who interact with children. "At each stage of development young and old are given media images to copy and media messages to emulate." (Richardson, 1981)

### Toys

The most conventional way to look at sex stereotypes might be to look at children's toy choices. Fagot (1974) observed children in a room stacked with a wide range of toys: girls played housekeeping games, sewing, stringing beads or cooking. Boys played with guns, toy trucks, fire engines and with carpentry tools. Beginning at age three or four preschoolers choose to play with same sex pairs, and as early as two or three, children's play is affected by their own sex and the sex of those around them. (Bee, 1981) Researchers went into the bedrooms of a group of six year old children and made a list of toys and room decorations. It was assumed that parents selected the items in the rooms. Boys rooms contained more vehicles, educational art materials, sports equipment, toy animals, machines and military toys. Girls rooms had more dolls, doll houses, and domestic toys. Boys rooms were decorated with an animal theme; and girls have more flowers and ruffles for decoration. (Rheingold and Cook, 1975)

Jacklin, Maccoby and Dick (1973) watched mothers with 14 month old children and found no differences in the toys handed to daughters than to sons. The toys in the room were selected by the researchers not the parents.

When mothers were asked at what age they would allow their children to play alone outside, to cut with scissors, and so on, ages are higher for girls than boys. (Lefrancois, 1983)

In the use of toys, girls asked for help three times more frequently than boys did; yet parents respond more positively to girls requests. They responded negatively to boys which rewards dependent behavior in girls and punishes boys request for dependent behavior. (Fagot, 1978)

Girls are criticized for gross motor activities and boys are more likely to be left alone to explore the physical world. Girls get positive response for watching television and dancing and girls get more feedback than boys from parents for this behavior. (Ambron, 1984) Asked by one researcher (Lansky, 1967) how they would react if their son wanted to play with a cosmetic kit, parents said they would be strongly opposed, but if their daughter wanted to play with a gun, the same parents said they would not particularly mind.

A content analysis by Richardson (1981) of the Sears Wish Book for 1979 Holiday Season revealed toys are still gender linked. There are clear differences in expectations by gender for younger children in the layout pages with toys indicated: Girls are to play house, toys requiring manipulation (such as blocks, tinker toys, erector sets, trucks and vehicles) are for boys. More space was devoted to dolls than any other single category of toy. Girls were not pictured with manipulative toys. Girls are depicted as listening to music, boys operating the phonograph; girls reading and boys using the teaching computer. (Richardson, 1981)

Sawyer in 1977 used the BEM Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1974) to study the stereotyped toy choices made by children and their parents. The study revealed, female children are more likely than males to identify with the



opposite sex parents and to take the androgynous role. (Sawyer, 1977) Fling and Manosevitz (1972) state in their study of preschool children their findings show no significant difference between responses of parents and those of their children. Fling and Manosevitz used the It Scale for children examining same--sex and cross--sex behavior. Kohlberg and Zigler (1967) found that four and five year old children were oriented toward the same sex parent.

This evidence seems to be somewhat conflicting, however, it was revealed in Smart and Smart (1982) that 94% of kindergarten children indicate aggressive behavior belongs to males when asked to indicate male or female behaviors after being shown a picture of aggressive behavior. In the same study, when the examiner was a man, increased knowledge or stereotypes was indicated than when a woman was the examiner. This, Smart and Smart (1982) believe fits with the study which indicates fathers exert greater pressure than mothers for traditionally gender typed behavior. Using choices of occupations as perceived by school aged children as a replacement for play. A study of first, fifth, and eighth grade boys, older boys chose traditional male occupations; older girls chose feminine occupations for themselves and when choosing for the opposite sex girls chose traditional roles for boys but not as consistently as the boys did for themselves. Boys chose non-traditional jobs for girls, as girls did for themselves. (Williams, Bennett and Best, 1975) In an earlier study, when three to six year old children were questioned regarding occupational choice, it was found that boys expressed a wide variety of choice while girls chose mostly nurse and teacher. (Kirshner and Vondracek, 1973)

In a recent survey of literature on parents and identification, Johnson (1963) reported that girls who identified with fathers are better adjusted than girls who identified with mothers. Thorough various means and media a

message is conveyed to young children by adults. One other form of transmission is by direct verbal communication.

### Communication

In the tenth month babies start to develop a sexual identity. (Caplan, 1977) Infant girls are much more consistent in their behavior than boys are and girls are generally more attentive. Girls talk more and as early as six months pay more attention to male than female faces while male children attend more to pictures of females. (Caplan, 1977) On Channel 23, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, in June of 1984 on "What Every Baby Knows," Dr. T. Berry Brazelton of the Harvard Medical School stated, "Newborn babies always turn away from a male voice toward a female voice." In addition, a study done by communication students at the University of Oklahoma, which involved seventy six school age children indicated: a male speaker is perceived by male and female children as being more effective than a female speaker; but, the female speaker facilitates higher comprehension than male speakers regardless of the subject. (Clinton, Guinn, Lamirand, Reddington, Stoeber, 1983)

In nonverbal communication all indications from animal and human research suggest there is a direct relation between the amount of space surrounding a person and his or her dominance. (Sommer, 1969) The professor's lecturn, the executive's desk size and position is an indicator of position, the resources the priviledges, the pleasures, of the powerful. That is what "position" means in life. (Henley, 1972)

When 800 plus experiments were done regarding standing and sitting it was learned that 1) women have a greater tolerance of invasion of personal space, 2) when women get as close to men as they do to women men retreat and, 3) when men get as close to men as they do to when the male subjects

"fight" for space, 4) both males and females stand closer to women than to men. (Willis, 1966) In general, those with higher status "touch" those with lower status. Women are "touched" more than men. (Henley, 1977) All interruptions in conversations in natural settings are by men. (Zimmerman and West, 1975). In same sex conversations lapses or pauses are fairly equal, in cross sex conversations females have more silences. (Zimmerman and West, 1976) Zimmerman and West (1976) conclude: "men deny equal status to women as conversational partners." In our culture a well demeaned young man remains "cool" he does not reveal much about himself or his feelings or emotions. (Henley, 1973) In American society persons with higher status are not expected to reveal much about themselves to persons of lower status. (Goffman, 1967) In contrast "a younger woman is expected to be self-disclosing, she is socialized to reveal a great many of her feelings and therefore to be vulnerable. The personal consequences are feelings of "femininity" and vulnerability and powerlessness in women and feelings of masculinity and dominance and higher status in men." (Richarson, 1981)

In Eakin and Eakin's (1978), "Sex Differences in Communication", they state "There seems to be a difference in the value placed on males and female stereotypes. The male stereotype is more socially desirable than the female stereotype. There is evidence to suggest that people hold stereotypes across the boundary lines of age, marital status, religion and education and there is therefore reason to believe that this is generalized to the White population. Some studies show that four of five girls want to be boys whereas less than one out of two boys want to be girls. It has also been learned that 80% of the women waiting to have babies prefer males." (Eaken and Eakin, 1978)

Garcia-Zamor (1973) found that nursery school children associated euphemistic speech and negative value judgements with girls, and aggressive and competitive comments with boys. Differences in speech include: 1) women using more intensifiers e.g., "such quite, and very," (Key, 1975). 2) females enunciate more than males (Kramer, 1975). 3) They use more grammar and sentence structure than males (Thompson, 1967) and intonation patterns differ. (Brend, 1975) Trudgill (1972) states that males prove their social status through achievements and females signal it linguistically.

"The socialization of the young child begins in the first group in which they live, the family. They acquire the language of the culture and with that acquisition how to think, what to think about, and how to relate to others is undelibly etched upon them. Consequently the kind of self that develops is a function of the kind of communication provided by significant others tending (or not tending) to their needs." (Richardson, 1981)

#### The Native American Culture as an Influence

Until 1970, the United States census did not include Native Americans as an ethnic group. In "American's Other Children" it was stated that "American Indians are at the bottom of the economic ladder. As a whole they have the highest rate of unemployment and school dropouts, live in the poorest housing and are often accorded the lowest social status in our communities," (Henderson, 1971). Henderson further states:

"The average life expectancy is forty four years; 40 percent of the Indian school children drop out of high school (this is double the national average); 60% of the Indian population has less than an eighth grade education; the infant mortality rate is twenty six deaths per thousand (ten points above the national average; 50 percent of the Indian families have

annual incomes below two thousand dollars; 75 percent have annual incomes below three thousand dollars; unemployment is nearly 40 percent almost 10 times the national average." (Henderson, 1971) Sixty one different tribes inhabit the state of Oklahoma, which has the largest Indian population in the United States. (Embree, 1978)

Joseph S. Roucek (1965) called the Native American, "The most oppressed race in the United States." Historically, in the process of "deculturalization," the Native American child has been removed from parents to be placed in boarding schools, taught to speak the white man's language, relocated to industrial areas from the reservation only to return, been set apart psychologically due to language, clothing and social custom, been unable to participate in activities in integrated schools due to finances, been separated from his/her social group, been made to feel different and therefore inferior. Native Americans have experienced the unique status in their own lands of being made wards of the Federal government by Congress in 1871. This status has been re-interpreted through the years. (Roucek, 1965)

Many young Native Americans have felt that school segregation is a punishment for being "red". (Roucek, 1969) In an analysis of 582 essays by Native American Children between fifteen and seventeen years of age in all types of schools made reference to parents, family or tribe with love or concern. The Native American children wanted to own something, a "car" was mentioned most frequently. Ninety one percent wanted a regular job and most wanted off the reservation. Native American children knew more about jobs having attended integrated schools than other Indians. They had much more humility and much more lack of confidence (Hoyt, 1962) than the 207 essays of white children indicated.

In a study of Iroquis Native Americans, the women used tools and worked garden plots. The men fenced and hunted. The tribe was controlled by senior women. All the male leaders were chosen by the senior women. The male leaders were political leaders, but the women controlled when they went to war and decided the fate of captives. Economically, the maintenance of the household was a joint undertaking. Men and women cooperated in an agricultural society. (Randle, 1951) The Native American regarded the woman as inferior, the dependant servant of man and from habit she considered herself to be so. (Morgan, 1851) However, Randle (1951) observed, "Behind the Feminist movement as well as behind most male chauvinism is the concept that the difference between the sexes is always interpreted as inferiority ... Iroquis men and women have separate and different culture patterns, different values and different life goals." (Randle, 1951)

"In Indian Society, the grandfather was the teacher, a storyteller. The grandfather figure supplies ideals, a continued validity of the family, and the traditions of the culture. Such a teacher would not be outdated in today's society. Survival is a word that describes the spirit of the Indian people as diverse as the Kiowas of the Sundance and the Cherokee of the Kee-Too-Wah Fire. The Oklahoma Indian has learned the lesson of building and rebuilding a civilization and remaining true to certain basic values, regardless of the nature of that change." (Strickland, 1980)

Edwin Embree writes of the American Indian, "A new policy with three main objectives was submitted as an official document to the United States Commissioner of Indian Affairs:

- 1) Economic rehabilitation of the Indians principally on the land
- 2) Organization of the tribes for managing their own affairs

### 3) Civic and Cultural Freedom and Opportunity. (Embree, 1978)

This information is limited in terms of vastness of the needs of the Native Americans in our society, but it may or may not be appropriate as gender role formation influences are studied.

In summary, in examining the basic influences on young children it is recognized that adults in the home and in the school are a great influence on the gender role identification of young children. If sex role is defined by some as: "Behaviors that are adopted because it is expected of children not because he or she prefers it, nor because he/she is so identified" (Spence and Helmreich, 1978), then one question continues to be: In what setting is the child influenced the most in gender role formation?

Chapter three includes the methods and procedures used in this research.

### CHAPTER III

#### METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This study investigated the differences in gender type toy preferences of preschool children of Native American/non-Native American descent in a day care/non-day care setting. There were 155 (N=155) preschool children between three and five years of age. There were 69 (N=69) girls and 66 (N=66) boys in the study. 49 (N=49) were of Native American descent and 106 (N=106) were non-Native American descent. Eighty nine (N=89) were in full day (Day Care) programs and 66 (N=66) were in half day (non-day care programs). Photographs of toys were evaluated in traditional masculine, feminine, and neutral terms by a panel of experts. The photographs were presented systematically to each child and a Child Data Form was used to record responses on each child's identification of his or her own sex, toy preferences and categories of environmental influence. See Appendix D.

This chapter contains an explanation of the methods and procedures used in the experiment. The procedures used were categorized as follows: (1) Pre-experimental procedures, (2) experimental procedures, and (3) post experimental procedures.

##### Pre-experimental Procedures

The pre-experimental procedures consisted of all those tasks which the researcher needed to complete before actual data collection began. The most important task being a choice of research design which will be described in the following sections.



### Choice of Research Design

The first pre-experimental procedure was to choose a research design and plan which would be the most effective in obtaining the answers to the research questions and controlling the sources of variation. The design plan is: the overall program for the evaluation problem; the actual manipulation of independent variables being controlled; and the actual methods used in the gathering and analyses of the data.

A research design serves two basic purposes: (1) It provides answers to basic research questions posed by the investigator; and (2) it controls external sources (independent variables) of variation. In other words, it is through the design that research is made effective and interpretable. Kerlinger (1973) makes the following statement in regard to research and evaluation designs:

"... How does design accomplish this? Research design sets up the framework for 'adequate' tests of relations among variables. The design tells us, in a sense what observations (measurements) to make, how to make them, and how to analyze the quantitative representations (data) of the observations. Strictly speaking, design does not tell us precisely what to do, but rather suggests the directions of observation making and analysis, how many observations should be made, and which variables and independent variables are active and which are assigned. We can then act to manipulate (control), the active variables and to dichotomize or trichotomize or otherwise categorize the assigned variables. A design tells us what type of statistical analysis to use. Finally an adequate (proper for the particular situation) design outlines possible conclusions to be drawn from the statistical analysis." p.p. 196-197, (Kerlinger, 1973)

The research design chosen for this experimental research is a two-group survey design with most independent variables controlled by randomization. However, the variables of (1) race, (2) type of setting, (3) age, (4) gender, and (5) sources of influence are controlled within the design.

### Experimental Procedures

#### Selection of Participants

The next step of the pre-experimental procedure was to select the participants. The procedure involved the grouping of all potential participants into populations for the selection of a random sample of these populations.

Children were sought in an all Native American Child Care Center funded by the Federal or state governments for the purpose of educating and perpetuating the culture of Native Americans in the state of Oklahoma. This population includes children in full day and half day child care programs in Oklahoma City, Shawnee, McLoud, and Norman, Oklahoma. The population of non-Native American preschool children was taken in Norman, Midwest City and Del City, Oklahoma. To more specifically describe the Centers included, they are listed as follows.

#### Native American Centers

1. Native American Day Care Center, is located in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. Enrollment Criteria: 1) children must be of Native American descent preschool age and must attend for a full day every day.
2. The Kickapoo Headstart, McLoud, Oklahoma whose enrollment consist of preschool children of Native American descent, who meet maximum low income requirements, and attend for a half day every day. Preference given to Kickapoo Indians.

3. The Pottawatomie Child Care Center in Shawnee, Oklahoma, consist of children of preschool age, of Native American descent (preference given to Pottawatomie) who will attend for a half day every day.

4. The Lincoln School Summer Program in Norman, Oklahoma consist of children of pre-kindergarten age, of Native American descent, who will attend for a half day Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday of each week the summer of 1984.

#### Non-Native American Preschools

5. The Middle Earth Day Care Center in Norman, Oklahoma, where preschool children are varied, socioeconomic and cultural background, and can attend a full day every day. This Center was originally funded to limit sexism in the curriculum and provide care for children of student mothers and single parents. Toy guns are discouraged.

6. Pumpkin Shell Nursery School in Norman, Oklahoma. The criteria for enrollment in this school are for the preschool child to attend for half day on Monday, Wednesday and Friday or Tuesday and Thursday. These subjects are from a wide range of income level, occupations, and cross/cultural backgrounds.

7. Rose State College Child Development Center, Midwest City, Oklahoma. Children are accepted from birth to five years of age. They are from a mixed socioeconomic cross/cultural background, and must attend the center for a full day everyday. Student's children are given preference in this center.

8. Tinker Del Child Development Center, Del City, Oklahoma. Children are accepted from three through six years of age. They are from a mixed socioeconomic cross/cultural background and must attend the program for

a full day everyday. This Center is located near Tinker Air Force Base in Midwest City, Oklahoma.

Following the administration of the test (nine photographs of toys categorized by experts as traditionally masculine, feminine, and neutral), samples were randomly drawn from each population to control independent variables and be assured of a proportionate sampling of participants.

#### Instruments Used in Data Collection:

##### Photographs used in to Determine Toy Preference

In the collection of data, nine photographs of preschool toys were used. The researcher along with a professional photographer, David Fitzgerald, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, developed specifically for this study, nine photographs which were evaluated by eleven experts in Special Education, Early Childhood Education and Human Development. The experts were to consider these photographs with regard to traditionally gender typed toys. They also were to consider the acceptability of black and white color of the photographs of toy objects, 8 X 10 in size, with regard to controlling the color variable if real toys were used instead. All of eleven experts agreed on the photographs as being acceptable instruments to determine traditionally gender typed toy preferences. See Appendix B for responses.

##### Child Data Form and Procedure

A Child Data Form and standardized procedure was developed to question and to record the response of each child individually as they were viewing the photographs of gender type toys. The Child Data Form is presented in Appendix C.

The standardized interview and photograph viewing were as follows:

The Interviewer was instructed:

- a) To find a quiet area free of interruption.
- b) To establish rapport before beginning the interview.
- c) To seat the child at a child sized table beside the interviewer.
- d) To take between five and not more than fifteen minutes for the administration of the test cards.
- e) To begin the interview by asking, "Are you a boy or a girl and to record the response on the Child Data Form seen in Appendix C.
- f) To place three photographs (previously numbered to avoid repetition) of toys of each male, female and neutral gender type, side by side, directly in front of the child, identifying each toy as it is placed on the table.
- g) To identify the toys once more before asking for preferences and to follow this order of presentation:
  - 1) stove, car, puzzle,
  - 2) dishes, tools, building blocks,
  - 3) doll, gun, and paint brushes.
- h) To turn remaining photographs face down on the table to avoid distraction during the time questions are being asked of the child by the interviewer after each choice is made..
- i) To then ask the child "Why did you like this one the best?" If no response is given by the child, the interviewer should then ask, "Where have you seen a toy like this before?" The response is recorded each time on the Child Data Form.
- j) This process is repeated two more times using numbered sets of neutral, male and female toys.

k) Responses should then be recorded and categorized according to source of influence with regard to home, center and "other".

Additional data obtained included: 1) Setting of child care. 2) Native American/non-Native American culture differentiation 3) Sex of the child and 4) knowledge of the child's own gender 5) single or two parent family status 6) if the child was from a single parent home or the sex of the parent was recorded. This information was obtained by permission from the child's teacher. 7) Additional data was also included in a table of toy preferences among male and female Native American and non-Native American children (page 62).

### Post Experimental Procedures

#### Data Analysis Procedures

Responses of the 155 Native American and non-Native American pre-school children were analyzed to determine their differences and similarities. These responses were used in testing ten hypotheses. The ten hypotheses were stated as a result of controlling five independent variables in the study design. The five independent variables and their levels were as follows:

- (1) Source of Influence
  - a. Home
  - b. School
  - c. Other
- (2) Race
  - a. Native American
  - b. non-Native American
- (3) Gender
  - a. Female
  - b. Male

- (4) Child Care Setting
  - a. Day Care
  - b. non-Day Care
- (5) Gender Typed Toys
  - a. Male
  - b. Female
  - c. Neutral

A chi square ( $X^2$ ) statistic was used to test each of the hypotheses. The results of analyzing the data are presented in Chapter IV.

## CHAPTER IV

### PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This study investigated the differences in gender-type toy preferences of pre-school children in a day care/non-day care setting. There were one hundred and fifty five Native American and non-Native American children three through five years of age who acted as subjects to determine the differences and similarities in sources of influence, race, gender and child care setting with regard to gender type toy preferences. The subject indicated gender toy preferences by responding to nine black and white photographs of traditional toys followed by an interview involving the influence on choice of toy. The five independent variables considered in this analysis of the data obtained were as follows:

- 1) Source of Influence
  - a. home
  - b. school
  - c. other
- 2) Race
  - a. Native American
  - b. non-Native American
- 3) Sex
  - a. male
  - b. female



- 4) Child Care Setting
  - a. Day care
  - b. Non day care
- 5) Gender Typed of Toy Selection
  - a. male
  - b. female
  - c. neutral

This chapter contains the results of the data analysis. Each hypothesis is considered individually, additional findings are also presented, and a summary of all findings is presented at the end of the chapter.

#### Preliminary Analysis of Data

Preliminary analysis of the data obtained from 69 female and 66 male preschool aged children involved frequency counts of responses when measurement was at the nominal level. The raw scores are presented in the appendices. Following the frequency counts, the statistic chi square ( $X^2$ ) was used to test each of the hypotheses. The results of testing these hypotheses is as follows:

#### Results of Testing a Null Hypothesis Number One

The first null hypothesis was stated in the following format:

$HO_1$ : No statistically significant differences exist among the sources of influence on toy preferences by male and female children.

This particular hypotheses was tested by comparing the sources of influence in home, center, and "other" with the toy preference responses of male and female children. The results of the statistical calculations are shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1  
Results of Testing Differences in Source of Influence on Male/Female Selection of Toys  $HO_1$

| Observed (O) | Expected (E) | O-E  | $(O-E)^2$ | $(O-E)^2/E$ |
|--------------|--------------|------|-----------|-------------|
| 138          | 129.6        | 8.4  | 70.56     | 0.544       |
| 135          | 143.4        | 8.4  | 70.56     | 0.492       |
| 12           | 27.6         | 15.6 | 243.36    | 8.817       |
| 46           | 30.4         | 15.6 | 243.36    | 8.005       |
| 67           | 59.8         | 7.2  | 51.84     | 0.867       |
| 59           | 66.2         | 7.2  | 51.84     | 0.783       |

$\chi^2 = 19.515$   
 $df = 2$   
 $p = .001 **$

The results of testing null hypothesis number one showed there was a significant difference between male and female toy preferences with regard to sources of influence ( $\chi^2 = 19.515$ ;  $df = 2$ ;  $p < .001$ ). These results allow the researcher to reject the first null hypotheses.

Additional visual comparisons were made to determine specific differences in sources of influence on male and female childrens' toy preferences. More male and female toy choices are influenced by the home than by the school setting. "Other" influences are also greater than the school.

#### Results of Testing Null Hypotheses Number Two

The second hypothesis was stated in the following format:

HO<sub>2</sub>: No statistically significant differences exist among the sources of influence on gender typed toy preferences between Native American and non-Native American children.

This hypothesis was tested by comparing the sources of influences limited in this study to home, center, and "other" with the toy preference responses of Native American and non-Native American children.

The results of testing null hypothesis number two shows there was no significant difference in sources of influence on Native American and non-Native American children's toy preferences ( $\chi^2 = 0.0608$ ;  $df = 2$ ;  $P > .05$ ). These results would not allow the researcher to reject the null hypothesis. They are shown in Table 2.

Additional visual comparison indicate that the sources of influence on Native American and non-Native American childrens' toy preferences do not differ significantly.

#### Results of Testing Null Hypothesis Number Three

The third null hypothesis was stated in the following format:

TABLE 2

Results of Testing Differences in Source of Influence and Native American/Non-Native American Toy Choices  $H_{O2}$ 

| Observed (O) | Expected (E) | O-E | (O-E) <sup>2</sup> | (O-E) <sup>2</sup> /E |
|--------------|--------------|-----|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 89           | 87.8         | 1.2 | 1.44               | 0.016                 |
| 184          | 185.2        | 1.2 | 1.44               | 0.008                 |
| 18           | 18.6         | 0.6 | 0.36               | 0.019                 |
| 40           | 39.4         | 0.6 | 0.36               | 0.009                 |
| 40           | 40.6         | 0.6 | 0.36               | 0.009                 |
| 86           | 85.4         | 0.6 | 0.36               | 0.004                 |

$\chi^2 = 0.0608$   
 df = 2  
 p .05

HO<sub>3</sub>: No statistically significant differences exist among the sources of influence on gender typed toy preferences of children in a day care and non-day care setting.

This null hypothesis was tested by comparing sources of influence in home, center, and "other" with the toy preferences of children in a day care and non-day care setting.

The results of null hypothesis number three are shown in Table 3. They indicate a significant difference between sources of influence on gender toy selection in a day care and non-day care setting ( $X^2 = 28.126$ ;  $df = 2$ ;  $p < .001$ ). These results allow the researcher to reject the third null hypothesis.

Additional visual comparisons indicate the home and "other" influence the daycare child's toy preferences more than the non-daycare child's toy preferences. The school has the least influence on day or non-day care childrens' gender typed toy preferences.

#### Results of Testing Null Hypothesis Number Four

The fourth hypothesis was stated in the following format:

HO<sub>4</sub>: No statistically significant differences exist among the sources of influence on toy preferences with regard to male, female and neutral toys.

This null hypothesis was tested by comparing sources of influence in home, center, and "other" with the gender typed toy preferences on the children in the study.

The results of null hypothesis in number four showed a significant difference among sources of influence on toy selection and toy preferences with regard to male, female, and neutral toys ( $X^2 = 31.433$ ;  $df = 4$ ;  $p < .001$ ). These

TABLE 3

Results of Testing Differences in Source of Influence and Day Care/Non-Day Care Choices  $H_{O3}$ 

| Observed (O) | Expected (E) | O-E  | (O-E) <sup>2</sup> | (O-E) <sup>2</sup> /E |
|--------------|--------------|------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 135          | 159.5        | 24.5 | 600.25             | 3.763                 |
| 138          | 113.5        | 24.5 | 600.25             | 5.289                 |
| 49           | 33.9         | 15.1 | 228.01             | 6.726                 |
| 9            | 24.1         | 15.1 | 228.01             | 9.461                 |
| 83           | 73.6         | 9.4  | 88.36              | 1.201                 |
| 43           | 52.4         | 9.4  | 88.36              | 1.686                 |

$X^2 = 28.126$   
 $df = 2$   
 $p = .001 **$

results allow the researcher to reject the fourth null hypothesis. They are presented in Table 4.

Visual comparisons indicate the significant differences in sources of influence on male, female and neutral toy preferences. Male toy preferences are influenced by the home more than the school or "other" influences; female toy preferences are influenced by the home more than school or "other"; and neutral toy preferences are influenced more by the home than school or "other". The school is the least influence on male, female and neutral toys selected.

#### Results of Testing Null Hypothesis Number Five

The fifth hypothesis was stated in the following format:

HO<sub>5</sub>: No statistically significant differences exist between Native American and non-Native American childrens' toy preferences with regard to being male or female.

This null hypothesis was tested by comparing the toy preferences of male and female Native American and non-Native American children. The results are presented in Table 5.

The results of null hypotheses number five showed no significant difference in the Native American/non-Native American child's toy preferences with regard to being male or female ( $X^2 = 0.165$ ;  $df = 1$ ;  $p > .05$ ). These results do not allow the researcher to reject the null hypothesis.

Further visual comparisons indicate male Native American and non-Native American children have similiar toy preferences; female Native American and non-Native American children have similiar toy preferences with regard to gender typed toys.

TABLE 4

Results of Testing Differences in Source of Influence and Gender Typed Toy Selection  $HO_4$ 

| Observed (O) | Expected (E) | O-E  | (O-E) <sup>2</sup> | (O-E) <sup>2</sup> /E |
|--------------|--------------|------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 135          | 127.2        | 7.8  | 60.84              | 0.478                 |
| 10           | 27.0         | 17.0 | 289.00             | 10.704                |
| 68           | 58.8         | 9.2  | 84.64              | 1.439                 |
| 76           | 73.5         | 2.5  | 6.25               | 0.085                 |
| 17           | 15.6         | 1.4  | 2.56               | 0.164                 |
| 30           | 33.9         | 3.9  | 15.21              | 0.449                 |
| 62           | 72.3         | 10.3 | 106.09             | 1.467                 |
| 31           | 15.4         | 15.6 | 243.36             | 15.803                |
| 28           | 33.3         | 5.3  | 28.09              | 0.844                 |

$$\chi^2 = 31.433$$

$$df = 4$$

$$p = .001 **$$



TABLE 5

Results of Testing Differences in Native American/Non-Native American and Male/Female Toy Selection  $H_{O5}$ 

| Observed (O) | Expected (E) | O-E | $(O-E)^2$ | $(O-E)^2/E$ |
|--------------|--------------|-----|-----------|-------------|
| 72           | 69.8         | 2.2 | 4.84      | 0.069       |
| 145          | 147.2        | 2.2 | 4.84      | 0.033       |
| 75           | 77.2         | 2.2 | 4.84      | 0.063       |
| 165          | 162.8        | 2.2 | 4.84      | 0.030       |

$\chi^2 = 0.165$   
 $df = 1$   
 $p = .05$

#### Results of Testing Null Hypothesis Number Six

The sixth hypothesis was stated in the following format:

HO<sub>6</sub>: No statistically significant differences exist between Native American and non-Native American children's gender typed toy preferences when they are compared with regard to day care and non-day care setting.

This null hypotheses was tested by comparing the toy preferences of Native American and non-Native American children in a day care and non-day care setting. The results are presented in Table 6.

The results of the null hypothesis indicate no significant difference in the Native American and non-Native American child's toy preferences in a day care/non-day care setting ( $\chi^2 = 0.951$ ;  $df = 1$ ;  $p > .05$ ). These results do not allow the researcher to reject the null hypothesis.

Further visual comparison indicates the toy preferences of Native American and non-Native American children in day care and non-day care settings do not differ significantly.

#### Results of Testing Null Hypothesis Number Seven

The seventh hypothesis was stated in the following format:

HO<sub>7</sub>: No statistically significant differences exist between Native American and non-Native American children's toy preferences with regard to male and female and neutral choices.

The null hypothesis was tested by comparing Native American and non-Native American toy preferences. The results are presented in Table 7.

The results of the null hypothesis indicate no significant differences in Native American and non-Native American children's male, female, and neutral

TABLE 6

Results of Testing Differences in Day Care/Non-Day Care and Native American/Non-Native American Toy Choices  $HO_6$ 

| Observed (O) | Expected (E) | O-E | $(O-E)^2$ | $(O-E)^2/E$ |
|--------------|--------------|-----|-----------|-------------|
| 81           | 85.8         | 4.8 | 23.04     | 0.269       |
| 66           | 61.2         | 4.8 | 23.04     | 0.376       |
| 186          | 181.2        | 4.8 | 23.04     | 0.127       |
| 124          | 128.8        | 4.8 | 23.04     | 0.127       |

$\chi^2 = 0.951$   
 $df = 1$   
 $p = .05$

TABLE 7

Results in Testing Differences in Native American/Non-Native American and Gender-Typed Toy Selection  $HO_7$ 

| Observed (O) | Expected (E) | O-E | (O-E) <sup>2</sup> | (O-E) <sup>2</sup> /E |
|--------------|--------------|-----|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 74           | 68.5         | 5.5 | 30.25              | 0.442                 |
| 139          | 144.5        | 5.5 | 30.25              | 0.209                 |
| 37           | 39.6         | 2.6 | 6.76               | 0.171                 |
| 86           | 83.4         | 2.6 | 6.76               | 0.081                 |
| 36           | 38.9         | 2.9 | 8.41               | 0.216                 |
| 85           | 82.1         | 2.9 | 8.41               | 0.102                 |

$X^2 = 1.2214$   
 df = 2  
 p .05

toy preferences ( $X^2 = 1.221$ ;  $df = 2$ ;  $p > .05$ ). These results do not allow the researcher to reject the null hypothesis.

Further visual comparison indicates the gender typed toy selection of Native American and non-Native American children to be very similar.

#### Results of Testing Null Hypothesis Number Eight

The eighth hypothesis was stated in the following format:

HO<sub>8</sub>: No statistically significant difference exists between male and female children's toy preferences when compared with regard to day care/non-day care setting.

This null hypothesis was tested by comparing male and female toy preferences in a day care/non-day care setting. The results are presented in Table 8.

The results of the null hypothesis indicates no significant differences in male and female children's toy preferences when compared with regard to day care/non-day care setting ( $X^2 = 1.664$ ;  $df = 1$ ;  $p > .05$ ). These results do not allow the researcher to reject the null hypothesis.

A visual comparison indicates male and female children in a day care and non-day care setting have similar gender typed preferences. There are no significant differences in day care and non day care male female gender typed toy choices.

#### Results of Testing Null Hypothesis Number Nine

The ninth hypothesis was stated in the following format:

HO<sub>9</sub>: No statistically significant difference exist between male and female children's gender typed toy preferences.

This null hypothesis was tested by comparing male and female gender typed toy preferences. The results are presented in Table 9.

TABLE 8

Results of Testing Differences in Day Care/Non-Day Care/Male and Female Toy Choices  $H_{O_8}$ 

| Observed (O) | Expected (E) | O-E | (O-E) <sup>2</sup> | (O-E) <sup>2</sup> /E |
|--------------|--------------|-----|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 120          | 126.8        | 6.8 | 46.24              | 0.365                 |
| 97           | 90.2         | 6.8 | 46.24              | 0.513                 |
| 147          | 140.2        | 6.8 | 46.24              | 0.323                 |
| 93           | 99.8         | 6.8 | 46.24              | 0.463                 |

$\chi^2 = 1.664$   
 $df = 1$   
 $p = .05$

TABLE 9  
Results of Differences in Male/Female Gender Typed Toy Selection  $H_{O_9}$

| Observed (O) | Expected (E) | O-E   | (O-E) <sup>2</sup> | (O-E) <sup>2</sup> /E |
|--------------|--------------|-------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 156          | 101.1        | 55    | 3025               | 29.95                 |
| 57           | 112.0        | -55   | 3025               | 27.01                 |
| 12           | 58.4         | -46.4 | 2152.96            | 36.86                 |
| 111          | 64.6         | 46.4  | 2152.96            | 33.33                 |
| 49           | 57.5         | -8.5  | 72.25              | 1.26                  |
| 72           | 63.5         | 8.5   | 72.25              | 1.14                  |

$\chi^2 = 129.55$   
 $df = 2$   
 $p = .0001 ***$

The results of the null hypothesis indicates a significant difference in male and female gender typed toy preferences ( $X^2 = 129.55$ ;  $df = 2$ ;  $p < .001$ ). These results allowed the researcher to reject the ninth null hypothesis.

A visual comparison indicates male children choose male toys more than neutral or female toys; female children choose female toys more than male or neutral toys.

#### Results of Testing Null Hypothesis Number Ten

The tenth hypothesis was stated in the following format:

$H_{O10}$ : No statistically significant differences exist among the gender typed toy preferences by children in a day care/non-day care setting.

This null hypothesis was tested by comparing male, female, and neutral toy preferences by children in a day care/non-day care setting.

The results of the null hypothesis indicates no significant difference in gender typed toy preferences by children in a day care/non day care setting ( $X^2 = 0.798$ ;  $df = 2$ ;  $p > .05$ ). Results are shown in Table 10.

Further visual comparison indicates in a day care/non-day care setting, children make gender typed toy choices very similiarly.

#### Ancillary Findings

A visual comparison of the gender typed toy preferences of Native American/non-Native American children indicates cars and guns (traditional male toys) are chosen more by male children and dolls and puzzles (traditional female and neutral toys) are chosen more by female children. Native American male children chose no female toys, only male and neutral. Guns were chosen eighty one times by male and female children in schools where no guns are allowed. The non-Native American male child chose the gun more than any



TABLE 10

Results of Testing Differences in Day Care/Non-Day Care and Gender Typed Toy Selection  $H_{O10}$ 

| Observed (O) | Expected (E) | O-E | $(O-E)^2$ | $(O-E)^2/E$ |
|--------------|--------------|-----|-----------|-------------|
| 122          | 124.4        | 2.4 | 5.76      | 0.046       |
| 91           | 88.6         | 2.4 | 5.76      | 0.065       |
| 70           | 71.9         | 1.9 | 3.61      | 0.050       |
| 53           | 51.5         | 1.9 | 3.61      | 0.071       |
| 75           | 70.7         | 4.3 | 18.49     | 0.262       |
| 46           | 50.3         | 4.3 | 18.49     | 0.368       |

$\chi^2 = 0.798$   
 $df = 2$   
 $p = .05$

other toy was chosen. The toy preference raw data results are presented in Table 11.

#### Summary of Results of Statistical Analysis

Ten null hypothesis were tested for significance at the .05 level of confidence. These results are summarized as follows and are shown in Table 12.

There were significant differences in male and female toy preferences with regard to sources of influence.

There were no significant differences in sources of influence on Native American and non-Native American children's gender typed toy preferences.

There were significant differences in sources of influence on gender typed toy preferences in a day care/non-day care setting.

There were significant differences between sources of influence on toy selection and toy preferences with regard to male, female, and neutral toys.

There were no significant differences in the gender typed toy preferences of male and female Native American and non-American children.

There were no significant differences in the Native American/non-Native American child's toy preferences in a day care/non-day care setting.

There were no significant differences in the Native American and non-Native American child's male, female, and neutral gender typed toy preferences.

There were no significant differences in male and female children's toy preferences in a day care/non-day care setting.

There were significant differences in male and female responses in gender typed toy preferences.

Table 11  
Summary of Gender Typed Toy Selection

|                                       |                      | Male Toys (N=211) |     |       | Neutral Toys (N=123) |        |        | Female Toys (N=122) |       |        |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-----|-------|----------------------|--------|--------|---------------------|-------|--------|
|                                       |                      | Gun               | Car | Tools | Puzzle               | Paints | Blocks | Stove               | Dolls | Dishes |
| NATIVE<br>AMERICAN<br>(N=50)          | MALE<br>(N=25) (N=   | 22                | 23  | 14    | 9                    | 2      | 5      | 0                   | 0     | 0      |
|                                       | FEMALE<br>(N=25) (N= | 3                 | 11  | 3     | 13                   | 4      | 4      | 10                  | 18    | 9      |
| NON-<br>NATIVE<br>AMERICAN<br>(N=102) | MALE<br>(N=47) (N=   | 39                | 38  | 22    | 20                   | 3      | 10     | 4                   | 2     | 3      |
|                                       | FEMALE<br>(N=55) (N= | 17                | 14  | 5     | 32                   | 8      | 13     | 22                  | 33    | 21     |
| TOTAL NUMBER* (N=                     |                      | 81                | 86  | 44    | 74                   | 17     | 32     | 36                  | 53    | 33     |

\* "Each child was asked to make one selection from each of three groups."

Table 12

Summary of Results of Testing the Ten Null Hypotheses:  
The Statistical Results and Levels of Significance

| ESSENCE OF HYPOTHESIS |                                        | $\chi^2$ VALUE | df | PROBABILITY<br>LEVEL | SIGNIFICANT<br>DIFFERENCE<br>** |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------------|----------------|----|----------------------|---------------------------------|
| HO <sub>1</sub>       | Source of Influence vs. Sex            | 19.515         | 2  | p .001               | **                              |
| HO <sub>2</sub>       | Source of Influence vs. Race           | 0.0608         | 2  | p .05                | --                              |
| HO <sub>3</sub>       | Source of Influence vs. Setting        | 28.126         | 2  | p .001               | **                              |
| HO <sub>4</sub>       | Source of Influence vs. Type of Toys   | 31.433         | 4  | p .001               | **                              |
| HO <sub>5</sub>       | Race vs. Sex                           | 0.165          | 1  | p .05                | --                              |
| HO <sub>6</sub>       | Race vs. Day Care/Non-Day Care         | 0.951          | 1  | p .05                | --                              |
| HO <sub>7</sub>       | Race vs. Type of Toys                  | 1.221          | 2  | p .05                | --                              |
| HO <sub>8</sub>       | Sex vs. Day Care/Non-Day Care          | 1.664          | 1  | p .05                | --                              |
| HO <sub>9</sub>       | Sex vs. Type of Toys                   | 129.55         | 2  | p .001               | ***                             |
| HO <sub>10</sub>      | Day Care/Non Day Care vs. Type of Toys | 0.798          | 2  | p .05                | --                              |

-- = no significant difference

\*\* = a significant difference

\*\*\* = very significant difference

There were no significant differences in gender typed toy preferences of children in a day care/non-day care setting.

The conclusions drawn from the results presented in this chapter are in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V  
SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND SUGGESTIONS  
FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine significant basic influences on gender typed toy preferences of Native American and non-Native American children in a day care/non-day care setting.

There were one hundred and fifty five three and four year old children of Native American and non-Native descent in a day care/non-day care setting. Sixty-six males and sixty-nine females were presented with black and white photographs of male, female and neutral toys classified as such by a panel of experts in Special Education and Early Childhood Education. Additional information was acquired by interviewing each child following the procedure for indicating their toy preferences.

Hypotheses were tested with regard to differences in: (1) source of influence (2) gender (3) race (4) childcare setting (5) gender typed toy preference. Secondary differences were observed in the study by visually comparing toy preferences that were salient.

The results of testing the ten hypotheses showed that there was a significant difference in male and female toy preferences with regard to sources of influence. There was no significant difference in sources of influence on Native American and non-Native American children's gender typed toy preferences. There was a significant difference in sources of influence on

gender toy preferences in a day care/non day care setting. There was a significant difference between sources of influence on toy selection and toy preferences with regard to male, female, and neutral toys. There was no significant difference in the gender typed toy preferences of male and female Native American and non-Native American children. There was no significant difference in the Native American and non-Native American child's toy preferences in a day care/non-day care setting. There was no significant difference in the Native American child's male, female and neutral gender typed toy preferences. There was no significant difference in male and female children's toy preferences in a day care/non-day care setting. A significant difference in male and female responses in gender typed toy preferences was found but there was no significant difference in gender typed toy preferences of children in a day care/non-day care setting.

Observations, remarks and findings concerning the results of testing these ten hypotheses are meant to be a continuation of the study of gender formation. They are not to be interpreted as generalizations of all pre-school children but of the population from which the subjects were taken. A summary of implications based on the review of literature and the results of this study are presented in the following section.

### Conclusions

This research indicated some studies from the literature were supported and some were not. The following is a summary of the implications of this study:

- \* Male and female children are influenced by the home more than any other source of influence to make gender-typed choices in toys.

- \* The time spent in the center has little significance with regard to male/female gender typed toy selections.
- \* The home is the greatest influence on day care and non-day care children.
- \* "Other" influences are greater than the school even though the child spends more time in a full time day care situation. When parents work and the pre-school child's bedtime is early, the child spends little time regularly with the parent, except for weekends, when the child is attending a 7:30a.m. to 5:30p.m. Day Care Center.
- \* Native American children's gender toy choices are more similar to non-Native American choices than they are different. There was no significant difference in the two groups. Apparently all the children in this study saw similar catalogs, books, television, and experience similar traditional attitudes conveyed by the home. The income variable in the home was not examined in this study.
- \* Male children chose traditionally male toys more than female or neutral toys. Cars, guns, and tools were chosen the most, puzzles and blocks were next. Paints, stove, dolls and dishes were chosen the least. See Table 11, Page 62.
- \* Female children chose traditionally female toys more than male or neutral toys. Neutral toys were chosen by female children more than male toys. Dolls were chosen the most. Puzzles were next. A car was chosen last by non-Native American females, but Native American females chose dishes last. See Table 11, Page 62.

These findings support the research done by Fagot (1982) when she says, "The biological components of gender identity and sex role behavior, while



definitely of consequence, are relatively small by comparison with cultural differences." (pp. 13)

The results also support Money and Erhardt (1975) when they state on page 14, "Most parents give children cues without conscious effort routinely."

The data analysis does not support Santrock (1984) when he describes a "de-emphasis on parents as a critical socializing agent (pp. 20), nor does the data support Richardson's (1981) belief that "girls are allowed greater freedom than boys to veer from the approved path" with regard to feminine or unfeminine behavior. In the results of this particular study (Table 9), male children chose male toys, and female children chose female toys.

When the review of literature and results of this study were summarized several possibilities for further research were indicated. In the following section, these implications are stated.

#### Suggestions for Further Research

There were several implications for further research noted during this study. The possibilities are described as follows:

\* The Gender Typed Toy Preferences Test could be used to collect data again, and to further validate the instrument used in this study, and/or to collect data with different populations. Some of these groups could include:

- a) single parents (cross sex, same sex)
- b) teen parents
- c) step parents
- d) "latch key" children (siblings)
- e) school personnel
- f) grandparents of preschool children
- g) foster parents

- h) children older than five years of age
- i) Preschool children from homes with different income levels
- j) children of cultures other than Native American.

\* Another possibility might be to use the same instrument in a repeated measure design, which would involve implementing a concentrated relearning program on gender role formation for the children, parents, or teachers, then testing them before and after intervention.

\* Additionally, in collecting data from adults a different procedure for asking questions could be used with the same instrument. For example, "Which toy would you like the most for your child?" and "Why do you like this one the best?" and "Where have you seen this before?" and/or, "As a child did you have a toy like this?"

\* Another possibility would be to compare the results of data collected by this instrument and data collected with other similar instruments. Additional variables such as the income level of the parents of the children, non-traditional parental responses, or sibling responses of older children in the family could also be compared.

## References

- Ambron, S. R., and Salkind, N. J., Child Development, fourth edition, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1984. pp. 320-333.
- American College Dictionary, C. L. Barnhart (ed.), Random House, New York, 1955.
- Auletta, K., Children of Children, Parade Magazine. Page 5-7, June 17, 1984.
- Bandura, A., R. H. Walters. Social Learning and Personality Development. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.
- Bascow. S. H. Sex-roles, stereotypes, traditions and alternatives. Monterey, California: Brooks-Cole Publishing Co., 1980.
- Bee, H. The Developing Child. Third edition, 1981, pp. 376-392.
- Belsky, J., Lerner, R. M. and Spanier, G. B. The Child In The Family, Addison-Weseley, 1984, pp. 73.
- Bem, S. L. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42 155-162.
- Berger, K. S. The Developing Person Through the Life Span, Worth Publishers, New York, 1983.
- Biller, H. B. Sex-role learning: Some comments and complexities from a multi-dimensional perspective. In S. Cohen and T. J. Comiskey (Eds.). Child Development: A contemporary perspective. Itasca, IL., F. E. Peacock, 1977.
- Brazelton, T. B. on "Working Mother" A Television Show Life Line. Network Channel 23, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. June 11, 1984.

- Brend, R. M. "Male-female intonation patterns in American English" 84-87 in Barrie Thorne and Nancy Henley (eds.). Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance, Rowley, Mass.: Newbury Press, 1975.
- Brown, D. G., "Sex Role Preference in Young Children" Psychological Monograph, 1956. 70 No. 14.
- Brown, J. and Bakeman, R. "Antecedents of emotional involvement in mothers of premature and full-term infants." Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, New Orleans, March, 1977.
- Brun-Golbndasin, Sverre, "Sex Roles and the Socialization Process," pp. 59-78 in Edward Dolhberg (ed.). The Changing Roles of Men and Women, London, Duckworth, 1967.
- Caplan, F. The First Twelve Months of Life. The Princeton Center for Early Childhood, Bantam Books, New York, 1983.
- Chasen, B. Sex role stereotyping and pre-kindergarten teachers. The Elementary School Journal, January, 1974, 220-235.
- Chiles-Miller, P. "Reactions to Marital Roles in Commercials." Journal of Advertising Research, 15, 1975, 45-49.
- Clinton, M., Guinn, M., Lamerand, L., Reddington, C., Stoever, G. "Gender interaction between speaker and listener: A study of listing comprehension and speaker effectiveness." A paper presented at the Communications Regional Conference, Memphis, Tennessee, June 1983.
- Collins, G., "Gender Identity, sex role behavior in children studied", New York Times Service, The Norman Transcript, February, 1984, pp. 4.
- Copperman, P., "The Literary Hoax: The Decline of Reading, Writing, and Learning in the Public Schools and What We Can Do About It." New York, Morrow, 1980.

- DeFain, J. "Sexism in Parenting Manuals," The Family Coordinator, 26, 1977, pp. 245-251.
- Dickie, J. R., Van Gent, E., Hoogewerf, K., Martinez, I., and Dieterman, L. "Mother-Father-Infant Triad: Who affects whose satisfaction?" Paper presented at biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Boston, MA, April, 1981.
- Drake, C. T., and McDougall, D. "Effects of the absence of a father and other male models on the development of boys' sex roles." Developmental Psychology, 1977, 13, 537-538.
- Eakin, B. W. and Eakin, R. G., Sex differences in Communication. Houghton Mifflin, 1978, 8-15.
- Edwards, C. P. and B. B. Whiting. "Differential socialization of girls and boys in light of cross cultural research." C. M. Super and S. Harkness (Ed.). Anthropological perspectives on child development (New directions for Child Development, No. 8). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- Embree, E. R. Indians of the Americas. Collier Books, New York, 1978.
- Emmerick, W. "Parental identification in young children," Genetic Psychological Monographs, 1959, 60, 257-308.
- Epstein, A. S. "Pregnant teenager's knowledge of child development." Paper presented at biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, San Francisco, March, 1979.
- Erhardt, A. and Baker, S. W. "Hormonal aberrations and their implications for the understanding of normal sex differentiation." A paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Philadelphia, March, 1973.
- Erikson, E. H. Childhood and Society, New York, Norton, 1952.

- Etzioni, A. "A Sex Control Science and Society" Science 16 (1968), 1007-10010.
- Fagot, B. I. and Kronsberg, S. J., "Sex differences: Biological and Social Factors Influencing the Behavior of Younger Boys and Girls." S. B. Moore and C. R. Cooper (Eds). The Young Child: Reviews of Research (Vol. 3), Washington, D.C., National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1982.
- Fagot, B. J. and Patterson, G. R. "An invivo analysis of reinforcing contingencies for sex role behavior in the preschool child." Developmental Psychology, 1969, 1, pp. 563-568.
- Fein, G. G., D. Johnson, N. Kosson, L. Stork, and L. Wasserman. "Stereotypes and preferences in the toy choices of 20 month old boys and girls" Developmental Psychology, 1975, 11:527-528.
- Fields, S. Like Father, Like Daughter, Little, Brown. Boston, Toronto, 1st edition, 1983.
- Field, T. "Affective Displays in High Risk Infants in Early Interaction." In T. Field and A. Foge; (Eds.), Emotions and Interactions. Hillsdale, New Jersey, Lawrence Earlbaum, 1982.
- Fischer, K. W., Lazerson, A. Human Development, W. H. Freeman and Co., New York, 1984.
- Fling, S. and Manosevitz, M. "Sex typing in nursery school: children's play interests." Developmental Psychology, 1972, 7 (2), 146-152.
- Friend, S., "The Ego and the Id.", in K. W. Fischer, and a Lazerson, Human Development, Translation by J. Reviere and J. Strachey, New York, Norton, 1960.
- Garcia-Azamor, Ma. A. "Child awareness of sex role distinctions in language."

- Gardner, R. The Parents Book About Divorce, Bantam Book, 1977, 210-211.
- Gerbner, G. et al. "The demonstration of power: Violence profile No. 10." Journal of Communication, 29, 1979, 177-196.
- Gerbner, G. and Gross, L. "Living with Television: The violence profile" Journal of Communication, 26 1976, 173-199.
- Goffman, E., The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. Garden City, New York Doubleday and Co., Inc. 1959.
- Goffman, E., Interaction Ritual, New York, Anchor Books, 1967, 47-95.
- Goffman, E., Gender Advertisements, New York: Harper Colophone, 1976.
- Greenberg, M. "The male early childhood teacher, An appraisal," Young Children, 1977, 32, 34-38.
- Hartley, R. E. "Children's Concepts of Males and Female Roles." Merrill Palmer Quarterly, 1959, 6. 83-91.
- Henderson, G. America's Other Children, Henderson (ed). University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, OK, 1971.
- Hendrick, J., The Whole Child. Times Mirror/Mosby Santa Clara, 1984, third edition, 261.
- Henley, N. "Power Sex and Non Verbal Communication." Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1977.
- Henley, N. "Body Politics: Power, Sex and Non Verbal Communication." Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1977.
- Hetherington, E. M. "Effects of paternal absence on sex-typed behaviors in Negro and White preadolescent males." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 87-91.
- Hetherington, E. M., Cox, M., and Cox, R. "The development of children in mother headed families." In H. Hoffman and D. Reiss (Eds.). The American Family: Dying and Developing. New York: Plenum, 1978.

- Hetherington, E. M., And Deur, J. The effects of father absence on child development. Young Children, 1971, 26, 233-248.
- Herzog, E. and Sudia, C. E., Children in fatherless families. In B. M. Caldwell and H. N. Riccute (Eds.). Review of Child Development Research (Vol. 3). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.
- Hoffman, L. W., "Changes in family roles socialization and sex differences." American Psychologist, 32 (1977) 644-657.
- Honig, A. S. "Parental Involvement in Early Childhood Education" (Rev. Ed.). Washington, D. C., National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1979.
- Hoyt, E. E. "Young Indians Some Problems of Mental Hygiene," Mental Health, Vol, XLVI, No. 1 (January, 1962), 41-47.
- Jacklin, C. N. Maccoby, E. E. and Dick, A. E., "Barrier behavior and toy preferences (and their absence) in the one year old," Child Development, 1973, 44, 196-200.
- Jastrzembski, L. R., Sex Role Identification in Preschool Children. A study of stereotypic toy choices made by children and their parents. (A Master's Thesis. Oklahoma State University) 1975.
- Johnson, M. M., "Sex Role Learning in the Nuclear Family." Child Development, Vol. 34 (1963). 319-333.
- Ragan, J. "Acquisition and Significance of Sex Typing and Sex Role Research," Hoffman and Lois Wladis Hoffman, eds. Review of Child Development Research. New York Russell Sage Foundation, 1964. Vol. I, p. 137.
- Ragan, J. "The emergence of sex differences," School Review. 80:21-27, February, 1972.



- Kerlinger, F. N., Research, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973, pp. 120-161.
- Key, M. R. Male/Female Language, Netuchen, New Jersey, The Scarecrow Press, 1975.
- Kohlberg, L. "A Cognitive Developmental Analysis of Children's Sex Role Concepts and Attitudes." In E. E. Maccoby (ed.), The Development of Sex Differences, Stanford, California, Stanford University Press, 1966.
- Kohlberg, L. and Ziegler, E. "Impact of cognitive maturation on the development of sex role attitudes in the years four to eight." Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1967, 75, 89-161.
- Kramer, C., "Women's speech: separate but unequal?" pp. 43-56 in Barrie Thorne and Nancy Henley (eds.), Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance. Rowley, Mass., Newbury House, 1975.
- Krieg, T. R., Children's Perceptions of Sex Roles Related to Adult Activities (A Master's Thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1977).
- Kuhn, D. Nash, S. Churmin, and Brucken, L. "Sex Role Concepts of Two and Three Year Olds," Child Development, 1978, 49, 445-451.
- Kerchner, E. P. and Vondracek, S. I. "What do you want to be when you grow up? Vocational choice in children aged three to six." Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, March, 1973.
- Lake, A. "Are we born into our sex-roles or programmed into them." Woman's Day, January, 1975, pp. 24-25.
- Lanib, M. E. "The development of parent preferences in the first two years of life." Sex Roles, 3, 1977, pp. 495-497.

- Lausky, L. M. "The family structure also affects the model: Sex role attitudes in parents of preschool children." Merrill Palmer Quarterly, 1967, 13, 139-150.
- LeCorgue, L. C. and Laosa, L. M., "Father absence on low-income Mexican-American families: Children: social adjustment and conceptual differentiation of sex role attributes." Developmental Psychology, 1976, 12, 439-448.
- LeFranncois, G. R. Of Children, Fourth Edition, Wadsworth, 1983, 312-313.
- Leach, P. Babyhood, Alfred Knopf, 1983, pp. 139-140.
- Maccoby, E. E. and Jacklin, C. N. The Psychology of Sex Differences, Stanford, California, Stanford University Press, 1974.
- Marcus, D. E., and Overton, W. F. "The development of cognitive gender constancy and sex role differnces," Child Development, 1978, 49, 434-444.
- Markle, G. E. and Nam, C. B. "The Impact of Sex Predetermination in Fertility." Presented at the annual meeting of the Population Association of America: April, 1973.
- McGhee, P., and Grodzetsky, P. "Sex role identification and humor among preschool children." Journal of Psychology, 84, 1973, 183-193.
- Money, John and Ebrhardt, Anke, A. Man, Woman, Boy and Girl, Baltimore, Maryland, The John Hopkins University Press, 1972.
- Morgan, L. H. (1951). "League of the Ho-De-No-Sau-Nee or Iroquis." Reprint, New York, Dodd Mead, 1904, in Roger Kinsing Kin Groups and Social Structure, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975.
- Moss, E. A. "Sex, age, and state as determinants of mother-infant interaction." Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Behavior and Development, 13, 1967, pp. 19-36.

- Mussen, P. and Rutherford, E. "Parent-Child Relations in Relation to Young Children's Sex Role Preferences." Child Development, 1963, 34, 589-607.
- Mussen, P. and Parker, A. "Mother nurturance and girls' incidental milative learning," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2, 94-97.
- Mussen, P. and Destler, L. "Masculinity identification and father-son relationships." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 59, 350-356.
- N.O.W. "Women on Words and Images, Dick and Jane as victims: Sex stereotyping in children's readers," Princeton, New Jersey: NOW 1972.
- Norris, William, American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, (ed.), Mifflin, Boston, 1976.
- Oklahoma State Employment Security Commission, Research and Planning Commission in Cooperation with National Census Bureau.
- Oklahoma Licensing Service, Department of Human Services, State Capitol, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.
- Palmer, E. L., McDowell, C. N. "Program/Commercial separators in children's television programming." Journal of Communication, 29, 1979, 197-201.
- Park, R. D. "Perspectives on Father Infant Interaction." In J. D. Osofsky (ed). Handbook of Infant Development. New York, John Wiley and Sons Inc., 1979.
- Payne, D. E. and Mussen, P. H. "Parent-child relations and father identification among adolescent boys." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1956, 52, 358-362.
- Pederson, F. A., and Robsin, K. S. "Father participation in infancy." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry. 39, 1969, 466-472, Newman, B. M., and Newman, P. R. Infancy and Childhood: Development and its contexts. New York, Wiley, 1978.
- Pawer, T. G. "Sex Typing Infancy." The Role of the Father Infant Neutral Hearth Journal 2, 226-240.

- Quaforth, J. M. "Children's understanding of the nature of television characters." Journal of Communication, 29, 1979, 210-218.
- Randle, M. C. "Iroquis Women, Then and Now," in W. N. Fenton ed., Symposium on local diversity in Iroquis culture, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin No. 149. Washington, D. C., U. S. Government Printing Office, 1951.
- Pheingold, H. and Cook, K. V. "The contents of boys and girls rooms as an index of parents behavior." Child Development, 1975, 46, 459-463.
- Richardson, L. W., The Dynamics of Sex and Gender, 2nd Edition, Houghton Mifflin, 1981. pp. 41-58.
- Rothbard, M. K., and Maccoby, E. E., "Parents' differential reactions to sons and daughters," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 237-243.
- Roucek, J. S. "The Most Oppressed Race in the United States: The Indians." The Educational Forum, Kappa Delta Pi, May, 1965 in George Henderson (ed.) American's Other Children. University of Oklahoma Press, 1971.
- Rubin, J.; Provenzano, F., and Luria, Z. "The eye of the beholder: Parents views on the sex of newborns," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1974, 44, 512-519.
- Rubin, J. Z., F. J. Provenzano and Z. Luria. "The eye of the beholder: Parents views on the sex of newborns." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1974. 43, 720-731.
- Santrock, J. W. Life Span Development, William C. Brown, 1984, pp. 235.
- Sawyers, J. K., "Sex Role Identification in preschool children: a study of stereotypic toy choices made by children and conformity to their parents." (A Master's Thesis, Oklahoma State University, July 1977).
- Salby, R. G. and Frey, K. S. "Development of gender constancy and selective attention to same models." Child Development, 1975, 46, 849-856.

- Smart, M. S., R. C. Smart, Children, McMillan Publishing Co., New York, 1982, 193.
- Smart, M. S. and R. C. Smart. Children, fourth edition, 1982, pp. 185-186.
- Sommer, R. Personal Space: The Behavioral Bases of Design. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1969.
- Spanier, G. B. and Glick, P. C. "Marital instability in the United States: Some correlates and recent changes." Family Relations, 1981, 31, 329-338.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, Robert L. "Masculinity and Femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates and antecedents." Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1978.
- Spence, J. T. Helmreich, R. and Stapp, J. "Ratings of Self and Peers on Sex Role Attributes and their Relation to Self Esteem and Conceptions of Masculinity and Femininity." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 1975. 32, pp. 29-39.
- Stein, A. H. and L. K. Friedrich. "Impact on Television on Children and Youth." IN E. M. Heterington (Ed.). Review of Child Development Research, Vol. 5, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1976.
- Tan, A. S., "T. V. beauty ads and role expectations of adolescent female viewers." Journal of Questionnaire, 1976, 53, pp. 271-279.
- Tarvis, C. and C. Offir. The longest war: Sex differences in perspective. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1977.
- Thompson, S. K. "Gender Labels and Early Sex Role Development," Child Development, 1975, 46, 339-347.
- Thompson, S. K., "Gender labels and early sex role development." Child Development. 1975. 46, 339-347.

- Thompson, W. N., Quantitative Research in Public Address and Communication.  
New York, Random House, 1967.
- Trelease, J. The Read-aloud Handbook, Penguin Books, 1983. pp. 91-106.
- Trudgill, P. "Sex, covert prestige and linguistic change in Urban British English of Norvicle." Language in Society, 1, 1972, 179-195.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census, Series P-20, No. 352. "Household and family characteristics:" March, 1979. Current Population Reports. Washington, D. C., U. S. Government Printing Office, July, 1980.
- U. S. Bureau of Census, "Number timing and duration of marriages and divorces in the United States." Current population reports, Series P-20, No. 297. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1976.
- Weitzman, L. J. "Sex Role Socialization: A Focus on Women." Palo Alto, California, Mayfield, 1979.
- Weitzman, L. J.; Eefler, D., Hokoda, E., and Ross, C. "Sex role socialization in picture books for preschool children." American Journal of Sociology, 77, 1972, pp. 1125-1150.
- Williams, J. E., S. M. Bennett, and D. L. Best. "Awareness and expression of sex stereotypes in young children." Developmental Psychology, 1975, 11, 635-642.
- Willis, F. N., Jr. "Initial speaking distance as a function of the speaker's relationship" Psychonomic Science, 6, 1966, 221-222.
- Zimmerman, D. H. and West, C. "Sex roles, interruptions and silences in conversations." pp. 105-129 in Barrie Thorne and Nancy Henley (eds.). Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance. Rowley, Massachusetts, Newbury House, 1975.

APPENDIX A  
LETTER REQUESTING OPPORTUNITY FOR  
DATA COLLECTION

June 11, 1978

Rose State College  
Kickapoo Headstart  
Native American Center  
Middle Earth Daycare  
Pumpkin Shell Nursery  
Tinker Del Child Development Center  
Pottawatomie Childcare Center

To Whom It May Concern:

Given permission, it is my intention to submit nine photographs of toys to the children in your center between the ages of 3 and 5 for the purpose of determining the toy preferences of preschool children for my doctoral dissertation at the University of Oklahoma. We would like to come at prearranged times until the work is completed.

I have discussed this with you previously and I hope this will be a satisfactory arrangement. If there is any difficulty, please call me at my home (329-0649) or office (733-7449).

Sincerely,

Marcia Guinn



March 11, 1984

Rose State College  
Kickapoo Headstart  
Native American Center  
Middle Earth Daycare  
Pumpkin Shell Nursery  
Tinker Del Child Development Center  
Pottawatomie Childcare Center

To Whom It May Concern:

Given permission, it is my intention to submit nine photographs of toys to the children in your center between the ages of 3 and 5 for the purpose of determining the toy preferences of preschool children for my doctoral dissertation at the University of Oklahoma. We would like to come at prearranged times until the work is completed.

I have discussed this with you previously and I hope this will be a satisfactory arrangement. If there is any difficulty, please call me at my home (329-0649) or office (733-7449).

Sincerely,

Marcia Guinn

**APPENDIX B**  
**PANEL OF EXPERTS**

June 6, 1984

### Panel of Experts

Nine photographs of toys were chosen by a panel of experts in the fields of Child Psychology, Child Development, Special Education, Educational Psychology, Guidance and Counseling., Marriage and Family, and Early Childhood Education. Five men and six women were included in the panel of persons. Each person was asked separately to:

- 1) Classify the photographs according to traditional opinions of what were to be considered male, female, and neutral toys.
- 2) After completing this task, each was asked to make comments about their selection.

The following was the result of the panel selections:

#### 1. Dr. O. J. Rupiper, Male, Educational Psychologist

| M       | F        | N         | Comments          |
|---------|----------|-----------|-------------------|
| 1 Gun   | 3 Doll   | 7 Blocks  | Agreed with panel |
| 2 Car   | 4 Stove  | 8 Paints  |                   |
| 6 Tools | 5 Dishes | 9 Puzzle* |                   |

#### 2. Dr. Henry Draper, Male, Child Development

| M       | F        | N        | Comments          |
|---------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 Gun   | 4 Blocks | 7 Dolls  | Agreed with panel |
| 2 Car   | 5 Puzzle | 8 Dishes |                   |
| 3 Tools | 6 Paints | 9 Stove  |                   |

#### 3. Dr. Avi Scherman, Male, Educational Psychology

| M       | F        | N        | Comments          |
|---------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 Gun   | 4 Stove  | 7 Puzzle | Agreed with panel |
| 2 Car   | 5 Dishes | 8 Paints |                   |
| 3 Tools | 6 Dolls  | 9 Blocks |                   |

## 4. Dr. Charles Butler, Male, Secondary Education

| M       | F        | N        | Comments          |
|---------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 Gun   | 4 Blocks | 7 Dolls  | Agreed with panel |
| 2 Car   | 5 Paints | 8 Dishes |                   |
| 3 Tools | 6 Puzzle | 9 Stove  |                   |

## 5. Dr. John McAlester, Male, Psychiatrist

| M       | F        | N        | Comments          |
|---------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 Gun   | 4 Stove  | 7 Paints | Agreed with panel |
| 2 Car   | 5 Dolls  | 8 Blocks |                   |
| 3 Tools | 6 Dishes | 9 Puzzle |                   |

## 6. Dr. Peggy Petty, Female, Early Childhood Education

| M       | F        | N        | Comments          |
|---------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 Gun   | 4 Stove  | 7 Paints | Agreed with panel |
| 2 Car   | 5 Dolls  | 8 Blocks |                   |
| 3 Tools | 6 Dishes | 9 Puzzle |                   |

## 7. Dr. Wanda Draper, Female, Child Development

| M        | F        | N        | Comments          |
|----------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 Gun    | 4 Stove  | 7 Paints | Agreed with panel |
| 2 Blocks | 5 Dolls  | 8 Car    |                   |
| 3 Tools  | 6 Dishes | 9 Puzzle |                   |

## 8. Dr. Maggie Hayes, Female, Marriage and Family Relations

| M        | F        | N        | Comments          |
|----------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 Gun    | 4 Blocks | 7 Dolls  | Agreed with panel |
| 2 Blocks | 5 Puzzle | 8 Dishes |                   |
| 3 Tools  | 6 Paints | 9 Stove  |                   |

## 9. Dr. Gaye McNutt, Female, Special Education

| M       | F        | N        | Comments          |
|---------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 Gun   | 4 Stove  | 7 Paints | Agreed with panel |
| 2 Car   | 5 Dolls  | 8 Blocks |                   |
| 3 Tools | 6 Dishes | 9 Puzzle |                   |

## 10. Dr. Marcia Funnel, Female, Early Childhood Education

| M       | F        | N        | Comments          |
|---------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 Gun   | 4 Stove  | 7 Paints | Agreed with panel |
| 2 Car   | 5 Dolls  | 8 Blocks |                   |
| 3 Tools | 6 Dishes | 9 Puzzle |                   |

## 11. Dr. Francis Everett, Female, Child Psychologist

| M       | F        | N        | Comments          |
|---------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 Gun   | 4 Stove  | 7 Paints | Agreed with panel |
| 2 Car   | 5 Dolls  | 8 Blocks |                   |
| 3 Tools | 6 Dishes | 9 Puzzle |                   |

APPENDIX C  
CHILD DATA INFORMATION FORM

## Child Data Information Card

Month \_\_\_\_\_ First Name of the Child \_\_\_\_\_

Year \_\_\_\_\_ Birthdate \_\_\_\_\_ or age \_\_\_\_\_

Number of Children \_\_\_\_\_ Check one: Two Parent \_\_\_\_ One Parent \_\_\_\_

in the family \_\_\_\_\_ Sex of One Parent Home (circle) F M

Sex of the Child: Boy \_\_\_\_ Girl \_\_\_\_

Check one:

Native American \_\_\_\_

Non-Native American

Are you a boy \_\_\_\_ or a girl \_\_\_\_?

| Male           | Female        | Neutral                  |
|----------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| a stove _____  | b car _____   | c puzzle _____           |
| d dishes _____ | e tools _____ | f building blocks _____  |
| g doll _____   | h gun _____   | i painting brushes _____ |

Why? Where? 1) 1st selection and response \_\_\_\_\_ Source \_\_\_\_\_

Why? Where? 2) 2nd selection and response \_\_\_\_\_ Source \_\_\_\_\_

Why? Where? 3) 3rd selection and response \_\_\_\_\_ Source \_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX D  
XEROXED COPIES OF ORIGINAL  
PHOTOGRAPHS USED IN THE  
GENDER TYPED TOY PREFERENCE TEST























