CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 THE PURPOSE OF THE PRESENT STUDY

Feminism questions accepted conceptualizations about the sexes. As a result of this challenge of women's movement, research on sex differences and sex roles is beginning to acquire new meanings within psychology. Analysis of sex roles and sex stereotyping may be capable of advancing our insights into the human conditions as a whole, into our modes of thinking and values and into our ways of acting; just as much as the analysis of many other variables that we would not think of ignoring—individual differences, class, race, level of education. For these reasons the study of sex roles and sex stereotyping is shifting from peripheral to a more central position in research endeavours of psychologists.

A distinction of two aspects of sex-role has to be made. One aspect concerns the fostering of different personality traits in men and women. In this sense of the term, the masculine role prescribes that men be active, aggressive, competitive and so forth; while the feminine role prescribes that women should be nurturant, warm, altruistic and the like. The second aspect of sex roles by contrast concerns the assignment of different social responsibilities to men and women.
Thus sex roles refer to two different things:-

i) Personality traits supposedly consistent with biological sex which is a concern of psychology of sex roles. ii) Different adult social responsibilities which is again assumed to be linked with personality traits. For instance, women take up child care because they are nurturant and so on. This second aspect is in the domain of sociology of sex roles.

Questions concerning the origin and nature of sex differences cannot properly be answered by and in a society that is predicated on their existence and in a society not premised on their existence (Hartnett et al). It is important to recognize that the action of nature and nurture is not simple one of independent factors operating on the organism. They constantly interact and in such a way that their relative contributions are inseparable. Human beings live in a social situation that is characterised by relation of power, different social roles and so on. We can no more escape our social situation than can deny that we are biological organisms. To claim that sex differences are biologically determined is not justified. Blurton Jones (1972) and Hinde (1974) first pointed out the artificial nature of dividing influences on development into innate and acquired. They say that the genetic material in the chromosomes provide a flexibile plan for the sequence of
development but this is by no means a rigid blueprint, it provides the developing organism with way of actions on the environment rather than specifying the outcome of these actions. The outcome depends on the result of each successive interaction between the organism and the environment.

In a society in which women have different and unequal social roles, we would expect certain psychological differences to develop. The research in the area of sex differences indicates the differences in various psycho-social activities and physical capabilities among sexes.

(Douvan (1963), Money and Ehrhardt (1972), Maccoby and Jacklin (1974), Williams and Best (1982)). The biological paradigm is both very influential and widely accepted as a framework for the explanation of human social behaviour. One of these is to draw conclusions about human behaviour from animals. But human beings are different from other animals in several respects (language, social interaction, imagination).

i) The importance of learning in human species is tremendous. Human infant is genetically predisposed to develop certain forms of behaviour (language, interaction .........). The detail content of that behaviour depends upon social environment (evident in cross-cultural and historical data).
ii) Humans have a far more complex verbal communication amplified through written and printed words transmitting knowledge.

iii) Humans are able manipulators of their environment.

iv) Humans unlike other species can separate conception of a task from its execution (Marx quotes p29).

v) Humans can create history.

We can no more escape our social situation than we can deny that we are biological organisms.

1.2 KEY CONCEPTS OF THE WORK.

1.2.1 Stereotypes:

Walter Lippman cleverly termed stereotypes as 'pictures in our heads' to stress the fact that there is no rational basis for stereotypes. G.W. Allport in his 'nature of prejudice' defined stereotype as 'an exaggerated belief associated with a category (pl87)

Note that stereotype is not a category. It is a belief associated with a category. A stereotype is not also a generalization, a generalization is based on a certain definable probability......By employing a stereotype, the perceiver tends to discount the perceived one's individuality.

The current use of the term refers to a culturally determined and relatively inflexible manner of viewing individuals such that one perceives them as if they had
been 'cast from a mould' simply because they are members. Though stereotype is defined by many scholars the general agreement as to the absence of rational or logical reasoning.

1.2.2 SEX STEREOTYPES:-

Definition of Sex role stereotypes or sex stereotypes: The term 'sex roles' refer to the psychological traits and the social responsibilities that individuals have and feel are appropriate for them because they are males or females. (Pleck). Sex Role stereotypes refer to preconceived and simplified assumptions and generalizations about behaviour that is expected of males and females solely because they are males or females. (Demmark, 1977).

Sex role beliefs were differentiated from sex role stereotypes by Unger (1984). He defines sex roles as sets of attributes including attitudes, personality traits and behaviour that a culture defines as appropriate for each sex. He further states that sex role beliefs become sex role stereotypes when individuals use the attributes as rules and apply them to almost all females and males.

1.2.3 Sex Role Identity. An individual's gender, body-image, self-esteem, self-concept, skills, weaknesses and sex role combine to provide him with an identity - a sense of the self as
unique and separate from others. An individual's sex role identity is but one aspect of his or her total self identity. The sex roles of the culture to which a child belongs form a basis for his or her own developing sex role identity as do the socialization practices to which he or she is exposed and the personal beliefs and attitudes he or she has acquired along way.

Angrist (1969) defines sex role identity as, "a constellation of qualities an individual understands to characterise males and females in his (or her) culture." Included in the constellation of qualities are not just activities but personality features, role relations, social positions and a host of abilities and behaviours - all thought to differentiate sexes.

GENDER IDENTITY:
It refers to an individual's biological sex or sex of rearing. One is labeled male or female by a medical staff and reared accordingly.

One set of terms 'male' or 'female' refers to an individual's sex; the other set 'masculine' or 'feminine' refers to an individual's sex role. A boy having male gender identity does not necessarily have masculine sex role identity, he can be either masculine, feminine or androgynous.
Gender identity can further be distinguished from sex identity which refers to one's sexual preference (heterosexual, homosexual, bisexual and asexual). Sexual identity is generally acquired in late adolescence. Again gender identity is unrelated to sexual identity.

Robert Stoller (1968) defines masculinity (masculine gender identity) and femininity (feminine gender identity) as any quality that is felt by its possessor to be male or female. In other words masculinity and femininity is a belief, not an incontroversible fact. According to Stoller one gets such beliefs from parental attitudes especially in childhood; these attitudes being more or less those held by society at large.

He further points out that 'although masculinity fits well with maleness and femininity with femaleness, both masculinity and femininity are found in everyone but in differing forms. Gender identity implies psychologically motivated behaviour.'

Gender identity as Money & Ehrhardt (1972) point out, is 'the public expression of gender as well as of biological and environmental influences on the developing child. They are large enough to override genetic and physical gender assignments'. They further caution that once the gender identity is established in early childhood, it is not easily amenable to
change. Transsexualism is the most extreme form of gender confusion.

Stoller (1968) conceptualizes the earliest stage in the development of masculinity - femininity on the sense of one's sex - of maleness or femaleness. He calls it Core Gender Identity. According to him it is a part of but not identical with gender identity - a concept that covers a much wider range of behaviours. Core gender identity is a conviction that the assignment of one's sex was anatomically and ultimately psychologically correct. Core gender identity to him is the biopsychic phenomenon.

1.2.4. SEX ROLE DEVELOPMENT.

Sex role development has been considered an extremely important and lasting aspect of socialization by many psychologists.

Sex role development is the process through which people adopt the attributes of the cultural sex roles.

Sex typing is the process by which a person acquires values and adopts sex typed behaviour patterns (Mischel (1970)). Behaviours have been labeled sex typed which are deemed to be more appropriate for one sex than the other in a given society. The number and kinds of behaviours thus categorized in industrialized society are large. They range from personality traits to intellectual skills.
Robert Sears (1965) too defines sex typing as a developmental process by which the behavioural components of one or another gender role are established. He emphasizes the role of learning into the acquisition and says that it is a complex process and results from the impositions on the child of a number of training practices that have the specific consequences of producing masculine or feminine qualities of behaviour. Not only the role adoption but the degree and kind of identity itself is dependent upon the imposition of training on a child.

1.3 SIGNIFICANCE OF SEX ROLE TYPING

If we are keen to know the significance of sex role typing we can not overlook the motive to stereotype. We all stereotype because we tend to perceive the world quite simple. They allow us to act toward others in terms of minimal knowledge (group membership is all that we know). We tend to fit unfamiliar into known framework. In the process we ignore disconfirmatory evidence. Even if we come across contradictory evidence, we can temper with the stereotype in such a way that conflict is resolved. (Viola Klein (1950)).

The sex role system as we have seen is the multifaceted phenomenon, but three factors can be isolated as being of major importance to its operation.

1) The assignment on the basis of sex, of one of two different series of personality traits - masculine and
feminine stereotypes which are thought of as forming opposite ends of a single continuum i.e. as being mutually exclusive. Traits vary from culture to culture and from time to time.

ii) The allocation on the basis of sex, of different categories of those activities considered to be necessary and useful for sustenance and improvement of living. The division of labour too varies across cultures (Margret Mead (1950)).

iii) The investing of the male with a higher value than the female, so characteristics, traits, activities etc. associated with male deemed to be having more importance and greater value than those with female. As in many cultures, the male activity (breadwinning) is more valued. Today when adult roles are virtually interchangeable, male activity is highly valued even when male and female activity differ not one bit. (Brooks & Mathews (1979)). These too vary from culture to culture and time to time, accounts for value for the sex rather than for an activity or a trait.

1.3.1 PSYCHOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE:-

At the individual or microlevel too stereotypes exert their influence a great-deal. i) Many people expect others as well as themselves to act in accordance with the appropriate sex role stereotype e.g. all adult women often are expected to want to bear children because of the expressive feminine sex role stereotype.
ii) Sex often determines type of experiences to which people are exposed during their lives e.g. males are more encouraged to take up maths.

iii) Sex roles are a major source of many people's self-concept. People often use society's sex role stereotypes as their standards for self evaluation.

iv) Gender role qualities or traits that belong to the opposite sex are usually viewed as unacceptable and hence have a greater likelihood of not being recognised by the person possessing them; acceptable qualities to be recognised consciously while unacceptable qualities are not (though sometimes they appear in a person's behaviour repertoire). (Robert Sears (1965)). This fact is empirically proved in Lobel's (1984) study. Behaviour which was consistent with sex stereotypes is judged to have occurred more frequently than non sex-stereotypic behaviour. This fact was ascertained by Hepburn (1985).

The social desirability or higher value for masculine characteristics in this age 'despite the professed and legal equality' by college students is reported in Rosen Krantz et al (1968) study.

From the above discussion it is evident that sex stereotypes exist and prevail at micro as well as macrolevel. They play a very influential role in our perception, self-concept, interests, etc.
1.4 NATURE AND SCOPE OF SEX ROLE TYPING:

Sex role includes characteristics widely viewed as
i) 'typical of women and men (sex role stereotypes), and
ii) 'desirable' for women and men (sex role norms) (Pleck (1981)).

The contents of sex roles are usually both descriptive and prescriptive in nature. Sex role stereotypes are widely shared descriptive beliefs about what the sexes actually are. Sex role norms are widely shared prescriptive beliefs about what the sexes should be.

While sex role stereotypes and norms represent beliefs about males and females as social groups, the term sex typing refers to the characteristics of a particular individual with respect to Sex related dimensions.

In the recent developments in the study of sex roles, new concepts have been added. Spence and Helmreich (1972) have suggested replacing the term with four distinct categories, namely i) Gender Identity ii) Sexual orientation iii) sex role attitudes and iv) behaviours and personality characteristics.

Attention has also been focussed on situational factors and their interaction with person variables. Sex and gender roles belong to situations and social structure. However, a person is not a role but occupies or plays out a role (Sherif (1982)). Advances in our
understanding of the sex roles have been facilitated by person situational analyses (O'Leary et al, in press).

An overwhelming body of evidence indicates that sex labeling performs important cognitive functions in our society. (John Money & Anke Ehrhardt (1972); Stoller (1968), Sears (1965)). The sense of being male or female is due to the interplay between the labeling of the baby as one sex or the other (a result of genetic make up and hormonal influence) and the reactions of the society around the infant to that maleness or femaleness. Thus gender identity is a combination of biological and environmental influences. It also refers to the sense of individual has, of maleness or femaleness which in most cases is correct, in rare cases a vague sense of being a member of opposite sex. (Stoller (1968)). Differences in treatment shape basic conceptions of self. Human beings are continuously bombarded with message of how to be appropriately masculine or feminine. Messages differ from cultures and races.... All these reactions filtered through awareness either consciously or not, and are filed away slowly adding to and modifying the person's self image (Money & Ehrhardt (1972)).

Holding a similar view and agreeing to the role of parents in the acquisition of gender, Robert Sears (1965) comments on variability of sex typing across
individuals and even cultures in these words, 'Since masculine and feminine roles are not themselves sharply defined in the same way for all people and since the relevant qualities of parental behaviour are by no means fully recognised by the parents or under their conscious control, there is ample room for variation in the degree to which the abstractly (or ideally) defined gender role will ultimately be performed by the child.'

Not only parents but peers are instrumental in the regulation of conformity to sex roles during early adolescence. However, in adulthood sex roles may be maintained by situational factors and by the differential distribution of males and females into occupational and domestic contexts. (Unger (1984)).

One widely accepted point of view about sex role specification holds that some of the related behaviours are developed as integral personality functions without awareness on the part of the subject of their sex-status connection. For example, little girls may be 'gentled' as infants and little boys 'rough-housed' with ensuing abuilt-in personality dimensions (moulding). The sex differentiated disciplinary techniques noted by Sears, Maccoby & Levin (1957) would fall into this category of events. Canalization (Murphy (1947)) also seem to play its part as a subtle delimiting preferences. Another type of limiting sex
Directional training of the child takes place early in life through parental application of verbal appeals, that is 'good girl' 'naughty boy' etc. It would be logical to expect sex designating terms to be built into self concept as a symbolic self designation. This self designation encouraging the identification (self generalization) of indifferetration serves as a basis for the formation of a concept of a general category of being, to which one belongs, as perceptually distinctive and specified others also belong. (Hartley (1964); Baum (1939)).

Thus all these forces namely moulding, canalizing, symbol-manipulating etc. are crucial in earlier sex typing. It is not fixed that all the behaviour exposures will be necessarily (exclusively) relevant towards appropriate sex role definition. The childhood interests may facilitate diversified behaviour perhaps of opposite sex role.

Money (1972) considers gender identity as composed of identification with the parent or others of the same sex and complementation from the parent or others of the opposite sex. He further says that both parents directly and indirectly induce in child to imitate their behaviour and complement their behaviour...... It is advantageous if they both agree as to what constitutes approved identification and complementation.
There is no doubt that sex stereotyping has got cultural connotation. There are substantial variations in cultural sex roles and their accompanying stereotypes. This diversity among sex roles is one indication that many characteristics associated with them are not biologically determined but are transmitted by culture. Again, sex typing is stronger in some cultures and some social classes than in others. Degree of typing and punishments vary from culture to culture and time to time. (Maccoby & Jacklin (1974)). Individual's biographical variability is shaped to some extent by our racial history, to some extent by the events and experiences of personal history (Money (1972)). Generally the sex role stereotypes of technologically advanced cultures are quite similar. The stereotypes for femininity include characteristics that can be categorised as expressive or communal e.g. domestic, warm, emotional, physically weak, dependent, passive, pretty, aware of others' feelings, gentle and tactful, whereas the masculinity stereotypes include characteristics generally associated with instrumentality or agency and are described by words such as provider, intelligent, unemotional, physically strong, independent, active, aggressive, scientific, logical, objective in outlook, worldly, able in maths and business.
Behavioural prescriptions based on sex role stereotypes originated long before the scientists became concerned with investigating them. Religion created a structure of male priests, ministers and rabbis who served as masculine jobs and guided people in the tradition of female subservience.

The findings of numerous studies (e.g. A. Steinmann (1971)) done on cross-cultural sex role perceptions show that almost all groups (including both sexes and various ages) subscribe to the familiar male-superior and female-inferior sex roles. The behavioural enactment and resulting self perceptions of these roles are shared equally by both sexes.

Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) report that in about every culture women mother and care for home while men work outside home.

Culture and society not only originate but perpetuate and strengthen sex role stereotypes. This fact was reported by emphasizing different factors involved into the process of perpetuation. Mary Key (1971) noted that the early sex role perceptions of most members of society perpetuated and strengthened with the acquisition of reading skills ....In books of children additional impact is given to the existing prevalence of male centered characters.

R.J. Weizman & Coworkers (1972) agree to this view and express that the rigid portrayals of adults in
vocations devalue the self images and lower the career aspirations of girls. Another factor like mass media provides steady reinforcement of these stereotypes beyond childhood and throughout life.

Williams and Best (1982) reporting on cross-cultural similarities and differences, comment that the children in all countries are developing increasing knowledge of the pan-cultural aspects of the masculine feminine stereotypes identified in adult studies.

Sex role definition involves also age role definition. At each developmental level, a sex role specified at that level is implemented. Role cognitions and expectations may, however, develop in anticipation of future statuses by perception of role implementation by older people.

With age children's knowledge broadens and includes most occupations and other future roles, activities, appearance, characteristics and personality traits. By middle to late elementary school, children accurately know most aspects of the culture's sex role stereotypes (Emmerich & Shepard (1982)). The imitative activity continues with the priority of the old models challenged by the introduction of new. As the child is forcibly separated from home by school, the focus of exposure is diluted while new requirements for adjustment intensify the perceptual saliency of new models (Smuts (1971)). So we can say that the
individual during his/her development undergoes modification in his sex role system due to age, knowledge, education and experience. Although traditional sex roles in familial and occupational sphere are still very much evident (A study done on 731 Detroit families), conspicuous changes in attitudes, values, personality traits and behaviour patterns are noticeable. These changes can be attributed to new technologies, political ideologies, economic policies, social values along with rapid industrialization and migration. Currently, findings (Nyrop, Benderly, Covercutter & Parker (1975) Ghadially & Kazi(1980)) suggest that changes relating to household composition, stereotyped concept of masculinity- femininity, sex-role attitudes, marriage, career, socialization pattern etc have led to a considerable changed pattern in Indian society today. All these changes ultimately get affected at macro (legal, economic, political, social) and at micro (individual and his family) levels. However, ideas about masculine - feminine qualities still have profound impact on motherhood, education, career, family relationships etc. In recent history work and the family have become increasingly separated. Now, however, the direction of social evolution is reversing, replacing this traditional segregation of...
work and family roles by sex, a new pattern in which women and men each integrate responsibilities in both, paid employment and family.

1.5 NEED FOR RESEARCH:

Some radical changes have been taking place in the whole approach to the study of sex differences. For, with the dawn of the century science at least began making it possible to proceed on the basis of 'facts' rather than theory. Genetics born just after year 1900 revealed for the first time, exactly what caused one person to be created and to develop as a male, another as a female. The medical sciences contributed streams of important information about the growth structure and physical functioning of the sexes. Endocrinology brought dramatic new knowledge concerning the glands and their hormones. Anthropology in far corners of the world threw important light on the comparative behaviours of women and men in other cultures; Psychologists were learning how to evaluate scientifically the traits of the two sexes and to measure their mental capacities and aptitudes. Psychoanalysts were delving into the 'unconscious', sociologists were gathering information about revealed behaviour traits and biochemists were showing how to measure and evaluate statistics regarding human beings.
From all these and other sources, then information was pouring in which should have dispelled many of the uncertainties regarding the differences between women and men.

Behaviourism and feminism are the two strong currents beginning to sweep through intellectual world. Behaviourist movement giving force to in the twenties turned many persons toward the belief that virtually all human traits were 'conditioned' and made suspect any evidence of basic or inborn differences. Simultaneously feminist movement seeking to achieve for women as much equality with men as possible, was to capitalize on the behaviourist theories as a means of minimizing the importance of sex differences and of providing that women and men were what they were largely because of differences in training, experiences and opportunities.

Behavioural prescriptions based on sex role stereotypes originated long before the scientists became concerned with investigating them. Sex role is a recent concept and has become a major category of research after 1939. The elaborate emphasis on sexual differences served to support the opposition to women's employment in several ways. In the first place, work was seen as a danger to both the health and temperament of qualification of motherhood. Besides, the disturbance of women's
position in the social structure would topple the whole
structure, which would prove a threat to moral
standards, to the economic foundations of the family
and to the self-esteem of men.

Gendertyping is often underestimated. Personality
development and occupational segregation are not just
two areas where it is prevalent. It is embedded in our
very language and the concepts that we use to organize
our perceptions of our society. Education, sports,
communication, hobbies, leisure activities, toys and
dress are some of the areas where society expects them
to adopt certain behavioural patterns and avoid certain
others. Cultural variations are found. Nevertheless,
each culture has its own values and socialization
practice which determines sex role behaviour
accordingly.

Nearly everyone believed that women's first duty was to
bear and raise children and maintain the home, and that
women were inherently better fitted there than any
other functions. The convention governing American
women also showed much that was old and much that was
new. Victorian notion of feminine delicacy and
gentility is still current among the middle class. One
common view of woman's proper role expressed by C.W.
Marsh, 'nature made woman weaker-physically and
mentally than man, and also better and more refined.

Man compared with her is coarse, strong and aggressive.
By confining to the duties for which nature has prepared them respectively, the better they will harmonize. Let her stay in, let him go out'. Likewise nearly everyone agreed that it was sometimes necessary and proper for women to work and that some jobs outside the home was suitable for some women. As the home was woman's sphere, so the workplace was man's. Man was deficient in the feminine ideals of 'tenderness, compassion ...., beauty and the harmonies of grace essential to the criterion of a true home, but abundantly endowed with the masculine qualities of, 'energy, desire, daring and forcible possession' necessary in the world of business, Govt. and war. Even feminist like Mary Putham Jacobi, a physician, wrote in 1981, - women cannot maintain the same intellectual standards as are established and maintained by men.' By the end of century it was generally acknowledged that women were much sturdier than imagined. Purity, modesty and lack of passion were among the most valued of the qualities generally attributed to women. The girl who did not line up to such ideals of feminine propriety was likely to be viewed as a temptress and an outcast.

On this background it is interesting to find out what girls and boys of today, think of themselves as females and males, what traits and qualities they attribute to themselves.

1.23
A relatively stable equilibrium of division of work roles of men and women existed for centuries. A virtual revolution of women roles has taken place since World War II, such as the participation by women in labour force, relaxation of sex-related barriers of certain jobs etc. Yet, despite these changes viewed from slightly different perspective, very little has really changed in the area of work role pattern. Women now comprise about 40% of labour force, are mainly segregated into feminine typed occupations. Women who work full time still earn much less than their male counterparts and women still perform the bulk of the tasks associated with housework and childrearing. Edward Gross in his study of American occupational sex segregation from 1900 to 1960 has concluded. 'There is as much sexual segregation now as there was some sixty years ago'.

Reasons for the origin and maintenance of occupational segregation, anthropologists and social scientists are, by and large, agreed on at least 3 aspects of occupational segregation - the universal existence of a division of labour between the sexes, differences among societies in the particular jobs assigned to men and women, and the greater importance accorded by virtually all societies to whichever jobs men happen to perform. Sex trait stereotypes are closely related to occupational roles e.g. teaching is believed to be
feminine profession and further the feminine characteristics which are required for successful teacher. Assignment of different roles and activities in the field of education, occupation and family sphere is strictly followed by the personal characteristics attached to two sex groups.
Considering these factors, it would not be a futile effort to investigate the occupational interests of developing girl's and boys at different educational levels. Further, the relationship between the sex trait stereotypes as revealed in self-disclosure and the occupational interests, would also be able to guide us in understanding the emphasis given in different areas of sex typing.
Stereotypes are culturally correlated. Degree of sextyping and punishments to non-conformity vary from culture to culture and time to time. Although there is very little cross-cultural research on sex roles themselves, there is a considerable and growing literature on sex role stereotypes whereas the attitudes to women research has been specifically concerned with the attitude to a woman's role in society. The sex role stereotype research has been concerned specifically with the psychological characteristics differentially ascribed to women and to men. Williams and Best's study (1982) of sex stereotypes from 30 nations reports a high degree of
similarity especially a high degree of pan-cultural
generality in characteristics associated with men and
women.
It seems then that there are likely to be differences
in sex stereotypes of the two sexes (but particularly
women) as a function of cultural (and religious)
factors.
In the present phase of our cultural history, the
leaders of liberation are predominantly women, 'because
for unfold generations of our pre-Old Testament and
subsequent religious and cultural past, more women have
known themselves as sub-servient to men than men have
known themselves as subservient to women.' (John Money
(1972)).
In this context, one would certainly like to know the
differences in sex role stereotypes of the two sexes
in a specific culture.
The different approaches namely, identification theory,
social learning theory and cognitive developmental
theory, emphasize different dimensions of acquisition
including a source, age, permanence of learning and the
roles of motivation and biology underlying the
learning. Yet, all of them agree as to the child's role
in incorporating and organizing his experiences and
assimilating into 'self'.
According to Bem (1972), sextyping results from
assimilation of the self concept to the gender schema.
In essence, the self concept or self esteem of an individual helps to guide individual's personality. The famous formula given by W. James (1890) as definition of self esteem is that it is equal to success. Thus one's feelings of worth are determined by the ratio of one's actual accomplishment to one's supposed potentialities. The affect resulting from such evaluations is an important element of self esteem for W. James.

Mead (1934) developed the idea of feedback in suggesting that self perception actually develop in a context of social interaction and are largely influenced by the feedback an individual gets from others. Mead also contributed to the idea that self perception is of various roles one plays, are hierarchical in that some of these dimensions are more important than others.

The self identities of men and women were compared and it was found that women than men have been characterised by more difficulty in developing a separate sense of self. Many adult women find their autonomy severely determined and their needs sacrificed because their self definition and appraisal remain so tied to the emotional responds of others ..... women are conditioned to attend to the needs of others first (Jordan (1983), cited in Aries & Rose (1986)). However, at the other extreme many adult men find themselves unable to experience real empathy or
connectedness with others (Jordan (1983)). There is a growing literature among social scientists who examine the male role. Articles in popular journals deal with a wide range of male roles and male experience including discussion of sexism, racism, heterosexual behaviour, homophobia and fathering. Unquestionably such publications attempt to promote understanding of conscious and progressive changes in men.

Block (1973) contends that there appears to be differential effects of socialization for men and women reinforcing different behaviours. There are those who feel that even if society does encourage broader sex role possibilities for males, the average contemporary man is poorly equipped to cope with personal insights or nurturing emotional relationships. Miller (1987) agrees with those who see the male as relatively deficient in interpersonal relationships. According to her, the boy is encouraged to turn to the world of men, where processes are structured to limit direct emotional involvement with anybody male or female. What is rare is a man who has incorporated an image of himself as a person who takes care of his equals both men and women - who feels this identification as a critical part of his inner sense of self-equal to or more important than other inner images, like that of being superior to his equals, for example.
Miller (1987) considers women's potential growth to her ability to achieve a sense of worthwhile identity ... there is no universal acknowledgement of women's excellent functioning in instrumental roles. Indeed women themselves have feared to acknowledge their executive and organizational abilities. 'Recognition of effectiveness or valid achievement provokes in women, frightening visions of destruction'. Women have a fear that if they acknowledge their 'instrumental' abilities, they may lose their accepted 'feminine' place in society. Horner 1969 found that bright women exhibit a 'fear of success' unrelated to their abilities.

In this context, we would not just like to know how men and women view themselves as members of a sex but how they project themselves as a human being. Their intrinsic image of self, a sense of worthwhileness is closely related to their sex role system.

Current contradictions in traditional sex role socialization are being amplified by women's new work role. Historically, interest in sex differences has always been high when women's roles are in rapid transition.

Women are now demanding changes in their social roles, not primarily because the sexes have traditionally performed different functions, but the enormous gap in political and economic power between males and females.
The pertinent issue for human equality is not that sex differences exist in style and social functions but rather women have been excluded from the decision making process that governs contemporary society and from the professions that support it. At the same time polarisation of sex roles tends to alienate men from women and to alienate men from aspects of femininity within themselves, as well as alienating women from aspects of masculinity within themselves.

Bem (1974) emerges as an eloquent proponent of androgyny. Bem believes that it is possible in principle for a person to be both masculine and feminine, depending upon situational appropriateness. Bem views human behaviour as uniquely flexible - human behaviours are makers of their own culture. Washburn viewing all human beings as potentially androgynous reflects that, 'one way to become complete' in oneself is to make the unconscious conscious, which involves in part, acknowledging the existence of our sex qualities.

Erikson (1963) sees the need for men and women together, each respecting the unique qualities of the other. 'The study of life histories confirms a far-reaching sameness in men and women insofar as they express the mathematic architecture of the universe, the organization of logical thought, and the structure of language. But such a study also suggests that while
boys and girls can think and act and talk alike; they
naturally do not experience their bodies and (thus the
world) alike ... There is a psychobiological
difference central to two great modes of life; the
paternal and the maternal modes. The amended Golden
Rule suggests that one sex enhances the uniqueness of
the other; it also implies that each, to be really
unique, depends on a mutuality with an equally unique
partner'.

The discussion so far highlights the need for research
in the area of sex role typing.

For men integration of agency and communion requires
that self-assertion, self-interest and self-extension
are tempered by considerations of mutuality,
interdependence and joint welfare. For women,
integration of communion with agency requires that the
concern for harmonious functioning of the group, the
submersion of self and the importance of conscientious
characteristic of communion be amended to include
aspects of agentic self expression, self-assertion;
aspects that are essential for personal integration and
self actualization.

Research done in India on this topic is very scanty. To
the best of the knowledge of the author, research on
developmental aspect of sex role typing has not been
carried out so far in India. The research carried out so
far on sex role typing has not taken into consideration many aspects of sex role typing simultaneously as done by the present author.

Thus one can say that this study is a humble attempt to provide a sound research basis for understanding the developmental changes in sex role typing of Maharashtrian girls and boys of Bombay city.

1.6 QUESTIONS POSED -
The sex role typing can be studied from various angles. However, in the present study it has been studied from two angles, as
A) Developmental changes of sex role typing.
B) Salient personality variables influencing the sex role development.

The specific research questions posed in the thesis about the above mentioned aspects are stated below:
1) What is the pattern of developmental changes as revealed in our study.
2) If we assume a relationship between the different sex role orientations and a set of personality variables such as self-perception, values and occupational interest. What is the pattern of the relationship among the independent and dependent variables?
3) We assume that all personality variables undergo change during developing years and they subsequently change one's sex role orientation. Then can we assume
that all variables change in a similar pattern so as to bring a change in sex role orientation?

4) If we group our sample on the basis of their sex role orientation, sex or socio-economic status what type of similarities and differences will emerge in personality pattern of our students grouped according to educational level.

Though a variety of questions were raised for the sake of clarifying our concepts, only a few of them were empirically tested. Objectives were defined and hypotheses were framed only for those objectives.

In this study sex role orientation as measured by BSRI is assumed to define an individual's total sex role development. Individual is motivated to keep his behaviour consistent with an internalized sex role standards, a goal that he/she presumably accomplishes by suppressing any behaviour that might be considered undesirable or inappropriate for his sex (Kagan 1964, Kohlberg 1966).

1.7 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY.

1) To study and compare traditionality of sex role stereotyping among males and females on the basis of Bem's sex role inventory.

2) To investigate the difference in the nature and type of sex role development among
a) Males and females.

b) Males and females in different educational levels.

c) Males and females of different socio-economic status.

3) To study a relationship of self perception with
   a) Sex
   b) Educational levels.
   c) Sex role categories of sexes.
   d) Socio-economic status

4) To study the relationship of different value systems with
   a) Sex
   b) Sex role categories of sexes.
   c) Educational levels.

5) To investigate the difference in occupational interests among
   a) Males and females
   b) Sex role categories of males and females.
   c) Educational levels.

Objectives (1) (2) (3) form a major and prime part of the total project. The analysis has been done in detail. Objectives (4) (5) comparatively hold a secondary place in the thesis. The importance to the objectives is ascribed on the basis of their relevance to the total topic.
1.8 FORMULATION OF HYPOTHESES.

On the basis of review of literature and a pilot study conducted on students, different hypotheses were formulated.

1) Development of sex role in the present society will not be significantly different from traditional ideas of sex role development.

2) Sex role development will be different between
   a) males and females
   b) males and females across different educational levels.
   c) males and females across different socio-economic status.

3) There will be a difference in self-perception between
   a) Males and Females
   b) males and females with different sex role development.
   c) males and females with different educational levels.
   d) Males and females with different socio-economic status.

4) There will be a difference in value systems between
   a) males and females
   b) males and females with different sex role development.
   c) Males and females with different educational levels.
5) There will be a difference as regards to occupational interests between
   a) males and females
   b) males and females with different sex role development.
   c) Males and females with different educational levels.