CHAPTER 6
DISCUSSION

We have commented upon the results wherever possible and hence they are just briefly discussed here.

6.1 Hypothesis 1 & 2 - Sex Role development:
Hypothesis 1 and 2 are related to this dependent variable.

6.1.1. Hypothesis 1
The first hypothesis stating that even in the modern era of social upheaval and progress, males and females will show traditionality in their sex role development.

This hypothesis states that males and females both will endorse own-sex score higher than the opposite sex score. This hypothesis is almost totally proved. In the TMs and TFS, the difference between their two scores is highly significant (P=.000). This fact is substantiated by the results of other groups of males and females at different educational levels. In all, there are eight groups in 4 levels where we can compare their two scores.
Out of them 5 groups show significance. Two out of remaining three, though not prove statistically, support the same fact, one group which is disproving the fact is J.C. Males. Their own sex score is slightly lesser (though insignificantly) than the opposite sex score.

6.1.1.1. This hypothesis can further be tested among groups where the difference is assumed to be lesser. The assigned sex categories namely androgynous and undifferentiated, are those categories, in which individuals endorse both the traits either high (in androgynous) or low (in undifferentiated) are grouped. There we do not expect the two scores to vary considerably. Compared to other two sex categories the andro males and females show the difference is lesser but statistically highly significant. This fact clearly indicates that males and females and even androgynous males and androgynous females rate their own score highly than the opposite sex score. One fact should be made clear that an individual is categorised as androgynous or otherwise with respect to his/her standing in a group. The position is relative and not absolute. If the group varies in the two scores, the standards on which an individual is categorised as androgynous or otherwise will naturally vary with a group.
But in a given population androgynous and undifferentiated categories are assumed to show equality between these two scores.

The fact was traced among various subgroups of androgynous and undifferentiated males and females. At high school level androgynous males and females show the difference in their own sex and opposite sex score where their own sex score is greater than the opposite sex score. Females at this level, too show the same trend. At junior college level, males though follow the trend the difference between their two scores is remarkably less. However, females at the same level follow the general trend. At under graduate level again, males and females both have resorted to the same trend. Comparatively undifferentiated males show less difference than females. Post graduate males and females again are not exception to the general trend. Overall results prove the hypothesis that males and females despite the historical changes in the legal status of women and despite the changes in permissible
behaviours accorded to men and women, continue to
define and conform to the views of a larger society, is
proved. According to Ellis and Bentler(1973) the
relationship between sex stereotypes and traditional
sex determined role standards reinforce each other.
Legal and economic advances have extended the range of
roles permissible for men and women. Yet traditional
sex determined role standards curiously persist, even
though they are in general, no longer functionally
significant.
Lewin & Tragom(1987) also have reported modest evidence
of influence of social change over sex role
differentiation. Werner & La Russa(1985) found a little
change in many particulars, of sex role stereotypes in
recent decades. On the contrary McBroom(1987) has
reported less traditionalism in sex role stereotypes.
The present study clearly indicates that men and
women at all levels, with little variation in one or
two sub groups, assign more value to their own sex trait
than the opposite sex trait. Both have not embodied
equal opposite sex traits in their self image as a
male or female. The difference in the endorsement of
two characteristics is so wide that, it is reflected in
the findings of even individuals representing
'equality'.
The results are not beyond expectation. The social change of which sex-roles change is a part, is a very slow process. This change is concomitant to economic legal and most importantly attitudinal change. Traits are less amenable to change than actual behaviours, will be put to motion towards desirable direction when both men and women thrive towards being an 'individual.' society too has its own mite to offer 'cross sex typed' behaviours, in an effort to expand behaviour repertoires of men and women.

It is likely that today men and women are passing through a social turmoil. An individual is thinking in terms of his/her exact position in Society and the expectations from him in the changing circumstances. In this appraisal, he/she is trying to shift from the traditional guide posts, at the same time not in a position to completely disregard them. The researcher believes that modernization is a ongoing process and women and men are trying to liberate from self restricting bonds. But not successful so far and far ahead to go; have projected themselves as 'traditional' in our findings.
6.1.2 Hypothesis 2:-
This hypothesis has three components. It states that the sex role development will be different
a) Across males and females and
b) Across different educational levels.
c) Across 3 socio economic strata.
As per a) we expect on each personality characteristics males and females to vary.
In the findings we can clearly observe that out of 5 major groups of males and females the trait Mty differs among males and females in all 5 groups Fty in 3 groups. The androgynity score too varies in 4 groups. As we know androgynity score reflects the relative amounts of mty and fty that the person includes in self description and as such it best characterizes the nature of the persons' total sex role(Bem 1974).
Observing the trait mty among total males and females, we find high significance(P=.000) in the mean difference. In all four sub groups of males and females over 4 educational levels males prevail on this trait. On the other hand females in all these groups score significantly lower. The level on which males endorse lower mty than other levels, females score even markedly less. This is also true when males rise higher at a particular level females too rise in their same score. So we can say that at a particular level of
education, males and females significantly vary in a sex trait characteristic masculinity. This matter is of further investigation.

Regarding the trait femininity, we obtain the results partially conforming to the above fact. In the total group males score significantly lower than females. Again in subgroups of 4 levels at high school and postgraduate levels we find confirming results. Though at JC and UG levels, results are in the same direction but are not proved statistically significant. So we can say that the hypothesis with regards to a sex trait femininity is partially proved.

Besides we have seen in case of Mty, the difference in the males and females is somewhat maintained, we cannot find this characteristic in case of fty. There is no consistency in the difference between different levels.

Androgynieity would have been expected to be similar if we would expect males and females to represent both the traits similarly. In the findings, we clearly obtain different (significantly) degrees of androgynieity at different level except one. In TS group, it is significantly different at 5.pc. level. At High school, JC and UG level too, the difference is proved statistically. The only group where difference is non-significant is PG. Level.
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Hypothesis can further be tested qualitatively by obtaining difference between their own sex scores (males mty and females fty). Similarly their opposite sex scores (males fty with females mty). Being uncorrelated samples and scores we can not compare them statistically, the characteristics of the difference would throw some light on our hypothesis.

At the TS, Males' mty is lesser than female's fty. But if the data is divided into levels the difference changes from time to time. In one group male's mty is lesser than females fty. This group is H.S. Otherwise in all other three groups males than females have shown less inclination towards their own sex score.

Considering the nature of the difference between males fty and females aty (opposite sex score of both), in total sample males have endorsed more opposite sex score than what females did. In other levels except High school same trend is followed.

The above fact is well reflected in the androgyneity score. Except at P.G. Level males and females differ in thier androgyneity score. The level of significance is either of .05 or .01. Except High school, that is 3 out of total 5 levels so far we considered, males show significantly higher in androgyneity.
It would be interesting to find out whether androgynous and undifferentiated males and females follow the same direction. While discussing last hypothesis we had mentioned that results from this group were also confirming the males and females' results. Now if we take Mty we find males score more than females. (P= .00) Fty, males show significantly less than females (P= .00).

If we find out the scores males 'mty and females fty (5.257 and 5.259 respectively), we find no difference. So we can say both in their own sex score are on the same level. Their opposite sex scores i.e. Androgynous males fty and Andro females mty there is a difference more than the difference in their own sex scores. From this we can infer that males have endorsed opposite sex score in greater degree than did the females of the same category. Androgeinity score well demonstrates this fact. Andro Males report -.612 as their andty. Score while females show .827 as their index of the same score. However, the difference is not proved significant. The same score if we compare among undifferentiated males and females we find that males are significantly showing more androgeneity (-.428) than females (1.314). The level of significance is .01.

Overall results support the hypothesis on each personality sex trait stereotype in most of the groups.
males and females show significant variance. So we can say that males and females incorporate each trait in different degrees. Besides, males not only comparatively endorse lesser own sex score than females do; but also value for other sex score more than females do. Consequently males are proved to be more androgynous than females.

These results are somewhat different from Tomeh (1981) who studied sex-role orientation of American students. Results indicated that women more than men are non traditional in sex role ideologies. Women favoured showing a role sharing model whereas men showed resistance to this life style. McBroom 1987 has reported women to be less traditional because societal change seems to be tied to their immediate life. Shepard & Hess (1975) also reported that throughout the life cycle males' sex role attitudes are more stereotyped than females. In another study Lewin & Tragos (1987) mention that in 1982 girls show significantly less dissatisfaction with being a girl than they did in 1956..... There high school students do not hold a 'unisex' social role mode with respect to the desirable interests and personality traits of girls and boys. Boys still have higher social status. Canter & Meyerowitz (1984) too report greater sex typing in males as compared to females.
However, the fact that males have proved to be more androgynous than females, has emerged from our results. Though the researcher was expecting significantly different sex role typing among males and females, males were not expected to be more androgynous than females. One of the reasons is that it is females who are more exposed to societal changes like changes in employment, they have become more conscious and aware of their rights. Their priorities and confinements, commitments have changed. Another is they have realized the importance of masculine sex roles at least to some extent. Some of them have tried to adopt the masculine role and successfully co-ordinated it if not assimilated. On the other hand by and large males are not in transition as regards to their either social or familial status. Besides men are under more pressure to conform to ‘masculine role and subsequently to omit feminine role if any. A ‘tomboyish’ girl is less ridiculed than ‘Sissy’ boy. There is also a resistance to the women’s employment and apprehension about its consequences in other areas like child rearing, caring the aged and moralities etc, more from men than women. All these factors resulted into building up an expectation of males to be ‘less androgynous’. But the results are a sort of ‘sweet shock’ to the researcher.
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According to the researcher, the high androgyneity in males can be ascribed to the positive perception of feminine sex role. It means differential treatment to sons and daughters does not only mean inculcation of respective sex traits to sons and daughters but inculcation of positive and negative valuation to the traits. Feminine traits are more projected as negative traits (e.g., emotionality dependents on others) to sons than masculine traits as negative traits e.g., (decision making, independence) to daughters. As a result, sons have often negative image of feminine role rather than daughters having negative image of masculine role. When sons grow and are exposed to wider atmosphere where they find and often experience the positive aspect of feminine role, their self-evaluation and evaluation of other sex undergoes change toward egalitarian viewpoint.

On the other hand, despite the knowledge and opportunity (to some extent) of masculine role, females have faced the challenges of dual roles and value their femininity strongly perhaps more than before.
It is likely that females have started realizing the value of being 'women' in the larger world and determine to take up new roles (masculine), not at the cost of femininity.

It is also possible that why women stick to their own sex traits is due to the pressure toward the traditional role still tends to outweigh pressures toward modern role conceptions (Scanzoni). This may hold true even for Indian culture as a girl anticipates that in adult life she will play two roles with greater inclination towards the traditional. Modern mothers, though encourage their daughters to be self reliant and less dependent on others. (Masculine role), they define the daughters role as one of serving family interests (Mehta).

The new Indian woman wants to relate her intrinsic love for the house, the children and the family and combine with this, her determination to play a vital role in the socio-economic status of modern India.

6.1.2.2 Hypothesis 2.b emphasizes the fact of education and its influences on sex trait stereotyping. Here we expect to find some direction or trend or tendency of sex role measures of both males and females over developmental stages.

Since we have proved that sex typing is different in two sexes, we presume it to be different along levels
too. The index of androgeinity itself is able to explain the nature of trait typing among males and females.

About Males we are not able to say that education exerts influence on their sex role development or because of education, males are leaning towards egalitarian viewpoint. HS level they are least androgynous, at J.C level they are most androgynous, in UG & PG they are marginally different from each other but as compared to H.S.level much more androgynous, such is the picture of males representation of sex trait typing.

At the last stage of school, peer influence is at its peak and individuality is not yet established. Identity is not yet known. In this event boys tend to conform to the peers and conform to traditional norms, but as they advance in cognitive development they include many more options., in perceiving the gender stereotypes and behaviours of males and females around. If this theoretical proposition is true, then we can expect similar results from females too.

At high school level, females are most androgynous, at the next level (JC) they are least androgynous and in the latter two levels they rise in androgeinity. The results of females at a particular level vary from those of males but not the theory or logic behind.
This is probably due to, in most of social science research studies, sample is divided apart from sex on the basis of either education or age or socio-economic status and seldom maturity level. It is a widely acknowledged fact that the rate of maturity varies in girls from boys. Till adolescence (our primary, HS & JC levels) girls attain maturity earlier than boys. So the theoretical proposition greater bifurcation of sex role during adolescence period. In addition, androgeinity seems to be more prominent during late adolescence and adulthood. (Block 1973 PP. 512-526, Parson,Brayan(1978), Block Fischer, & Narus 1981) seems to be working here. However, as far as our hypothesis goes we can say that the hypothesis is proved only at the higher educational levels in both males and females. So it is partially proved and not totally.

JC level in our sample needs further elaboration. It is a characteristic level in a sense that males and females show androgeinity scores extreme among their counterparts and opposite to each other i.e. JC males show highest androgeinity among males whereas JC females show lowest of it among females. About mty, males and females match with each other in giving lowest masculinity among all other levels. About femininity too compared to general trend both reported lowest femininity. The reason lies with the age group which they are in.
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Adolescence is the period where support for crossing traditional sex role lines is found.(Curry & Hock 1981).

In short this a period of transition, search for identity and ambiguity which in a way is reflected in the findings of this particular level.

Another point should be noted here is about the distribution of four sex categories in terms of percentages in males as well as in females suggest that males and females do not deviate from normal trend and also from each other. In other words as far as percentages of 4 sex categories among males as well as among females indicate the absence of sex difference.

6.1.2.3

This hypothesis postulates the influence of socio-economic status on sex role development in males and females.

In the TS group, Mty varies in three classes namely lower, middle and higher. It is highest in higher class between lower and middle class there is no significant different on mty measures. But higher class is highly significant to bring home the difference with other classes (of F value=.000). On the other hand fty somewhat remains non-variant among three classes, though higher class again tops in obtaining highest scores. Androgenity index shows
variance due to socio-economic statuses. The middle class shows highest of it, then comes lower class and higher class shows least of it. The difference between lower and middle class is nonsignificant whereas higher class demonstrates significant difference in its association with other two classes with respect to androgeinity measures. We can say that middle and lower class are more or less equal on androgeinity score and middle class inclined towards higher androgeinity.

6.2 Hypothesis 2 - Self Perception

6.2.1 This hypothesis states that males and females will differ on this the variable of self perception as a function of sex and also sex role orientation. We can expect significant difference in the self perception of males and females and in different sex categories to which males and females belong.

This hypothesis is seldom proved in our study. In the total sample both the sexes stand on equal terms with females slightly on the better side.

In all subgroups(4) based on educational level, except at P.G.Level no sex difference is evident. On an average we can say that not only scores show similarity among sexes but even among levels. So we can say that hypothesis is disproved (Null hypothesis is retained).

But at P.G.Level the difference between self perception of males and females is significant at .05 level (P=.024) and males score lesser. It is rather surprising.
that the difference lies at the highest level of education when men vis-a-vis women are educated but still score lowest. On the other hand females score highest as compared to their counterparts. Hypothetically education will enhance the level of self perception and self esteem. This proved in case of females. With every stage of education their self perception seems to have risen though not at significant level. In case of males it is neither risen nor fallen as much in the previous levels but fallen at the highest level of education.

In fact the findings may mean that higher education appears to have differential effect on the self-perception of males and females, at least in the present settings. For females it may mean more hope for getting a well-off husband, opportunity to get a job (which can be 'dropped' at necessary time), higher status among other females, etc. For males it may mean narrower scope for opportunity, greater competition, fear of uncertainty of getting & maintaining a job-success etc. This analysis might be true with the sample of this study, because most of the post-graduating males (and females) are from various departments of Bombay University and Government college of Education and not from Institutions like IIT or medical colleges where 'professionals' are produced. Naturally the males from these academic background may be envisaging the sheer competition with the
professional. Many of them are those who might have tried other professional courses. If sample would have been more inclusive of different disciplines and faculties, perhaps results on this variable would have been different.

As far as males and females are concerned they show no difference in their self perception. So null hypothesis is retained.

8.2.2 The second component of the hypothesis states that males and females will vary in their self perception as a function of different sex role development.

If we look at TMs and the self perception with regards to their assigned sex categories we find anova insignificant, stating self perception is not a function of sex role development. Likewise TFs also reiterate the same fact.

It would be interesting to compare males and females in each category and see whether sex role development has differential effect on self perception. Here to our surprise barring one category, all three categories are not able to point out the significant difference among the sexes. Cross Sex Type females are the ones who stand higher than their male counterparts and even highest among all categories. All sub-groups (4 educational levels) were traced to illustrate this fact and it should be noted that at all 4 levels cross sex
type females surpass cross sex type males in their self perception, (not proved significantly). In that sense the findings point out though not prove the role of sex role development in self perception. Considering overall results we would say that hypothesis was disproved.

If sex role development truly influences self perception, we expect androgynous males and females to be similar and highest on the self perception undifferentiated males and females to be similar but lowest on the ladder of self perception. Among sex type and cross sex type, the sex difference would have emerged significantly.

Many studies reported the relationship between masculinity and self esteem (Whitley, 1985). Lamke (1982) found that masculine and androgynous subjects in the age group of 12-15 years had higher levels of self esteem than feminine and undifferentiated subjects. Hausen et al (1980) proved androgyny is a factor which enhances self esteem Thomas & Reznikoff (1984) also supported this view. However, our results do not support any of above findings. It was found to be a function of socio-economic class rather than sex. Three classes namely lower, middle and higher were obtained in the sample. Self perception over all 3 ses does not bring forth any sex difference at a significant level. However class difference is observed at a high significance (1p.o.level) (p=.000).
Lower class reports lowest, middle class reports moderate and higher class reports highest of it. The results speak of the influence of SES over self perception rather than sex, education of sex role development.

6.3 **Hypothesis 4 - Value Systems**

According to this hypothesis which states that males and females, and males and females with different sex role development, will hold different value systems. We expect significant and consistent difference among males and females and also significant difference among different assigned sex categories with regards to values.

6.3.1 In the total sample comparison between males and females show that they vary in 3 values out of 6 values which were tested. The values are refinement, stability and V MAS/FEM. Refinement the difference was noted as fairly significant at 1 p.c. level (P=.007). Stability at the significant level of 5 p.c. (P=.046) and V Mas/Fem at high level (1p.c., P=.000).

It would be interesting to trace the sex difference at various levels. Here each value will be judged at the 4 levels.

Refinement is a value somewhat corresponding to social desirability index. Though females were expected to score higher than males and they did in 3 levels out of 4, only one level the difference was found to be
statistically significant (1.p.c.level). The level is UG. At HS. level both sexes are almost equal (10.6 & 10.5).

Conscience is a second value in a scale, a high score indicates higher justice in an individual. Here no developmental difference among males and females was noticed. It was in congruence with the expectation.

There is no definite trend—either developmental or sexwise noticed. Only UG. level shows a little spur into the level of scores in both sexes. But it is not continued in P.G. Level where they resort to the original level.

**Stability—** Though in TS, sex difference was noted, at individual level of education such a bifurcation has appeared only at H.S. Level. In later levels no significant difference was found. In lower levels, i.e. HS and JC, males hold higher place while in upper educational levels, i.e. UG & PG. females hold higher place. It is surprising to find significant sex difference has at a total level. The answer lies in a fact that the only level we find the sex difference (i.e. HS) where it is so vast (P=.000), that it overrides the differences in other levels. On the whole we can say that males and females go hand in hand on stability as they move upward. Power is the next value which was expected to vary according to the respective stereotypes about males and females i.e. males will show more preference so higher score for power than females.
But to our surprise neither in TS nor at different educational levels, except at UG power was found to be statistically significant. At U.G.Level males results are congruent with our expectation. Apart from J.C level in all other levels males are comparatively at a higher level of this value of stability. JC is a unique level as we discussed it while analysing hypothesis 2-b.

Value Mas/Fem: Regarding value Mas/Fem (V mas/Fem in order to avoid confusion) a noticeable feature of the findings is in all groups the sex difference is statistically significant. Here we know high score indicates V masculinity. All males in all groups have shown higher V Masculinity. At the TS, the probability of the difference is .000. Comparison between sexes among levels reveal maximum difference (P=.001) in U.G.level and lowest in PG level (P=.036).

Political Ideology: Our next and last value is Political ideology. Neither in TS nor in all four educational levels, sex difference is noted nor any trend regarding this value in males or females is observed.

To summarise, we can take a look at each level and find out the existing sex differences if any. Valuewise discussion has already been done from time to time.
At H.S.Level males show preference over stability than females significantly. Males also show higher V Mas/Fem score. Otherwise about all other 4 values there is no significant difference.

At JC.Level only sex difference lies in V mas/Fem where males again show more preference for V masculinity. Other 5 values Males and Females do not differ significantly neither they show any trend.

At UG.level, the Subjects report significant difference among maximum i.e. 3 values. They are refinement, power and V Mas/Fem. UG.level is to some extent conforming to the researcher's expectation. In refinement, females are supposedly higher, in power males are higher and as usual (in our study) males are higher over V mas/Fem. All other levels are not able to show any direction or trend about their value preferences.

P.G.Level males and females demonstrate similarity among all values except V mas/Fem, where their results are not exception to the trend obtained in earlier findings.

Strikingly no value is repeated over 4 levels so as to signify consistent sex difference except V mas/Fem. Results are enough to indicate that males and females show similarity in their value preference. Only
exception is V mas/Fem. They further indicate the importance of this value and our purpose of this endeavour.

The message the results give can be translated in this way - males and females think similarly, have been dominated by diverse values similarly, but in the realm of gender identity, they are prepared to be different at any time, any level.

Other studies done on sex differences in value development should be mentioned. Grant et al (1986) in their study of medical students showed that though women tended toward less interest in extrinsic reward in comparison with men......less probability in major differences in practice behaviours.

Hoffman’s (1975) study based on sex differences in moral internalization and values support the commonly held view that females have more humanistic moral standards than males. Males have greater emphasis on achievement ...... females experience more guilt following transgression than males.

More fundamental fact is brought to light by Kluckhohn (1962) stating that each individual’s value system is unique but there will usually be much common values among members of any group. This fact is supported by our findings. The pattern of value system in males is found to be similar across all levels. Likewise females did not prove much variation across levels; eg.
males and also females were highest on refinement all over the levels. They were lowest on 'power'. Out of remaining four values conscience and political ideology both were 'moderate' Males showed higher preference for 'stability' at H.S.level but declined later on. On the other hand females gave less emphasis on it in the initial level but went up in the later levels. The results with V mas/fem is already discussed before

6.3.8 The other component of our hypothesis states that males and females with different sex role development i.e. different sex categories will show significant difference in value orientation.
Among males the 3 values namely conscience stability and political ideology prove to vary as a function of different sex role development. Conscience is found highest with andro group and this group stands distinct among all groups which are more or less equal on this value. Andro individuals represent internalization of situation appropriate behaviours rather than suppression of undesirable or inappropriate behaviours for his/ her sex. This internalization is not automatic or innate but a conscious effort by an individual leading to value-judgement of life style. Despite stress that those life styles curtail, it is possible because of values important to them. It is an
expected finding. In Females too andro group occupies the highest position as far as conscience is concerned then the CST (as contrary to males who have given least preference) although in females the differences do not prove statistically.

Stability again, andro group occupies second highest position. It is contrary to expectation and also to 'conscience' results. ST emphasize it most and it is understood. Sex typed are supposed to be individual's who place importance to conformity resulting into stability. CST is the one giving least emphasis. This fact is also obvious that CST are ones who give less importance to social sanction and follow their conscience. So they will place less emphasis on stability.

A conspicuous fact about value political ideology is CST giving least emphasis on it. The other 3 categories being on the same line, bringing home no significant difference among themselves.

When these two values namely stability and political ideology in females are to be discussed, stability is less preferred by females than males. Among themselves CST is highest and close to them are andro(as against CST posing lowest in males) .This fact should be noted.

6.27
Again in case of 'political ideology' in females ST occupies the least position (as against ST occupying 2nd highest position in males). The point of discussion here can be of the correlation of different sex categories masculinity/femininity with these values. Though any difference in the assigned sex categories among females is not statistically relevant.

When we look at TFs group we find no significant difference among any value as a function of sex role development. These findings are surprising.

V Mas/Fem is the value where impact of sex role development was expected but results do not show any difference in assigned sex categories in both sexes. This fact is also astonishing.

The hypothesis regarding the value difference as a function of sex role development is partly proved in males. It is totally disproved in females.

Overall results speak of powerful influence of sex as a function of value differentiation, again not in all values but a value related to sex (V Mas/Fem). Different sex role development is not powerful variable to bring considerable difference in value orientations.

**6.4 Hypothesis 5 = Occupational Interest.**

This is the last hypothesis of our present study. It postulates the influence of sex and sex role development on occupational interests.

6.28
The findings suggest the influence of sex as stronger than sex role development in the development of occupational interests. The differences brought forward by sex along a number of sub groups are following a certain pattern.

6.4.1 If we take total sample to study the independent variable sex, we obtain 7 fields of interest out of 12 pointing out the sex difference. The fields are Mechanical, Medical, Literary, Social Service, Artistic, Executive and Business. The difference between males & females over these fields is either .05 or .01 significance level. The characteristics of the differences are able to signify established beliefs about males and females in general. Out of these 7 fields, males show higher interests on mechanical, executive and business. In other fields i.e. medical, literary, social service and artistic, females show more interest. The results are consistent with the commonly held beliefs. The remaining fields where males and females do not prove to be different are outdoor, computational, scientific, persuasive, and clerical. Overall observation suggests some points. Outdoor is comparatively highest and clerical is lowest among both males and females. Scientific is too on the higher preference ladder for both males and females.
It would be interesting to study the variable sex at different levels so as to locate consistency and/or change in their interest pattern.

H.S. level points out differences in sex over four fields. They are mechanical and business (males high), medical & artistic (females high). Though there is noticeable difference in the fields of social service and literary interests, (females higher) it does not signify the true difference.

Again here too like total sample, outdoor is highest and clerical is the lowest among their (both males and females) preferential order. Scientific too shows higher if not highest preference in both sexes.

J.C. level obtains sex-differences over 4 fields. They are mechanical, medical computational and literary. Executive is also a field which shows greater difference though statistically insignificant.

Males show higher preference in two of four, they are mechanical and computational whereas females are showing greater interest in medical and literary. This is expected. In the fields of social service and artistic girls score higher. The general characteristics of the interest distribution are similar to other groups discussed.

At UG level 4 fields of interest obtain sex differences. Mechanical (males higher preference), and
literary, social service and artistic (females higher preference). The other fields which show considerable difference are medical (female high), executive and business (Males-high preference) but non-significant as far as statistics is concerned. In the medical field females show more preference but statistically insignificant.

The other characteristics of this level data is consistent with other above mentioned groups.

At PG level again 4 occupational fields show sex difference significant. Mechanical & business (males higher) literary and scientific (females higher). The other fields like persuasive executive males are relatively higher on their interest preferences. However, the difference is insignificant.

The general nature of the data, though in congruence with other levels and total sample group, for the first time medical is the field where males score higher though insignificantly.

From these findings, the following facts have emerged. Mechanical is the field which could show consistent sex difference almost very highly significant. Next to it is literary field, that obtains significant (almost high) difference at 4 levels out of five. Artistic, medical & business have been reported to be significantly different in 3 groups of five. Social
service is proved to be significant in two groups but showing higher preference for it in females in all groups. Similarly artistic and business though not proved statistically significant sex difference the trend is followed in all the groups. (artistic-females high business-males high preference).

All these results are congruent with our expectations. In case of outdoor, males were expected to be slightly higher than females but this did not come true and no trend was noticed.

Regarding persuasive and computational again no trend was noticed.

8.4.2 The hypothesis further states the difference in occupational interest pattern as a function of different sex role development. This hypothesis was proved only regarding one occupation and that is business.

The 4 assigned sex categories signifying different sex role development in males (N=200) do show the significant difference (P=.01) over the occupation ‘Business’. Here CST and ST are on high line of scores (CST highest) and Adro and UD at the low line. In all other occupations no significant difference was found.

When we talk of 4 assigned sex categories among females we find similar results. Here too business is the only occupational field which shows difference significant at
Here ST females oust all other categories and UD lagging behind among all.
All other occupational differences are non-significant.
The bird's view point out the following facts. Here too UD females tend to give highest preference for outdoor. They also emphasize medical and scientific interest whereas androgynous females lean towards social service and artistics occupations.
These results support the above mentioned fact in male's assigned sex categories.
The overall results on the hypothesis 5 suggest following points:-
Sex is again proved to be stronger independent variable to bring definite and consistent sex differences and developmental sex differences. Although hypothesis was not proved regarding sex differences on all the occupations, it has proved on those occupations around which occupational stereotypes are prevalent. i.e. mechanical, medical, literary, social service, artistic and business.
The trend is definitely directing us towards a conclusion that males and females vary consistently on many assumed to be prevalent occupational stereotypic interests.
As far as different sex role categories are concerned, they are able to prove their influence only on one occupational field. This result was true in males as well as females. When it was further traced in a mixed
group, it was again found to be showing significant differences. This fact strengthens the relationship of sex role development and 'business'. From this result we further infer that business is a more or less function of 'sex typed' and cross sex typed sex role development rather than androgynous or undifferentiated.

So we can say regarding hypothesis 5 that, it is partly proved.

6.5 GENERAL COMMENTS:

The overall results drawn from the two independent variables namely sex and assigned sex category on self-perception, values and occupational interest are able to indicate all pervading nature of sex differences rather than sex role developmental differences. The results reinforce Locksley & Colten's theoretical criticism on general sex stereotypes as interpreting and guiding behaviour. They comment upon the concept of androgynity and state, individual's living within a culture in which sex is deeply structurally embedded, are inevitably subject to a complex nexus of social relations that locate them in social space partly as a function of their sex.
6.6.1 Limitations of the study:

One of the important questions faced by any research worker is to what extent the results of one's own study can be generalised, as generalization from a particular study is always risky. It is, therefore, necessary to examine the limitations of the study and validity of the results.

Problem of validity can be dealt with at two levels. Internal validity can be attained by a measure, valid in that particular setting. External validity referring to the generalizability of the results to other situations can be had with carefully construed conditions. (Runkel & McGrath 1972).

One of the important problems in the evaluation of the design is the representativeness of the sample and random assignment of the subjects. The sample of the present study was drawn from the student population of five educational levels. An attempt was made to broaden the base by using subjects from various schools and colleges in different parts, localities of the Bombay city. One cannot claim a perfectly representative sample, as there are various constraints on the researcher, e.g. it is just not possible to consider the inclusion of all or even segments of students from all over Maharashtra, as the study emphasizes cultural implications.
A few educational institutions of a city like Bombay where people from different corners of Maharashtra, reside, are to be considered and only those students who volunteer and give co-operation could be considered as subjects. But the author does not feel it to be a serious limitation. It is not a survey type of study where the representativeness of the sample has to be meticulously observed. It is a judgement task in which obtaining judgement under carefully construed conditions is most important for the validity of the results.

Adequate care was taken in standardizing the set of instructions for all the tests. The investigator was the only person to administer the set of tests. As the sample included different levels of education, test instructions for each level were carefully worked out, in the form of explanation and illustration. It was, thus, likely that all subjects were kept to the maximum of incentive.

As far as independent variables are concerned sex and educational level was manipulated. But the assigned sex categories could perhaps be better measured with a larger sample. However, many practical constraints prevented any extension of the sample. For instance each institution would have been asked for more students at a session. But individual attention and
good rapport would have been difficult. In any instance, it was important to bear in mind that incentive should be at a maximum. Besides scoring and compiling of such a huge data itself had been a formidable task.

Socioeconomic status was another independent variable which was not manipulated to the researcher's satisfaction. The total sample consists of a large number of lower class, considerable number of middle class and comparatively smaller number of higher class. It is quite representative of the population. But as far as results are concerned the three classes are less comparable. Larger sample would have eliminated this difficulty.

Another independent variable—educational level was satisfactorily tackled except postgraduate level. Perhaps students from institutions providing 'professional' courses could have been profitably used, but getting co-operative students and suitable place, time for testing was a difficult task. Thus the investigator had to remain satisfied with a reasonably spread postgraduate students.

These limitations, thus would put some restraints on the generalization of the results of the study to very different populations and very different situations.
6.3.2 Contributions of the study:

The main objective of the study was to investigate sex role development with its relation to self perception, values and occupational interests with a developmental point of view. The interrelations of sex role development and self perception occupied major place. The use of sex as an independent variable pervades psychological literature. However, recent thinking regarding sex role stereotyping suggests that observations of differential behaviour as a function of physical sexuality may be misleading. The terms male and female may obscure important underlying variables that are responsible for differences found. This study has undertaken along with sex, sex role category as its main variable to find the relation of it with other variables mentioned above.

For investigating relation of sex with traditional sex role development the theoretical model of Bem was used. The present study found a positive and significant relationship of Sex with traditional sex role development. The contribution of this study is the revelation of both sexes to be traditional and females being more traditional than males.

The concept of androgyny itself is still a controversial concept and as such its role in various sex stereotyping areas was ignored in research endeavours. In India the relation of sex role category
in general and androgynous in particular with values and occupational interests was not studied so far. The present study did not find much positive relationship of any assigned sex role category with other variables barring few exceptions. In a way these negative results should be considered as an important contribution, as it warns a researcher that utmost precaution will have to be taken in using and interpreting assigned sex category-variable in research studies.

One of the most important contributions of the present study is the revelation of relationship of biological sex with values and occupational stereotypic interests. The relationship undoubtedly overrides the relationship of sex role categories with these variables. These results further point out the sex as powerful variable in individual differences.

These negative relations of assigned sex categories with self perception, values and occupational interests and positive relations of biological sex with these variables are very important in guiding us towards evaluation of egalitarianism of our boys and girls, of ourselves and of our society in general.

6.6.3 Suggestions:
As biological sex has proved to be significant in value and occupational stereotype interests but not in self perception some other dimensions like education of
parents, an assigned sex category, working status of
mother, culture or religion, should be tested for their
effects on self perception. It should be noted however
that SES has succeeded to show some positive and
significant relationship with self perception. Further
research with inclusion of larger sample and that with
larger of higher class will induct a better conclusion.
Assigned sex category can better be manipulated by
using perhaps larger sample of a category and relating
it to other variables or taking only two categories,
say, cross sex type and sex type and comparing them
with each other on the variables.
Sex role development based on Bem’s theory could
clearly indicate the sex, SES and educational level as
major influencing factors. Overlapping of these
results can be avoided by reducing the number of
variables. It seems that importance of developmental
aspect of sex role development could be further studied
profitably by allowing larger number in each
developmental level or by restricting the number of
developmental levels.
Lastly, similar studies with different areas of sex
role stereotyping would help in generalizing these
results to various other situations.