

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.

Definition of Terms.

Controversial findings & issues.

**The sociological point of view on
sex role development.**

A STUDY OF SEX ROLE IDENTIFICATION IN PRE-SCHOOL CHILDREN. 1

: INTRODUCTION :

Although roles in interpersonal behavior may arise from a number of sources, one way of looking at it is to treat it as they emerge from sex differences. This would mean physical differences between men and women. Differences in mental traits and personality to determine the degree to which they are attributable to biological, cultural or psychological experiences. It will be a gross error to consider the differences between men and women as entirely physical. Certain psychological conditions exist that make for separate subcultures for men and women. In all mental and physical differences some women surpass some men. Some assumed differences have never existed or what differences there may have been are grossly distorted. More than one hundred years' struggle to achieve sex equality has been only partially successful in removing these prejudices.

For purposes such as fostering better societal functioning and provision of standards of conduct for the members, a society usually divides itself into subgroups. Such sub-dividing also serves to satisfy certain basic individual needs of most members. Two bases for such subdivision are age and sex. Sex typing has become a fundamental part of the socialization process. Certain cultures even more than some of the other more modern cultures insist on rigid roles for the two sexes. Other societies too have operated on the basis of a rigid demarcation of the divisions of mankind. The Germans assigned authoritarian almost sadistic norms

to the male and self-depreciative, semi masochistic roles to the female.

Our own culture is not so rigid in observing sex role identification; all the same it has also certain norms of expectations for each sex. According to Robert Havighurst (1951), acceptance of appropriate sex role is one of the parental tasks. When childhood begins, dress, games and verbalization remind the youngster of his sex. During later childhood, a determined effort is made to maintain specific behavior patterns identified with each sex. The parents are concerned if Ramesh does not exhibit the proper aggressive tendencies or if he is playing with dolls beyond the fourth or fifth year, or if Swati is too tomboyish. The child increasingly selects his friends among his own sex group and by the preadolescent period is militant by championing his or her own sex. Adolescence brings increasing espousal of the personality reactions of one's own sex, and erotic interest becomes distinctly hetero sexual. Of course there is no research evidence to support such observations on Indian Culture.

The process of sex typing is largely cultural and psychological, as implied, with biology playing a negligible role.

Linton (1936) states " The division and ascription of statuses with relation to sex seems to be basic in all systems. All societies prescribe different attitudes and activities to men and women.

By belonging to their own appropriate groups, 3
individuals may derive not only personal security and recognition
but also standards for their own behaviors. Such grouping provides
each individual with a set of conditions to which to conform. For
socializing its children, the family as a social institution has
to conform to such social expectations. Thus a child being brought
up in such an environment develops a repertory of behavior which is
approved by his society.

The recognition of differences among age groups and
between sex groups tends to imply recognition of different needs,
different levels of learning and maturity and requirements of
different standards by which to live. Evidence for this implication
may be seen in the usual ascription of roles and statuses of
members of different age and sex groups. By belonging to their own
appropriate groups, individuals may derive not only personal security
and recognition but also standards for their own behavior. The
group provides the family with a set of conditions to which to
conform and the family socializes its young ones according to these
conditions.

Sex roles are decidedly a matter of socialization to fit
in with the expectations of a particular culture. All sorts of
diametrically opposed behavior is expected of males and females in
different cultures. Margaret Mead (1949) studied the group of the
Techambuli of New Guinea. This group, she remarks, "was the only
one of all those in which she has worked where little girls of 10
or 11 years were more alert and bolder and enterprising than the
boys. In adulthood, unadorned Techambuli women with shaven heads

are the managers and providers. They fish and go to market. Activity like child birth is hard. The men are decorated with strings of ornaments and wear real or false curls, spend their time particularly in dance steps, carving and painting. They are the artists managed by the strong practical women. This culture shows almost a complete reversal of what might be considered a caricature of the roles of men and women in the western society. Like most other societies, this society also highly values the masculine traits.

Since one of the important aspects of early socialization is the sex identification of the child, according to Freudian theory, the father functions in an instrumental role. The male child eventually will be called on in adulthood to serve the economic needs of the family and to play the traditional role of household head. His role in western culture includes the notions of aggressiveness and dominance, the girl tends slightly toward passivity and docility. However, in contrast to the traditional pattern of western Europe, our Indian joint/single family does provide a good identification model both in the father and the mother.

As with other types of socialization, parents arrange the sex typing by rewarding and punishing behavior that respectively elicits or inhibits the acquisition of the proper sex role. Boys are encouraged in masculine activities and choice of toys; girls identify with motherly duties in the maternal care of their dolls. The child's identification with the parent influences his learning of the appropriate role. The child apparently identifies or

assimilates the role of the individual with whom he has most interaction. Generally our observation shows that the mother demonstrates an expressive role or love-oriented techniques of control to both children; whereas the father is expressive toward the daughter, but more demanding or instrumental in relation to his son. To provide adequate sex identity for his son, the father must in some way combine the expressive role with the instrumental or demanding one. At the same time, the mother who usurps the instrumental or dominant role of the father may later encounter difficulties in her son's adjustment.

5

Generally our culture is more rewarding of the masculine rather than the feminine role. It is a mistake, however, to over simplify the nature of sex identity since ethnic, religious and mass sub-cultures impose their own differentiation. Whatever the conditions of learning and their final effects may be the acquisition of sex roles, which begins in early childhood and continues into adolescence, has marked impact on the young child's personality.

The primary concern of the present research is the effect of social-cultural factors on sex role preference. It is possible that as a child grows up, he learns to prefer the role of one of the sexes. The causes for a child preferring one sex role in contrast with the other remain undetermined inspite of several research efforts and theoretical formulations (Kagan 1964, Brown 1956, Lynn 1962, Mameson 1963).

One of the assumptions in research in this area has

been that preference of a parent's role necessarily means 6
identification with that parent, (Brown 1956, Delucia 1963, Rosenberg
and Sutton-Smith 1960). There is a reasonable amount of doubt about
the possibility of a child preferring the opposite sex parents role
while identifying with and adapting the role of the same sex parent.
On the other hand, it is not impossible that a child prefers and
identifies with the same sex parent.

The results of some research studies such as those by
Kagan (1956, 1960), Lynn (1959), Brown (1956, 1957, 1958 a),
Rosenberg and Sutton-Smith (1959, 1960, 1964), Sutton-Smith and
Rosenberg (1960, 1961, 1965) and mussen et al, (1956, 1959, 1961,
1963) imply that preference of a parent, preference of a parent's
role and identification with him are different faces of the problem
of sex role development in a child's life. The results of the above
studies give rise to hypotheses concerning cause and effect in this
area. Sex role development apparently depends upon the child's
relationship with his parents. The variables considered to be
important in the parent-child relationship are parental nurturance
level, parents own masculinity level and the reinforcement parents
provided for the child whenever " appropriate behavior is exhibited
by the child. It seems plausible that such parental variables
influence a child's learning of sex role behavior, since parents
are usually the first people, a child observes and with whom he
interacts. The beginning of sex role behavior occurs very early in
life. (Emmericle 1959, Hartup and Zoolk 1960, Hartup 1962, Sears,
Maccaby and Levin 1957 and Seward 1964). Further, parents are also
the first people who represent the culture of their society, (or

that of the narrower cultural sub group) to the child. Since cultures of different societies and sub cultures within societies vary from each other, it is quite possible that sex role expectations being a part of the culture, also vary among societies and among subcultures.

Definition of Terms:

Sex role identification and behavior has attracted much attention during the last fifteen years, while evaluating these definitions they all convey more or less the same idea but the approach as to its detail is quite different.

Lynn defines "Sex role identification" as the internalization of the role considered appropriate to a given sex and to the conscious characteristics of that role. Lynn also defines "Parental identification" as the internalization of personality characteristics of one's own parent and the unconscious characteristics similar to that parent. "Sex role adoption" is actual adoption of behavior traits of one sex or the other, not simply the wish to do so (Lynn 1962).

Sears has defined (Brown 1956) "Sex role identification" as the behavior associated with one sex or the other that the individual introjects and acquires as his own. He defines "Sex role preference" as being that associated with one sex or the other which the individual would like to adopt or which the individual sees as being more desirable or preferred behavior.

Brown (1956) defines the term "Identification" without

8

differentiating sex role identification from any other kind of identification. According to him, sex role preference and sex role identification are appropriately defined by Sears.

Kagan has defined " Sex role identification " as the belief that some of the attributes of the model belong to the self. He also defines " Sex role identify " as being the degree to which one regards oneself as masculine or feminine. Another concept defined by Kagan (1964) is sex typed behavior ". It is the pattern of behavior that the society considers appropriate for a particular sex or the behavior that matches the sex role standard of the society (Kagan 1964).

In the present study, Lynn's (1962) and Kagan's (1964) definitions may be more suitable as these cover most of the important aspects of sex-role development. Joshi [] (1969), combines Lynn's and Kagan's definitions and states " Sex role preference " is an aspiration whereas " Sex role identification, " "Sex role adoption and " Parental identification " are processes employed to fulfill the aspiration. " Sex typed behavior " and "Sex role identify" are outcomes of the processes of " Sex role adoption" and sex role identification" respectively.

CONTROVERSIAL FINDINGS AND ISSUES.

Many approaches have become popular in order to study the child. Amongst the direct techniques, the doll play observations and different kinds of interview sessions seem to be quite popular. Researchers who have utilized such data gathering techniques, report contrasting findings in the area of sex role learning and development.

9
Brown (1957) found that as children develop, large and significant changes occur in the sex role behavior of boys and of girls and that the changes observed in the two groups differ in kind, suggesting the existence of definite, relatively dichotomous sex role patterns. He also noted that boys show a significantly greater preference for the masculine role than girls do for the feminine role.

Another study by Brown (1957, 1958) and studies by Hall (1964), Hartly (1960), Hartup and Zuck (1960), Kagan (1957) and Lerve (1957) also showed that boys expressed a much stronger, preference for the masculine role than girls did for the feminine role. The majority of boys but only a minority of girls expressed sex appropriate preferences.

Lefkowitz has reported contradictory results (1962), when confronted with a direct choice, girls have about as much preference for the feminine role as boys do for the masculine role (Lefkowitz 1962). However more research is needed to settle this question and give a more definite explanation.

Parents' personality, their attitude and actual implication of sex typed behavior has also been studied. Parents indicate through their behavior, language and attitudes a feminine or a masculine orientation. They represent to the child the nature of masculine and feminine orientations in a given culture. (Sears, Maccoby and Levin 1957, Kagan 1964), The child introjects any of these orientations as a result of socialization.

On the basis of this elaborate documentation, the inference is that sex role behavior is essentially learned. As stated

by Sears, Maccoby and Levin (1957) and Kagan (1964), if a child perceives himself as similar to his same sex parent, he tends to identify with that parent and thus adopts his sex appropriate behavior. ~~by adopting~~ some of the more obvious attitudes of the same sex parent. Thus parental masculinity or femininity should certainly be considered an important and crucial factor in the sex role development of the child.

Parson's theoretical formulation in relation to social structure (1955, 1958), where identification is conceptualized as encompassing the behavior a child learns in the context of a social role with a parent. This would mean that the learned behaviors need not be those typical of the adult but rather are those elicited and reinforced systematically in the course of a child's interactions with an adult. Parsons' understanding of masculinity and femininity is the difference between instrumental and expressive orientations.

Johnson (1963) has recently proposed that a crucial factor in learning the masculine sex role for males and the feminine sex role for females is identification with the father. Both boys and girls make an initial role sex typed identification with the mothers. Within this framework the father forms differential role relationships with the son and with the daughter. This provides the basis for sex role learning in children of both sexes.

Johnson (1963) suggests that girls receive expressive behavior from both father and mother while boys are treated with expressive behavior from the mother and instrumental behavior from

the father. Thus, girls' interactions with the parents reinforce expressive behavior from childhood through adulthood while boys are reinforced for expressive behavior toward female and instrumental behavior toward males.

Lynn (1962) proposes that the different learning patterns used by girls and by boys lead them to develop different personality traits. His hypothetical framework is as follows :-

1. Females will tend to demonstrate greater need for affiliation than males.
2. Females tend to be more dependent than males on the external context of the situation.
3. Females will tend to be more receptive to the standards of others than males (Lynn 1962, P. 281).

The above personality traits are developed by girls because of their learning patterns, which involve mainly imitation, under conditions of warm personal interaction.

His hypothetical frame-work for boys is that -

1. Males tend to surpass females in the problem solving skill.
2. Males tend to be more concerned with internalized standards than females (Lynn 1962, P. 281).

Another point of view in the area of sex role behavior in children is that of the availability of the father, which has been supported by (Kagan 1964, Sears, Maccoby and Levin 1957) in

their discussion on modelling theory.

Since parents play an important role in sex typing, if one of the parents is absent - the effect of this absence of parental care is great on the personality development of the child. The absence of one or both parents may prove to be a psychic wound to the child. It was supposed that the father's being away may act as a hindrance in the son's learning sex appropriate sex role behavior. This explanation is based on the modelling theory of sex role learning, in which the relative absence of the father means the absence of a masculine model for the son. (Lynn and Sawrey 1959, Mussen and Distler 1959). The absence of a parent could be for varied reasons no matter what the reasons for this absence may be, the harmony or balance of home is disturbed by the absence of one of the parents.

Lynn (1959) hypothesized that girls identify with their mothers but boys identify with a cultured male stereotype rather than with their own father. Of course there are research studies which provide evidence of boys' identifying with their own fathers inspite of the fathers being absent from the home most of the time (Heilburn 1965 a, b, Brodbeck 1954, Good enough 1957, Bronfen bronner 1961, Os good 1957, Helper 1955, Gray 1959, Sopchak 1952).

The parent's attitude and pattern of reinforcement could act as a factor influencing the sex role behavior of a growing child. On the basis of some of the research studies (Sears, Maccoby and Levin 1957, Kohn 1959, Ragan 1964), it is indicated that there is a difference in the way boys and girls are treated by adults.

The expectation pattern of the family interaction suggests that girls are expected to retain their dependence and to develop conformity and passivity while boys are expected to be independent, aggressive and competent (Beller and Turner 1964, Crutchfield 1955, Hovland and Janis 1959, Kagan and Moss 1962, Lindzey and Goldberg 1953, Mc.Caudless, Bilous and Bennett 1961, Stanford et.al 1943, Sears etal, 1953, Siegel etal. 1959).

Other factors in the parent child relationship also influence the sex role development of a child. The appropriate sex role development depends on the level of nurturance provided in the parent child relationship. If the parent is warm, understanding and nurturant in her behavior and attitude to the child, it makes it easier for the child to identify with and adopt the behavior of the same sex parent. This point is stated by the researches on sex role identification (Heilbrun 1964, [] Kussen and Bistler 1959, Kussen and Rutherford 1963, Lofkowitz 1962, Heilbrun and Giv 1966).

The interaction between nurturance and reinforcement as the two factors combined may have all influence on the sex role behavior of a child. A nurturant model who combines in her behavior, the effect of the reinforcement, this effect may be long lasting regardless of the kind of reinforcement.

The effect of reinforcement, negative and positive is further elaborated in the learning theory. (Miller and Dollard 1941, Mowrer 1950, [] These researches suggest some implications in the area of sex role learning. Sex role behavior may be enhanced when learning in this area is followed by positive reinforcement than

followed by negative reinforcement. For example, boys are consistently told not to be a "Sissy" rather than what to be and that boys also know the masculine and feminine distinction by the age of three (Brown 1957, Hartup and Zoellk 1960).

The sociological point of view on Sex Role Development.

Sex role behavior, sex differences etc. include the culture and society as well. One cannot in this short space do full justice to the transmission and learning of culture for one thing, not nearly enough is known about it. Several things can be said in this connection. Anatomical and physiological differences between the sexes are poorly correlated with sex roles, the opposite sex and the culture at large. Behaviorally, the meaning of the sex role is decided by the particular society in which the child is born. It is believed that the process starts soon after the child is born. Seward states, "The individual is trained to sex role from the moment of birth when the girls are placed in pink, boys in blue bassinets". (Seward 1946) There is great human variation in sexual mating, in courtship patterns, sexual play, positions during intercourse and alternate paths to orgasm, (Stone and Church 1968).

We cannot take it for granted that sexual motivation arises spontaneously through simple physical maturation, since animal studies indicate that both drive level and mating patterns depend on early experience for normal development. A culture's view of sexuality can weaken the intensity of sexual feelings, it can define them for the individual himself, it can intensify

them to the point of making them frightening, it can define which acts, objects, partners, and settings produce agreeable sexual feelings and which disagreeable ones.

Outside the sex act, there can be yet wider variations in the roles assigned to males and females with respect to such tasks as child rearing, housekeeping, discipline of children, tending the fields or the herds, marketing produce, managing the budgets, handicrafts, hunting, fishing, participation in government and decision making and participation in recreational activities. Still further, there can be great variations among cultures in the traits ascribed to the two sexes, such as bravery, loyalty, passionateness, divousness, honesty, perseverance, generosity, cruelty, fortitude, sympathy, emotionality etc. Thus there are interests, tastes and preferences that are assumed to go with being male or female. This is how we assign plaything, food stuffs, activities, occupations and useful objects to the two sexes with some overlap. Nobody has yet fully explored and catalogued all the cultural differences in definitions of masculinity and femininity and yet we know that some knowledge of anthropology suggests that these differences are considerable. Among the yamana of south America, for instance swimming is an exclusively female skill. Although biological differences have some determining role, much of what we take for granted as biologically founded turns out to be what our society is accustomed to think the biological differences mean.

There can be yet other wider variations in the roles assigned to males and females with respect to genetic differences in personality. For example, the basic tendency of the human fetus is to develop as a female. If the genes order the gonads to become testicles and put out the male hormone and organ, the embryo will turn into a boy; otherwise it becomes a girl. You have to add something to get a male, nature's first intention is to create a female.

Nature may prefer women, but virtually every culture has been partial to men. That contradiction raises an increasingly pertinent question (as well as the hackles of militant feminists). Are women immutably different from men? Women's Liberationists believe that any differences other than anatomical - are a result of conditioning by society. The opposing view is that all of the differences are fixed in the genes. However, the nature-nurture controversy is oversimplified. What human beings are, results from a complex interaction between both forces. It is a false dichotomy to say that this difference is acquired and that one genetic. To try and differentiate is like asking a penny whether it is really a heads penny or a tails penny. Although some of the predispositions may be genetic, complex behavior patterns are probably not genetically determined.

If there is any truth in the idea that genetic predispositions exist, it is based on three kinds of evidence. First, there are the "cultural universals" cited by Margaret Mead (1935). Almost everywhere, the mother is the principal caretaker

of the child, and male dominance and aggression are the rule. Some anthropologists believe there has been an occasional female dominated society; others insist that none have existed.

Then there is the fact that among most ground-dwelling primates, males are dominant and have as a major function the protection of females and offspring. Some research suggests that this is true even when the young are raised apart from adults, which seems to mean that they do not learn their roles from their society.

Finally, behavioral sex differences show up long before any baby could possibly perceive subtle differences between his parents or know which parent he is expected to imitate. "A useful strategy", says Harvard Psychologist [redacted] Kagan, "is to assume that the earlier a particular difference appears, the more likely it is to be influenced by biological factors".

Physical differences appear even before birth. The heart of the female fetus often beats faster, and girls develop more rapidly. "Physiologically", says Sociologist Barbetta Blackington, "women are better-made animals". Males do have more strength and endurance though that hardly matters in a technological society.

Recent research hints that there may even be sex differences in the brain. According to some experimenters, the presence of the male hormone testosterone in the fetus may "masculinize" the brain, organizing the fetal nerve centers in characteristic ways. This possible "sex typing" of the central

nervous system before birth may make men and women respond differently to incoming stimuli. In fact, newborn girls do show different responses in some situations. They react more strongly to the removal of a blanket and more quickly to touch and pain. Moreover, experiments demonstrate that twelve-week-old girls gaze longer at photographs of faces than at geometric figures. Boys show no preference then, though eventually they pay more attention to figures. Kagan acknowledges the effect of environment, but he has found that it exerts a greater influence on girls than on boys. The female infants who experienced the most "face-to-face interaction" with their mothers were more attentive to faces than girls whose mothers did not exchange looks with them so much. Among boys, there was no consistent relationship.

This very early female attention to the human face suggests that women may have a greater and even partly innate sensitivity to other human beings. Perhaps this explains why girls seem to get more satisfaction from relationships with people.

Even after infancy, the sexes show differential interests that do not seem to grow solely out of experience. Psychoanalyst Erickson (1950) has found that boys and girls aged ten to twelve use space differently when asked to construct a scene with toys. Girls often build a low wall, sometimes with an elaborate doorway, surrounding a quiet interior scene. Boys are likely to construct towers, facades with cannons, and lively exterior scenes. Erickson acknowledges that cultural influences are at work, but he is convinced that they do not fully explain the nature of children's play. The differences, he says "seem to parallel the morphology (shape and form) of genital differentiation itself: in the male,

19
an external organ, erectible and intrusive; internal organs in the female, with vestibular access, leading to statically expectant ova".

In aptitude as well as in interest, sex differences become apparent early in life. Though girls are generally less adept than boys at mathematical and spatial reasoning, they learn to count sooner and to talk earlier and better. Female verbal superiority may be caused by sex-linked differences in the brain, or it may exist because mothers talk to infant girls more than to baby boys. But does the mother's talking cause the child to do likewise or could it be the other way round? The possibility that girls are talked to more because for biological reasons, they respond more than boys to words and thus stimulate ~~their~~ ^{their} mothers to keep talking.

Evidence that parental behavior does affect speech comes from tests made by Kegan (1962) among poor Guatemalan children. ^{& girls} There, boys are more highly valued than girls, are talked to more and become more verbal.

Mowrer (1960) states, while girls outdo boys verbally, they often lag behind in solving analytical problems, those that require attention to detail. Girls seem to think "globally", responding to situations as a whole instead of abstracting single elements. In the "rod and frame test", for instance, a subject sits in a dark room before a luminous rod inside a slightly tilted frame, and is asked to move the rod to an upright position. Boys can separate the rod visually from the frame and make it stand straight; girls misled by the tipped frame, usually adjust the rod not to the true vertical but to a position parallel with the sides of the frame.

In all such differences, environmental influence is suggested by the fact that children who think analytically most often prove to have mothers who have encouraged initiative and exploration, while youngsters who think globally have generally been tied to their mother's apron strings. In Western society, of course, it is usually boys who are urged toward adventure. Herein, perhaps - there is no proof-lies an explanation for the apparent male capacity to think analytically. We have to know lot more how this interaction can be analysed on Indian scene.

In IQ tests, males and females score pretty much alike. Since this is true, why do women seem less creative ? Many social scientists are convinced that the reasons are cultural. Women, they say, learn early in life that female accomplishment brings few rewards. In some cases, women can not be creative because they are discriminated against. In other instances, a woman's creativity may well be blunted by fear of nonconformity, failure or even success itself. Unlike men, Kegan says (1964) women are trained to have strong anxiety about being wrong.

To many psychoanalysts, however, the explanation lies in the fact that women possess the greatest creative power of all: bringing new life into being; thus they need not compensate by producing works of art. Men, it is theorized, are driven to make up for what seems to them a deficiency. That they feel keenly, though unconsciously, their inability to bear children is shown in dreams reported on the analyst's couch, in the behavior of small boys who play with dolls and walk around with their stomachs thrust forward in imitation of their pregnant mothers and in primitive

rities and ancient myths.

There are personality differences between the sexes too. Although no trait is confined to one sex - there are women who exceed the male average even in supposedly masculine characteristics some distinctions turn up remarkable early. At New York, University, for example, researchers have found that a female infant stops sucking a bottle and looks up when some one comes into the room; a male pays no attention to the visitor.

Another Kagan (1956) experiment shows that girls of twelve months who become frightened in a strange room drift toward their mothers, while boys look for something, to do. At four months, twice as many girls as boys cry when frightened in a strange laboratory. What is more, Kagan says, similar differences can be seen in monkeys and baboons, which "forces us to consider the possibility that some of the psychological differences between men and women may not be the product of experience alone but of subtle biological differences."

Animal studies suggest that there may be biological factors in maternal behavior; mothers of rhesus monkeys punish their male babies earlier and more often than their female offspring; they also touch their female babies more often and act more protective toward them.

As for the controversial question of female "passivity", there is no contradiction between being feminine and working. The ego can be active in both men and women, it is only in love and in

22

sex that passivity is particularly appropriate for women. As she sees it, passivity is no more than a kind of openness and warmth; it does not mean "inactivity, emptiness or immobility".

Another controversy rages over the effect of hormones. Militant women, who discount hormonal influence, disagree violently with scientific researchers, who almost unanimously agree that hormones help determine how people feel and act. So far, there have been few studies of male hormones, but scientists think they may eventually discover hormonal cycles in men that produce cyclic changes in mood and behavior. As for females, studies have indicated that 49 % of female medical and surgical hospital admissions, most psychiatric hospital admissions and 62 % of violent crimes among women prisoners occur on premenstrual and menstrual days. At Worcester State Hospital in Massachusetts, Psychologists Donald and Inge Broverman have found that estrogen sharpens sensory perception. They believe that this heightened sensitivity may lead more women than men to shy away from situations of stress.

One trait thought to be affected by hormones is aggressiveness. In all cultures, male infants tend to play more aggressively than females. While scientists think a genetic factor may be involved, they also observe that society fosters the difference by permitting male aggression and encouraging female adaptability. Some suggest that females may be aggressive as men but with words instead of deeds.

The definitive research on hormones and aggression is still to be done. However, it has been established that the female

23

hormone estrogen inhibits aggression in both animal and human males. It has also been proved that the male hormone androgen influences aggression in animals. For example, castration produces tractable steers rather than fierce bulls.

The influence of androgen begins even before birth. Administered to pregnant primates, the hormone makes newborn females play more aggressively than ordinary females. Moreover, such masculinized animals are unusually aggressive as long as they live, even if they are never again exposed to androgen.

Will there some day be a "unisex" society with no differences between men and women, except anatomical ones? It seems unlikely. Anatomy, parturition and gender, cannot be wished away "in a spasm of the distended will, as though the will, in pursuit of total human possibility, can amplify itself to overcome the given". Women's role as caretaker "was the evolutionary result of their biological role in birth and feeding". The baby bottle has freed women from some of the tasks of that role, but the major responsibility for child rearing is the woman's, even in the Soviet Union, the Israeli Kibbutz, Scandinavia and mainland China. Furthermore, though sex mothering skills are mostly learned, it is a fact that if animals are raised in isolation and then put in a room with the young of the species, it is the females who go to the infants and take care of them.

Perhaps the known biological differences can be totally overcome, and society can approach a state in which a person's sex is of no consequence for any significant activity except child

bearing, admits Jerome Kagan (1956). "But we must ask if such a society will be satisfying to its members". As he sees it, "complementarity" is what makes relationships stable and pleasurable.

The basic reason why unisex must fail is that in the sexual act itself the man has to be assertive, if tenderly, and the woman has to be receptive. What gives trouble is when men see assertiveness as aggression and women see receptiveness as submission". Unisex, would be "a disaster", because children need roles to identify with and rebel against. You can't identify with a blur. A unisex world would be a frictionless environment in which nobody would be able to grow up.

Though scientists disagree about the precise nature and causes of these differences, there is no argument about two points: society plays a tremendous part in shaping the differences, and most women are capable of doing whatever they want. Only in the top ranges of ability, says Kagan (1964) are innate differences significant; for typical men and women, "the biological differences are totally irrelevant". "There is no evidence," "that men are any more or less qualified by biological sex differences alone to perform the tasks generally reserved for them in today's societies".

Even though the number of educated women is at an all time high, the representation of women in the traditionally male professions is still extremely low. One likely reason for this paradox, is that U.S. women actively fear success.

Horner (1972) began looking into this when she discovered

that the few studies that had been made of women's motivation for achievement showed they had high anxiety. Reasonably certain that this meant women were afraid of competition, Horner decided nonetheless to test that assumption. Putting men and women in competitive and noncompetitive situation, she found that males showed a spurt of motivation in competition. Females did not. It was anxiety about competition, that apparently held the women back.

The revelation about fear of success came from the one sex "cue" included in the experiment. Horner had modified the familiar TAT (Thematic Apperception Test*) to require males to write about the success of another male, females on the success of a female. Asked to write about a mythical girl at the top of her medical school class, more than 65 % of the women associated her success with depression, illness and sometimes even death. Asked to write about a boy in the same position, 90 % of the men equated his success with happiness and prosperity. The women obviously seemed afraid of success.

Horner discovered that women's fear of success increases with their ability, and that the greater their fear, the less well they do in competition with men. She also found that fear of success increases as women progress farther in school, affecting as many as 90 % of college juniors. It is at this level that many women switch to more "traditionally feminine" goals, to teach instead of going to law school, for example, or to work for a politician instead of being one.

* Subjects tell a story that psychologist interprets.

Fear of success was clearly tied to the attitude of society in general and the attitudes of boy friends in particular. These attitudes became obvious during other TAT tests that Psychologist Horner administered to male law students. The men described a successful woman as unattractive, unpopular, unfeminine, merely a "computer" and overaggressive.

There is little doubt that there have been marked changes in sexual morality during the past several years, and that these changes have affected women, especially young women, more dramatically than men. Although behavioral experts believe that reports of a "sexual revolution" are greatly exaggerated, they agree that some profound changes - especially in attitude have taken place, of course, this is in United states.