6

LIBR-00857

Studies of
the Royal Commission
on the Status of Women
in Canada.

Sex Role Imagery in Children:
Social Origins of Mind

Prepared by:
Ronald D. Lambert, Ph.D.,
Associate Professor of Sociology
and Psychology,
University of Waterloo.
April 1969.

While this study was prepared for the Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada and is being published under its auspices, the views expressed therein are those of the author and not necessarily those of the Commissioners.

© Crown Copyrights reserved
Available by mail from Information Canada, Ottawa,
and at the following Information Canada bookshops:

HALIFAX
1735 Barrington Street

MONTREAL
Æterna-Vie Building, 1182 St. Catherine Street West

OTTAWA
171 Slater Street

TORONTO
221 Yonge Street

WINNIPEG
Mall Center Building, 499 Portage Avenue

VANCOUVER
657 Granville Street

or through your bookseller

Price $1.75 Catalogue No. Z1-1967/1-1/6

Price subject to change without notice

Information Canada
Ottawa, 1971

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
List of Tables		iii
Acknowledgements		vii
Chapter 1	Images and Social Interaction	1
	The Importance of Images	2
	Perceptual Organisation	3
	Instrumental Activity	4
	Social Control	5
Chapter 2	The Natural Social Order	11
	A Cultural View of Prejudice	14
	The Feminine Role	15
	The Dependent Variable	16
	A Word about Method	18
Chapter 3	Some Preliminary Findings	21
	A Word of Caution	21
	Sex Differences in Thinking about Sex	22
	The Multi-Dimensional Nature of SRD	24
	Something about the Parents	25
	Characteristics of Respondents' Mothers and SRD	26
Chapter 4	The Genesis of Imagery	29
	Social Differentiation and Imagery	30
	Parental Role Differentiation	31
	Child-Power	33
	Integration and Interaction in Peer Groups	35
	Some Pre-Adolescent and Adolescent Behaviours	37
Chapter 5	The Social Origins of Mind	41
	The Significance of Social Order	41
	A Correspondence	43
	The Continuing Nature of Socialization	45
	On the Perils of Explanation	46
	How Expectancies Victimize	52
	Some Needed Research	54
Chapter 6	Social Change	57
	Some Disclaimers	57
	The writer's position	61
	Structural Conditions Facilitating Personal Growth	63

TABLE OF CONTENTS - continued

		Page
Chapter 7	Summary and Conclusions	69
Appendix A	Methodology	73
	The Sample	75
	The Instruments	78
	Participation Bias	80
	Test-Retest Liability	82
Appendix B	Permission Letter to Parents and Children's Booklets #1 and #2	87
	Permission Letter to Parents	89
	Booklet #1	90
	Booklet #2	100
Appendix C	Letter to Parent and Parents' Questionnaire	113
	Letter to Parent	115
	Parents' Questionnaire	116
Appendix D	Tables	121
References		153

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table A-1	Test-Retest Reliability Coefficients for Six Measures of SRD, and for Measure of Child's Power in his Family	84
D-1	Relation Between Sex of Respondent and SRD-Behaviour, as a Function of Language Group and Age	123
D-2	Relation Between Sex of Respondent and SRD-Jobs, as a Function of Language Group and Age	124
D-3	Relation Between Sex of Respondent and SRD-Feminine Role, as a Function of Language Group and Age.	125
D-4	Relation Between Sex of Respondent and SRD-Authority Relations, as a Function of Language Group and Age.	126
D-5	Correlation Matrix of the Six SRD Measures.	127
D-6	Correlation Matrix of Measures of Traditionalism, Personality Belief, and Role Preference Scales	128
D-7	Traditionalism, Personality Belief, and Role Preference as Functions of Language Group .	129
D-8	Traditionalism as a Function of Education .	130
D-9	Personality Belief as a Function of Education	131
D-10	Role Preference as a Function of Education.	132
D-11	Traditionalism as a Function of Socio-Economic Status	133
D-12	Personality Belief as a Function of Socio-Economic Status	134
D-13	Role Preference as a Function of Socio-Economic Status	135

LIST OF TABLES - continued

Page

Table D-14 Correlation Matrix Relating the Three Parents' Variables, Traditionalism, Personality Belief and Role Preference, to the Six Children's SRD variables 136

D-15 Relations Between Semantic Differentiation of Parents and SRD-Behaviour, SRD-Authority Relations and SRD-Peer Relations. 137

D-16 Relations Between Perceived Role Differentiation of Parents with Respect to Discipline and SRD 138

D-17 Relations Between Socio-Emotional Differentiation of Parents and SRD-Authority Relations and SRD-Peer Relations 139

D-18 Relations Between Socio-Emotional Differentiation of Parents and SRD-Traits and SRD-Behaviour 140

D-19 Relations Between Differentiation of Parental Power and SRD 141

D-20 Relations Between Child-Power and SRD-Traits and SRD-Peer Relations, in English-Speaking boys, Age 9-11 142

D-21 Relations Between Child-Power and SRD in Boys 143

D-22 Relations Between Child-Power and SRD in English-Speaking Girls, Age 12-14 144

D-23 Relations Between Child-Power and SRD in Girls 145

D-24 Relations Between Degree of Differential Interaction with the Sexes and SRD 146

D-25 Relations Between Dating Versus Non-Dating Behaviour and SRD, among English-Speaking Girls, Age 12-14. 147

LIST OF TABLES - continued

		Page
Table D-26	Relations Between Dating Behaviour and SRD, among French-and English-Speaking Boys, Age 12-14.	148
D-27	Relations Between Attitude to School and SRD, both Sexes, both Language Groups, Age 12-14.	149
D-28	Relations Between Self-Reports of Grades and SRD, among English-Speaking Girls, Age 15 and Over	150
D-29	School Grades by Language Group and Age. .	151

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to acknowledge, with thanks, the collaboration of a number of people. Miss June Craig, now a graduate student in social work, and Mr. Wayne Millar, now a graduate student in sociology, worked on the project as colleagues from its inception to the keypunching stage. Madame Yvonne Raymond worked on the French portion of the study where she accomplished much in a short period of time. Miss Monique Bégin, Executive Secretary of the Commission, has been most supportive throughout the study. Mrs. Janice Patton did much to translate the original report into a comprehensible form. I am especially grateful to my wife, Marilyn, without whose intellectual stimulation, as well as support and patience, the study simply could not have been done.

CHAPTER 1

IMAGES AND SOCIAL INTERACTION

The concern of this report is quite simple and quite straightforward. We hope to shed some light on the question: Where do people, especially children, "get" their ideas about sex roles?

By sex roles, we are not referring to sex in the biological or reproductive sense. We are interested in what it <u>means</u> psychologically and socially to be a man or a woman, a boy or a girl. This is a study of the images people have of the sexes and where these images come from.

We know a lot about sex differences. There is much literature in the social sciences about the differences between the sexes (Maccoby, 1966 summarizes much of what is known). But these findings are typically of the sort which show that males perform better on activity A, and females better on activity B. We are investigating something that we believe is more fundamental than such differences, interesting as they are.

It is our assumption that the behavioural differences between the sexes are consequences or manifestations of more basic psychological differences. We assume, first, that children learn what it means to be a male or a female in our society; and second, that they learn ways of behaving which generally implement their images of the sexes.

To say that children learn one thing and then another is not to say that these are completely separate learnings. Both are part of a larger process of role learning in which children form a deepening commitment to their respective roles, and especially to their conceptions of them. In acquiring images of the sexes, children are learning what is appropriate to the sexes. They develop ideas of what is right or proper for them as boys or girls to do, to believe, to aspire to, and ways to relate to others. They are learning about the social order, which in time will appear to them to be a natural social order in the sense that they will come to take it for granted as the framework within which they think and act. As such, it is also an important source of their motivation.

Speaking more broadly, this study is an attempt to understand the place that conceptions of the "natural social order"

occupy in human thought. We do not allege that there is a single natural social order. People seem to think, to act, and to judge others as though there were such an order. By one means or another, men acquire conceptions of the world (Garfinkel, 1968; Kluckhohn, 1961). In time, these beliefs feel comfortable or natural, like a well-worn glove. People are born into different events, and so gradually come to subscribe to different natural social orders.

Another assumption underlying this study is that images of the sex roles are basic to the entire social order. Beliefs about the roles of the sexes are threads running through the fabric of society, having multiple effects upon human institutions and themselves nourished and sustained by these institutions. For example, traditional conceptions of the sexes are institutionalized in the practices of traditional Christendom, with its sexually segregated religious orders and its conceptions of the family. These institutional practices, in turn, strengthen traditional views of men and women. In the organization of religious institutions less tied to the past, such as humanistic fellowships, sex plays a less important role. We believe their members are less committed to historical ways of thinking about the sexes.

The remainder of this chapter will argue for the importance of states of mind which we will call images or expectancies. Chapter 2 will consist of a review of the variable or aspect of behaviour that we wish to understand better: sex-role differentiation (SRD).

The Importance of Images. Two general questions can be asked about images: what are their origins, and what are their effects? We conceive of images as mental pictures emerging from prior experiences and governing action.

Our concern in this chapter is to document the importance of images. The study whose findings we will report in later chapters was designed to explore the origins of sex-role imagery. We did not attempt to measure the effects of this mental state. Rather we assumed, within the limits of the study, that such an expectancy would, if tested, have effects on ensuing behaviour. Since we have not conducted such tests, it seems reasonable to document the impact of images or expectancies as they have been demonstrated in other studies. Some suggestions for experimental research testing for the effects of SRD will be offered later in the report.

Three functions or contributions of expectancies will be described briefly. They are: perceptual organization, instrumental activity, and control and legitimation. That is to say, there are three ways in which imagery figures in the psychology of the individual and his relations to others.

Perceptual Organization. Psychologists often view the world, especially the social world, as not possessing inherent order itself, at least, not the order we see in it. Thus, the distinction has been drawn between the objective world and the psychological world. It is alleged that we respond to the latter, rather than to the former. The psychological world consists of the organization which we impose on the objective world, the meaning which we attribute to it. It is said that the "real world" is potentially chaotic, in the sense that there is possibly an infinity of ways of responding to it (Bruner, Goodnow and Austin, 1956). There are many possible discriminations that can be made, but a member of a culture makes a modest number of discriminations. Although there are several million possible colour discriminations, for example, we respond in terms of relatively few colour categories.

Kuethe (1962a,b) has reported a series of experiments showing the effects of what he calls "social schemas". He finds evidence for the existence of schemas in the tendency for people to group objects together as "belonging" together. Kuethe had his experimental subjects position figures cut out of felt (man, woman, child, dog, and geometrical figures) on a large sheet of felt.

A few of Kuethe's findings are worth considering. He found a clear tendency for subjects to place the figures of the woman and child closer together than the man and child. Sixty-eight per cent placed the woman and child closer together, as compared to only 18 per cent who placed the man and child closer together. He argues that there is a tendency for people in our culture to perceive and organize the world in mother-and-child relations. (It would be interesting to determine whether subjects who think of the sexes in traditional ways are more likely to group in the fashion of the majority than subjects who hold more "modern," more egalitarian, and less differentiated views of the sex roles.)

A second finding was the tendency for subjects to group figures of a man and a woman together, as compared to rectangles of equivalent size. Kuethe began by showing his first subject two rectangles which had been placed 30 inches apart

by the experimenter. After the subject looked at these for a few seconds, the experimenter removed them, handed them to the subject, and requested him to replace them in the same positions. Then a second subject came in, and the experimenter removed the rectangles from the locations assigned them by the first subject. The second subject tried to replace them where they had been put by the first subject. The procedure was repeated until 30 subjects had performed the task. Kuethe was interested in the amount of cumulative error in the placements from the first subject through the 30. After 30 trials, the experimenter found that the distance between the two objects was still approximately 30 inches. The same procedure was repeated using figures of a man and a woman. In marked contrast, after 30 subjects had performed the task, the distance had been reduced from 30 inches to less than five inches. In fact, this reduction had been accomplished by the time the 17th subject performed the task. Again, Kuethe interpreted his findings as evidence of a marked cultural tendency to perceive humans, at least when they are of the opposite sex, as belonging together.

Instrumental Activity. A wide-ranging programme of research by Rosenthal (1966; Rosenthal and Jacobson, 1968a; but *cf* Barber 1968a, b; Rosenthal 1968b) has shown how expectations actively shape interpersonal relations. He found evidence in his earlier studies that experimenters' expectations or hypotheses enter into research and affect the source of data in such a way as to confirm themselves. Apparently the researcher produced cues of which he was unaware, and these somehow communicated to the source of the data what kind of data were desired. Rosenthal and his co-workers have identified the phenomenon even when the investigator is interacting with the lowly rodent.

A particularly striking example is provided by Rosenthal's study of expectancy effects in a California elementary school. First, the pupils were given intelligence tests. Then, supposedly on the basis of their findings, the investigators informed the teachers that certain children could be expected to "bloom" academically that year. In fact, and unknown to the teachers, the designated children were chosen randomly. The designated and non-designated children were then compared at several points in time to test the hypothesis that the teachers' expectations would tend to be confirmed.

This was indeed the case. It was found, first, the children who were predicted to improve in fact did so; and second, that this tendency was most pronounced in the first grade and diminished in each succeeding grade. The mere

assumption that something is so is sufficient to set in motion interpersonal processes whose effect is to confirm the assumption.

An interesting finding emerged in a more detailed analysis of the data from the non-designated children, those about whom no specific expectation was created. Some of these children improved in intelligence, even though not predicted to do so, while others changed very little. Rosenthal and Jacobson observed that teachers described those who improved in more negative terms than those who did not. Children who failed to live up to their teachers' expectations, even though their "failure" was in the direction of growth, were penalized in the estimation of their teachers. This last finding bears on the next function of expectations.

Social Control. A remarkable series of experiments has recently been conducted by Milgram (1963) which attest to the potent effect of expectations on one's own behaviour. There is evidence of a tendency for people to feel constrained or to behave in anti-social ways so long as it is legitimate that they do so. Consider the typical Milgram experiment to dispel the apparent paradox in this statement.

Milgram conducted what he called a learning experiment. He advertised for subjects, and obtained them from all walks of life and spanning a wide range of ages. The situation was introduced to the subjects as a study of the effects of punishment on human learning. The experimental set-up was contrived to impress the subject with its scientific sophistication.

Each experimental session involved the experimenter, the subject, and a confederate of the experimenter or "stooge" whom the subject took to be another subject. Lots were drawn to determine who would be the "teacher" and who the "learner". The draw was "fixed" so that the subject always was assigned to the teacher role, and the stooge to the learner role.

The learner-stooge was then strapped into a chair in an adjoining room and electrodes were affixed to him. The teacher-subject was then instructed to do the following: he was to read a list of word pairs once; then, he was to read the first word of a pair, followed by four options which included the original paired word. The learner was to indicate which of the four options had originally been paired with the stimulus or stem word. If he was wrong, the teacher was required to administer a 15-volt shock by pressing a button.

With each succeeding mistake, the teacher was to increase the shock level by 15 volts, until some 30 buttons later he would administer 450 volts, designated "Danger". In fact, the stooge's electrodes were not attached to the shock generator, but he was primed to make responses appropriate to the shocks he was presumably receiving. At one level, he was to cry out in pain; at another level, he was to ask to be released from the experiment; at another level, he was to plead that his heart was troubling him; and finally, he simply fell silent, no longer responding to the stimulus words and to the urgings of the teacher. If a subject objected, the experimenter used a series of standard prods, e.g., "the experiment requires that you continue". Although this was nominally a study of the effects of punishment on human learning, its real purpose was to assess the conditions under which people disobey commands. The dependent variable was the rate of disobedience in the experimental situation.

How many people might be expected to obey all the way to the end? Milgram asked different types of people, such as students, psychiatrists, and the like what percentage of a hypothetical sample of 100 subjects would administer 450 volts. Most agreed that the vast majority of subjects would disobey the experimenter. Forty psychiatrists felt, on the average, that less than one per cent would obey completely. This figure contrasts with the finding that 65 per cent (26 of 40 subjects) obeyed fully in Milgram's original experiment and none stopped before 300 volts.

Why were the psychiatrists so far off in their predictions? Why did so many subjects comply with the experimenter's instructions and urgings, in spite of the contrary evidence provided by their own senses? We may suppose that the psychiatrists engaged in the following kind of reasoning. First, what kind of a person would punish another human being in so cruel a fashion? He must obviously be said to have sadistic impulses. Second, how many sadistic people would we expect to find in the population at large? No doubt there are some, but over-all there must be few. Given these two assumptions, the psychiatrists' predictions seem quite reasonable.

What consideration did the psychiatrists ignore? It seems they did not allow for the reality of an institutionalized relationship founded on the achievement of important values in our culture, in this case, scientific knowledge. Built into the relationship, and into the experimenter's demands upon the subject, was a legitimacy that conferred upon the experimenter the <u>right</u> to make certain requests,

and upon the subject the duty to comply with them. Finally, to say that a relationship is institutionalized, and to say that the experimenter wields legitimate authority, is to say that the subjects make certain assumptions about the natural social order. The Milgram experiments are, in some sense, tests of peoples' commitments to their natural social order. They demonstrate how expectations operate as an undergirding of the social system and the maintenance of social control.

The three contributions we have discussed make a transition from the individual, at one extreme, to the social system, at the other. As a psychological state, images confer order upon the lives of individuals, and work as a mechanism to maintain the social order. It is these functions that we also ascribe to sex role imagery. First, images organize our perceptions of the world. We perceive the world in the ways we believe it should be. Essentially similar acts are assigned different meanings, depending on who performs them. What is approved in a man as ambition is frowned at in women as aggressiveness.

Second, our expectations of the sexes shape our interactions with people in such a way as to fulfil our prophecies. Because we believe certain things about the opposite sex and our own sex, we place subtle pressures upon them to meet these expectations. We structure our relationships and define the situation in such a way that the other feels obligated to perform accordingly, or else to destroy the relationship by challenging our expectations.

Our analysis in this and the next chapter constitutes an attack on two common assumptions in our thinking. First, we have opposed a naive realism which says that we interact directly with the world-out-there. It is our position that contact with reality is mediated by a moat of images and social conventions, so that we can assume no immediate contact between the perceiver and the perceived.

Second, we favour the view that much of our interaction with the social world is barely subject to our awareness and our control. Psychological processes are, for the most part, "silent processes". Consider, for instance, the research of Hess (1965) on the cue properties of pupil size in the perceived as determinants of impressions in the perceiver. Hess has found evidence of two important phenomena. He measured photographically subjects' pupil dilation, and found a tendency for pupils to dilate when perceiving objects of interest to the subject, and to constrict when looking at

disliked objects. Figuratively speaking, this means that people tend to absorb parts of the world that have some value to them. They go out psychologically to meet the world.

Hess' second major finding is particularly interesting to us. He showed a pair of pictures to 20 men. The pictures were identical, except that the pupils of the woman depicted were somewhat dilated in one picture and constricted in the other. Hess wrote:

> "The average response (male pupil dilation) to the picture with the large pupils was more than twice as strong as the response to the one with small pupils; nevertheless, when the men were questioned after the experimental session, most of them reported that the two pictures were identical. Some did say that one was 'more feminine' or 'prettier' or 'softer'. None noticed that one had larger pupils than the other.... As long ago as the Middle Ages women dilated their pupils with the drug belladonna (which means 'beautiful woman' in Italian). Clearly large pupils are attractive to men, but the response to them - at least in our subjects - is apparently at a nonverbal level. One might hazard a guess that what is appealing about large pupils in a woman is that they imply extraordinary interest in the man she is with!"

Theoretical and experimental advances by Skinner (1957), Schachter and Singer (1962), and Bem (1965, 1966) have isolated silent processes accounting for the appearance of self-knowledge. Bem argues forcefully that our awareness of ourselves emerges in much the same way as our knowledge of others. We are not privileged with direct access to the internal lives of others, hence we are forced to rely upon circumstantial evidence. We infer others' attitudes, beliefs, perceptions, and wealth of private experiences from our knowledge of the situations within which they are expressed.

Two men protest their belief in God. One man makes his testimony on the rack before he dies. The other makes his from a prepared script on the occasion of his promotion within the church bureaucracy. While we do not deny the sincerity of the second man, we are probably more confident of the first man's conviction. Bem contends that we know ourselves in much the same way.

On the face of it, we alone are privy to what is going on inside us. Bem believes that we observe ourselves performing, and we formulate hypotheses about what these acts mean. The behaviour is itself under the control of external conditions, rather than internal states such as attitudes. In one of Bem's experiments, subjects inferred whether they were telling the truth or lying from cues that had previously been associated with truth-telling or lying. Schachter and Singer's experiments similarly suggest that people rely on external cues for information about what is presumably taking place within their own skins. Subjects in their experiment found reasons for their physiological arousal in cues afforded by the behaviour of others in the situation. Subjects believed they were happy or angry depending on the expression of lightheartedness or hostility by paid confederates of the experimenter.

The same kind of logic can be detected in the process by which children develop sexual identities. Girls know they are girls and boys know they are boys from the roles into which they are cast. Girls infer that they are girls, and develop a "feminine psychology", from the clothes draped on them, from the toys placed in their hands, from the verbal and emotional expressions of their parents, and so on. There is no girl bursting to get out, finally issuing in a feminine psychology.

We are interested in two implications of this thesis. First, it provides an economical explanation of a way in which expectations fulfil themselves. No magical suppositions need be made about how expectations inside one person's head somehow shape the behaviour of another person. Expectations that manifest themselves in the behaviour of the beholder simultaneously afford an inferential base for the other about himself.

The second implication of the thesis has to do with the mechanics of change. If we wish girls to acquire a more differentiated and enriched self-image, then we ought to provide them with the kinds of experiences from which such self-awareness can emerge. There will continue to be a sexual psychology so long as there is a sexual sociology, i.e., so long as the conditions of existence differ.

In the next chapter, we will consider children's sex-role imagery. We assume that such imagery underlies much thinking about the sexes, and much of the interaction between

them. Moreover, we assume that these processes are largely silent, so that we typically respond in a relatively programmed manner, except on occasions when our assumptions about the sexes are made problematic. When they are thrown into relief, we find it necessary to renegotiate our images, at least momentarily.

CHAPTER 2

THE NATURAL SOCIAL ORDER

The fundamental premise of the research reported here is this: that claims of discrimination against women, as against coloured peoples and other minority groups, are basically in error. What appears to be discriminatory behaviour follows from the assumption that "they" are psychologically not "us". The problem becomes one, not of "why do whites withhold benefits from Negroes, which they accord other whites," or "why do men not give women the opportunity to achieve that they demand for themselves"; but rather, "why are they felt or conceived to be existentially different from us".

According to this logic, it is not a question of whether men and women are "equal" in any formal sense. Men and women may be assumed to be grossly different beings, but they are "equal" when each is accorded the rights that are peculiarly their respective lots. Injustice exists when either's legitimate claims as a man or as a woman are not honoured.

We do not subscribe to the view that there is a necessary natural social order, a point that bears repetition. Most people believe they are reasonable; at least, few would describe as unreasonable behaviour in which they persevere. This means that we need to look at each person's world using his particular ideas if we wish to comprehend the logic inherent in his actions. Each person's ideas and logic together constitute his natural social order, "natural" in the limited sense that it is reasonable and acceptable to him.

Given this kind of psycho-logic, a Negro who aspires to a position of prestige where he supervises whites in subordinate positions is not wronged when he is "discriminated" against. His aspirations contradict the natural social order. Similarly, a woman who aspires to lofty success in the business or academic world is not wronged when she is discouraged or denied the opportunity of advancement. Her rights are relative to her role, and her role is defined by her legitimate functions in the natural social order. Furthermore, reasoning in a circular fashion, we know what her legitimate functions are in life from the evidence of her peculiar temperament and psychology.

From the point of view of social change, this line of reasoning suggests that what is required is a redefinition of the images of the sexes. The image of women projected by the media, as in the soap commercials, is of people so immature that they can scarcely be trusted with the rearing of anyone's children, including their own. Again race relations provides a useful parallel. Negroes want to be recast in the mass media, so that they may be seen in a variety of occupational and other roles. It is assumed that we will change our conceptions of who they are when we no longer see them occupying subservient, frivolous roles. In these roles, they are given no opportunity to express the usual range of ambitions, failings and feelings experienced by whites. Until they have this opportunity, our images of Negroes will not be fully invested with their humanity. When we begin to see Negroes as psychologically like us, then we may be moved by claims of injustice.

Applying the same logic to the plight of women in our society, the argument takes the following form. When men can understand the latent capacities of women, and can appreciate the silent frustrations and sufferings of many women, then they, too, will be able to empathize with their usual lot in life. At that time, they may accept the view that women share the same psychology as men, and should be accorded rights consistent with that psychology. Of course, not only men adhere to a traditional conception of women and their psychology. Many women do, too. As with Negroes, if there is to be a redefinition of the female role, the change must take place in the thinking of both men and women.

We should not regard the natural social order as static or immutable, although it is highly resistant to change at the levels of the society and of the individual. Traditional assumptions about the proper role of Negroes are under continuous attack, so that some sectors of the community where these ideas lag are referred to as "prejudiced". By this standard, race relations are some generations in advance of sex relations. In the author's opinion, we have yet to reach the point where people who believe the only proper place for women is in the home, engaged in child-rearing, are labelled as prejudiced. The natural social order supporting such a view is still strongly supported by powerful traditional institutions, notably the church, school and state.

The historical transition from "traditional" to so-called "modern" society has been marked by a shift in the criteria for assigning people to roles in society. The dominant natural social order once placed greater importance on *ascription* as the basis for role assignment. This meant that one's position in life was largely based on who one was, into what class or group one was born, and the fortune of one's social inheritance. This may have made sense in societies which were not experiencing great population growth and in which the rate of technological change was much slower.

Ascription is today under attack. It is losing much of its moral authority, although the rate of change is uneven. Negroes are demanding that *achievement*, not ascription, be the grounds for advancement. This does not mean that members of minority groups will no longer perform menial tasks. It means, though, that people's social functions will be tied to their abilities and motivation. They will not be judged *a priori* on the basis of group membership, but on the basis of accomplishment.

Various authors (Friedan, 1963) have described the traditional definition of the female role as other-oriented, and the modern definition as self-oriented. The distinction is again in terms of ascription vs. achievement as the criterion for woman's self-definition. To say that a woman's role is other-oriented is to say that her identity is fixed relative to something else, her husband, for instance. Sociologists acknowledge this traditional definition when they determine a woman's social class according to her husband's occupation (Johnson, 1960). To say that a woman's role is self-oriented is, conversely, to say that her identity is defined by her own attainments.

There is much popular misunderstanding of the implications of such a shift in the definition of women, especially for the institutions of marriage, the family and the economy. It does not mean that women stop marrying, bearing children, and loving. It does mean that women seek to determine their own identities in a more generous opportunity structure. Many women will continue to opt for traditional avenues of fulfilment, but on the basis of choice rather than ascription.

Having introduced the notion of a natural social order, we should acknowledge that there are variations in the strength of its central premises. It is probably the case that few, if any, participants in our culture, are free from traditional

ways of thinking about race and about sex. Some may be more "enlightened" than others, but most of us bear the psychological effects of prejudice-rejected, if not prejudice-accepted. Whether we accept or reject the view inherent in the dominant natural social order, the myths are nevertheless a part of our psychological make-up.

Nor is it our view that the dominant natural social order is monolithic and uniform. It is not uniformly accepted throughout the social structure. We wish to know about the distribution of the traditional myths concerning the sexes at different points in society. It is the purpose of the present study to identify some of the structural conditions which generate variant conceptions of the prevailing natural social order.

A Cultural View of Prejudice. A central premise entertained here is that pervasive beliefs are primarily a property of a cultural system and only derivatively of a personality system. In holding a belief, individuals participate in a culture as culture-bearers. A prejudice is a belief in a culture under attack.

This assumption is consistent with the usual finding that prejudiced thinking and discriminatory behaviour are more likely found in the uneducated, less prosperous, lower-class members of society (Pettigrew, 1965). These people are less susceptible to the currents of cultural change that sweep through a social system. The better-educated cosmopolitans on the forward fringe of the social system are most susceptible to and most likely to participate in cultural changes.

We are supposing that there is a mythology associated with the feminine role. It is a set of beliefs, a "partial ideology", which specifies the content of the role, provides a rationale that legitimizes the existing state of affairs in terms of supposed characteristics of females, and ties the role into dominant societal values. Friedan (1963) has called this mythology the feminine mystique.

We will do two things in the remainder of this chapter. First, we will describe Kammeyer's studies of traditional and modern sex-role conceptions. Second, we will describe the major dependent variable investigated in the present report.

The Feminine Role. Kammeyer (1964, 1966, 1967) has reported a series of studies examining what he calls the traditional versus the modern conceptions of the feminine role. He posits two dimensions describing women: (1) feminine role behaviour, and (2) female personality traits. Typical statements designed to tap the first are: "In marriage, the husband should make the major decisions;" "English is a better major for a college girl than economics." Agreement with these items is scored in the traditional direction. They measure an evaluative component of people's attitudes to women, that is, what people judge to be correct behaviour.

Some items in the female personality traits scale are: "Women are more emotional than men;" "Men are more inclined toward intellectualism than women." Agreement with these statements is also scored in the traditional direction. They measure the belief component of peoples' attitudes to the female role, that is, what people believe to be descriptive or factual about women.

Kammeyer was interested in two dependent variables: (1) traditionalism, and (2) consistency on the two dimensions. Two of the explanatory variables he considered were (1) birth order, and (2) amount of interaction with others.

First, he found a rather striking relationship between birth order and traditionalism. Girls who were first-born tended to be more traditional than girls who were later-born on both dimensions of the feminine role. He also found that first-born girls were more likely to prefer marriage to graduation from college, to describe themselves as religious, and to agree with their parents concerning the feminine role. These findings prompted Kammeyer to describe eldest-born daughters as the "conservators of the culture". They tend to be bound closer to the values of the older generation, as exemplified in their parents. Conversely, it appears that potential for cultural change resides in the later-born daughters; their parents have apparently been less successful in transmitting parental values to them.

Second, Kammeyer investigated the relationship between a girl's relations with her friends and the consistency of her attitudes on the two dimensions of the feminine role. Over all, 67 per cent of the girls scored consistently, i.e., traditional on both dimensions, or modern on both. There was a marked tendency for girls who had many friends to be more consistent than for girls who were more isolated.

Similarly, girls who dated a great deal were significantly more consistent than were girls who dated very little or not at all. There was relationship between a measure of interaction with parents and consistency among girls who had few friends, although there was no evidence of an over-all relationship. Kammeyer concluded that simply interacting with others had the effect of producing consistent attitudes to the feminine role whether modern or traditional. It seems easier for internal or psychological inconsistencies to survive in an interpersonal vacuum.

The Dependent Variable. The purpose of this study is to throw some light on children's images of the male and female roles. We are not interested in the extent to which boys and girls are themselves differentiated psychologically. Our focus is on their beliefs about the psychological distinctiveness of the two sexes, the extent to which characteristics are sex-linked in their thinking. We have labelled our principal dependent variable sex-role differentiation (SRD).

We have postulated four dimensions of SRD, on the assumption that it is not a simple concept. Differentiation of children's thinking on one dimension does not necessarily imply differentiation on the other dimensions, although we do expect them to be positively correlated to some degree. The four dimensions are: SRD-Traits, SRD-Behaviour, SRD-Jobs, and SRD-Relations. SRD-Relations is further divided into SRD-Peer Relations and SRD-Authority Relations.

1. SRD-Traits. Children may think in more-or-less differentiated ways about the basic personality characteristics of the sexes. By personality characteristics we refer here to behaviour tendencies or characteristic ways people have of responding to the world. We asked our subjects about the following personality tendencies: tough, hardworking, sneaky, generous, noisy, outgoing and friendly, awkward and clumsy, trustworthy, obedient, mischievous, careful, and bossy. Children indicated the degree to which boys and girls their age could be described as possessing these attributes, and from their answers we constructed an index of differentiation.

If a subject described one of the sexes preponderantly in one way and the other sex in another way, we inferred that he thought of the sexes as psychologically distinct. At the other extreme were subjects who believed that boys and girls possessed the attributes to the same degree.

2. <u>SRD-Behaviour.</u> Some children may believe that the sexes are quite similar in terms of personality dispositions, but they may simultaneously feel that certain ways of conducting themselves are differentially suitable. Subjects were asked how appropriate each of the following actions were for boys and girls their age: cry when hurt, do dishes, play rough sports, dance, play softball, go out alone after dark, swear, learn to cook and bake, show off, make their own beds, go on dates, go on a long trip alone.

Although the assumption is made that SRD-Traits and SRD-Behaviour are conceptually distinct, we certainly expect them to be associated empirically to some degree. The correlation between these two measures will itself be treated as a dependent variable, so that we can ask what determines its magnitude. For example, a case can be made for the prediction that the correlation between these two forms of SRD will be higher among working-class children than among middle-class children. The same question was asked taking all four dimensions simultaneously.

3. <u>SRD-Jobs.</u> The second dimension is defined by specific actions, while the third one is defined by "packages" of activities, called roles. Children were asked about the appropriateness of boys and girls, when they are grown up, occupying certain roles in society. The roles defining the dimension were: medical doctor, cashier in a restaurant, bus driver, librarian, grade-school teacher, cook, clerk in a store, scientist, Prime Minister of Canada, usher in a movie theatre, principal of a school, judge. The index which was derived from their responses measured the degree of sex-typing of occupations.

4. <u>SRD-Relations.</u> The third dimension specified whether a male or female may properly occupy other roles in society. The fourth dimension embraces the relations prevailing between boys and girls, on one hand, and peers and authority, especially parents, on the other. In fact we have subdivided SRD-Relations into two component dimensions which we designate SRD-Peer Relations and SRD-Authority Relations. The first indicates how much boys and girls relate differently to children their own age. The second subdimension specifies grown-ups or people in authority, rather than peers.

SRD-Relations has been stated according to actual behaviour. Another way of defining this dimension would be in terms of appropriate ways of relating to others. Pretesting indicated almost no differentiation of the sexes at all in this regard. Subjects felt that boys and girls had the same

privileges and duties to others regardless of their sex. So there was no variation to explain. But variation was found in abundance when subjects were requested to describe the actual behaviour of the sexes to others. This way of defining the dimension provided us with variation to explain.

SRD-Traits most closely resemble Kammeyer's female personality traits dimension, while the other three seem to resemble his single feminine role behaviour dimension. Our four dimensions have been conceived largely in terms of a psychological space working from the self out into the social system. We believe that we move in the direction of a more relational definition of the sexes as we progress from SRD-Traits to SRD-Relations. We can imagine respondents who feel that the sexes are quite distinct in the strictly relational or social sense, but are identical at the psychological level. This pattern may be more common than the reverse, in which males and females are perceived as psychologically distinct, but similar socially.

A Word about Method. A method of study is a way of knowing. Knowledge is relative to the method of study. We must, therefore, acknowledge the relative nature of the information afforded by our techniques of data collection and analysis. We will single out some of the major features of the methodology here, but the reader is urged to consider the matter more fully in Appendix A.

Approximately 7,500 children were studied by questionnaire, a third of them French-speaking from the Province of Quebec, a third English-speaking from Ontario, and a third English-speaking from British Columbia and Nova Scotia. The ages of the children varied between 10 and 16, with the Quebec sample being older on the average. The mothers of two-thirds of the children also completed a questionnaire.

Each aspect of SRD was measured by a number of items whose applicability to each of the sexes was indicated by respondents. The various independent or explanatory factors were assessed by a series of questions which generally permitted simply "yes-no" or multiple-choice type answers. All questions were pretested at some length before being used in the study itself.

The children's questionnaires, in shortened form, appear as Appendix B; and the mothers' questionnaire, also in shortened form, appears as Appendix C.

Children were studied only if their school boards, principals, teachers and parents consented. This meant that some bias was unavoidably introduced to the extent that the characteristics of excluded children differed in unknown ways from the characteristics of included children; and to the extent that these differences might affect the direction and strength of the relationships that emerged. The problem of bias is treated more fully in Appendix A.

Data analysis was conducted in the following way. First, hypotheses or hunches were explored by cross-tabulating a measure of SRD against appropriate explanatory measures. For instance, we looked at the percentage of children thinking in differentiated terms at each of the age levels.

Second, we explored interesting relationships independently of other factors that might explain them. In the previous example, we measured the relationship between child's age, an explanatory variable, and SRD, the behaviour which we wished to explain, for the females and males separately. Sex was a "test variable" (Rosenberg, 1967). That is, we tested for sex to determine whether this factor accounted for differences in SRD which might otherwise be attributed merely to age.

The results of the study will be presented in the following two chapters. The first of the chapters details characteristics of SRD itself and of relationships among its several indicators. Here, too, are reported differences between the sexes in typing, as well as relationships to parental verbal behaviour. The second chapter explores in some detail relationships between SRD and structural characteristics of the children's families.

CHAPTER 3

SOME PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

This is the first of two chapters summarizing the principal findings of the study. We will report three kinds of results in this chapter: first, some differences in the ways boys and girls think about the sexes; second, the correlations between the several measures of sex-role differentiation; and third, some characteristics of the respondents' parents. The data are summarized in tabular form in Appendix D in order to make their exposition in this chapter easier to follow.

Chapter 4 breaks into two major parts. In the first, we will consider what we judge to be the major findings of the study, in which some features of the two bedrock groups in which children are caught, their family and their circle of friends, are related to SRD. We will analyse the degree of structural differentiation of family and peer group, and the participation of children in the distribution of family power, as it affects SRD. The second set of findings probes several aspects of pre-adolescent and adolescent behaviour, in particular children's attitudes toward school, grades, and dating behaviour.

A Word of Caution. We have not conducted the study to provide conclusive answers to the many questions that have directed our curiosity. We have sought data to accomplish two things: first, to stimulate and enrich our thinking; and second to discipline our imagination. As patterns in the data emerge, new ideas and new ways of looking at the data are suggested. At the same time, what the data "tell us" makes modest our enthusiasms and sets bounds on our speculation.

It is good that our thinking be disciplined; but it is good, too, that we do not anticipate greater certainty than the data can afford. There are limitations in the data: in the nonrepresentativeness of the sample, in subtle biases built into the scales, in non-independence of measures, and so on. We warn of the dangers in generalizing beyond the sample of children studied. We are warned that the study deals with correlations and that the responses defining the terms of the correlations generally originate in the same informants. The first caution means that causal relations should not be assumed where only correlations are reported, although some correlations can sustain this kind of inference

better than others. The second caution means that some part of the correlations are built in by virtue of having used the same respondents as sources of data for both the predictive and the predicted terms of the relationships.

We will report data that satisfy two criteria. First, the statistical differences must be "substantial"; that is, we will be impressed with differences that are large absolutely and not just directional. Second, the findings will be substantively significant. They will suggest meaning in their pattern. They should be differences that really make a difference. This means that we have not at present included analyses that were relatively barren of theoretical significance.

Sex Differences in Thinking about Sex. Perhaps the most obvious question to put to the data is whether sex makes a difference in sex-typing[1]. The relevant data are summarized in Tables D-1 to D-4 for SRD-Behaviour, SRD-Jobs, SRD-Authority Relations [2], and SRD-Feminine Role.

---

[1] Our index of SRD or sex-typing was constructed in the following way. Consider, for example, the adjective "tough", the first item in the SRD-Trait scale (see Appendix B, Booklet #1). The respondent was asked to circle a number on the seven-point scale corresponding to the degree to which he believed boys his age were "tough". The same kind of assessment was made of girls his age. If the same number were circled on both scales, the numerical difference between the two scores is zero, meaning little differentiation of the sexes, at least on the characteristic in question. A subject who circled "7" on one scale and "1" on the other scale would be said to think in a very differentiated way about the sexes. The "difference score" in this instance would be six. Still a third subject might circle "6" and "3" on the two scales, in his case yielding a difference score of three, and so locating him between the first two respondents. Summing the difference scores for all 12 items for a given subject gave a measure of the degree to which he differentiated the sexes in his thinking. All except the SRD-Feminine Role scale were constructed in this fashion. Scores for SRD-Feminine Role were obtained by assigning the weights of "1" through "5" to a child's response to each of items 57 through 64 (Appendix B, Booklet #1), and summing over all. A subject who obtained a high score on a scale was said to have "scored high on SRD", i.e. indicative of a tendency to segregate the sexes psychologically and socially.

[2] SRD-Authority Relations and SRD-Peer Relations were measured by items 128 to 137 and 138 to 147, respectively, in Booklet #2 (Appendix B).

It is clear, in Table D-1, that boys in every age and language group were markedly more differentiated in their thinking about the sexes, defined by appropriate behaviour, than were girls. The minimum spread between boys and girls occurred in the French-speaking 12-to-14 age group where it was 8.8 percentage points. In general, the difference was much larger, approaching 20 points among the youngest English-Canadian and the oldest French-Canadian children.

The same kind of finding for SRD-Jobs emerges in Table D-2. While the differences between boys and girls were consistent and pronounced, this was especially so in the French-speaking sample. The spread approached 20 points for both age groups among the Quebec respondents, about double that of the others.

The differences between the sexes were even greater on the SRD-Feminine Role measure. Over all, approximately 43 per cent of the boys indicated a traditional conception of the female role, compared to 20 per cent of the girls. The magnitude of this finding was evident at all age groups in both language samples. It is interesting to observe that this scale, which used a different response mode and method of construction, yielded essentially the same finding as SRD-Behaviour and SRD-Jobs, perhaps even more so.

All three of the above measures are in agreement: boys were more disposed to discriminate between the sexes. Table D-4 indicates that the sexes differed on SRD-Authority Relations, but in the opposite direction. That is, there is evidence that girls defined the sexes differentially in their relations to authority more so than did boys. Although the differences were not so large as those already described, they were nevertheless marked.

Over all, nearly 34 per cent of the girls thought in very differentiated terms about the sexes in their relations to authority. Twenty-four per cent of the boys did so, too.

The differences in SRD-Traits and SRD-Peer Relations were negligible. We conclude, however, that the sexes did differ in their tendencies to segregate the sexes psychologically. The multi-dimensional nature of SRD is underscored by the finding that boys were more differentiated on three of the dimensions, while girls were more so on a fourth.

It should be remarked that all of the findings were substantially present for both linguistic groups, and at all ages. There was no evidence of a simple developmental trend.

There was, first, a modest but consistent reduction in the four SRD measures from 9-11 to 12-14 in the English-language sample. Second, going from 12-14 to 15+, there was a consistent though small increase for girls in both language groups on SRD-Traits, SRD-Feminine Role, and SRD-Authority Relations. Third, there was a very strong increase on the same SRD measures for boys of both groups between 12-14 and 15+.

Finally, we note the absence of any significant differentiation of the sexes when they are defined at the strictly individual, dispositional level. It was when they were defined relationally that differentiation emerged. The lack of variation in SRD-Traits warrants further discussion later.

The Multi-Dimensional Nature of SRD. We have defined SRD in terms of conceptually independent dimensions. This assumption can be "tested" empirically through a correlational analysis. The data are summarized for the children in Table D-5 and for the parents in Table D-6, although different scales were used for these two samples.

Except for SRD-Authority Relations and SRD-Peer Relations the largest correlation is between SRD-Behaviour and SRD-Jobs. Clearly, the former two scales are highly related as they have in common approximately 36 per cent of their variance. The other correlations average around .25 or six per cent common variance. The figure of .25 represents not only true covariance, but also some amount due to common measurement artifact. Thus, the major portion of the correlation between SRD-Authority Relations and SRD-Peer Relations is probably genuine. But whatever the source of the covariance between the remaining scales, their correlations are not impressively large in any absolute sense. We note, too, that the correlations between SRD-Traits, SRD-Behaviour, SRD-Jobs and SRD-Authority Relations or SRD-Peer Relations do not substantially exceed the correlations of each with SRD-Feminine Role which was differently constructed, although they are all in the "right" direction.

Correlation matrices were computed for each level of each linguistic group, age, residence (rural versus urban), and socio-economic status. The magnitude and pattern of correlations did not depart in any noticeable way from Table D-5. This suggests considerable constancy in the empirical structure of our SRD construct.

Although fewer and different scales were used in measuring parents' traditionalism and orientation to the sex roles,

the correlations were somewhat higher than for the children. Of course, this may be partially attributable to a measurement artifact in the parents' instruments, such as an acquiescence response set. Or it may simply be indicative of greater consistency in the orientations of adults to social institutions, including the institution of sex.

Something About the Parents. Table D-7 indicates a clear relationship between language and the measures of Traditionalism, Personality Relief, and Role Preference (designated as T, P, and R, respectively). For example, 43.2 per cent of the Quebec parents scored at the traditional end of the R scale, compared to 22.9 per cent of the English-Canadian parents. Future analyses will test a number of possible explanations for this apparent difference to determine whether the effect attributed to language background is genuine. Preliminary inspection of the data suggests that it may be due to a higher average level of education in the English-speaking sample.

There is an intriguing contrast to be drawn between the language groups at the children's and the parents' levels. We have just observed that the French-Canadian parents appeared to be more traditional on all three measures considered. Tables D-1 to D-4 permit comparisons of the French-and-English-speaking children within each of the two age categories. In virtually every instance there was a sizable percentage spread, although SRD-Authority Relations was opposite to SRD-Behaviour, SRD-Jobs, and SRD-Feminine Role. English-speaking children were consistently more dichotomous in their thinking than children of like age in the province of Quebec. In other words, French-Canadian parents and children bore the opposite relation to their English-Canadian counterparts, the parents being more traditional and the children less so.

Tables D-8 to D-10 reveal a significant association between respondents' education and T, P, and R. Parents who have gone no further than elementary school tend to score at the traditional end of the R scale, compared to those who have attended university. The differences were striking: 45.1 per cent and 12.7 per cent respectively.

Marital status, and, associated with it, age, were also strongly related to position on the three scales. For example, 39.7 per cent of those who had been married 25 years or more were very traditional on the T scale. Only 19.5 per cent of parents who had been married less than 10 years scored similarly. In other words, respondents who have been married a long time show a stronger attachment to the major institutions in society.

Related to this finding was the greater traditionalism of those who have been married once, compared to others who have married a second time. Traditional subjects, as measured by T, accounted for 29.4 per cent and 20.1 per cent of these two groups. Respondents who reported that family possessions were registered in the husband's name tended to be the most traditional on all three scales, while registering things in the wife's name or in both names tended to be associated with modernism. The findings relating to ownership, however, were suggestive rather than definitive.

Socio-economic status (SES) was significantly related to respondents' scores on T, P, and R. Social class was assigned by coding husbands' occupations according to Blishen's recently constructed scale for Canada (1967). These data are presented in Tables D-11 to D-13. Thirty-nine per cent of the working-class subjects (Blishen's level VI) had traditional sex-role preferences, compared to only 12.9 per cent of the upper class (level I). The least pronounced difference occurred on the measure of personality beliefs, although it was clearly in the direction of greater traditionalism in the working class.

Subjects were also asked to assign themselves to one of the social classes. Relative to the effects of "objective" social class, already described, the effects of "subjective" social class washed out. That is, the relationship disappeared when subjects assigned themselves to a social class, instead of being assigned on the basis of objective criteria such as education, income, and occupational status.

T, P, and R were run against rural versus urban place of residence. There was no hint of any relationship here. Nor was there any indication of an interaction between place of residence and language status. It would appear that the rural population is urban in this respect, in spite of their place of residence. The mass media and centralized schooling have presumably urbanized even the nominally rural, so that there is no sign that people outside the cities cling to traditional conceptions of the sexes.

One of the difficulties with data collected from a single source is the danger of artifactually high relationships. We will consider next a package of data relating parental characteristics to children's sex-role imagery.

<u>Characteristics of Respondents' Mothers and SRD.</u> There was no evidence of any relationship between socio-economic status and SRD, neither over all nor in breakdowns of the

sample by language, sex, or age. This non-finding is in marked contrast to the pronounced inverse relationship in the parents' sample. SRD-Feminine Role, which was constructed like T, P, and R, also failed to produce any findings, suggesting that the absence of a relationship is quite general and not restricted to indices based on difference scores. Perhaps any relationship between such a broad background variable and SRD is somewhat diminished, so that we should look at more immediate intervening events, such as parental role enactment or role differentiation. This we will do.

Neither the mother's nor the father's education seems to have had any direct impact on SRD.

Of the three maternal variables, T, P, and R, only R bore any relationship to SRD. A few relationships did appear when T and P were considered, but these were so spotty that it is probably more realistic to view them as chance. Role Preference, however, did appear to be related to SRD, although only to SRD-Feminine Role. In other words, mothers who subscribed to a traditional conception of the female role were more likely to have children who held similar preferences.

When we consider the correlations between T, P, and R on the one side, and the six SRD measures on the other, the general absence of any relationship is quite apparent. The correlation matrix appears as Table D-14. The largest correlation in it was between R and SRD-Feminine Role, but a mere value of .16 or less than three per cent of the variance. Nor was there evidence of significant relationships when the sample was broken down by sex, age, language, rural-urban residence, or social class. The only hint of a relationship was a modest increase in the size of the correlation between R and SRD-Feminine Role as a function of age, but again we are dealing with what is at best a marginal relationship.

The findings of the present chapter may be summarized as follows. First, boys tended, regardless of age, to sex-type more than did girls, except where SRD-Authority Relations was concerned. Second, there was no simple developmental tendency, although the youngest and the oldest age groups differentiated the sexes more than the intermediate 12-14 age group. Third, the assumption of the multi-dimensional nature of SRD was borne out by generally low correlations between its various indicators. Fourth, there was a greater tendency to perceive the sexes as different relationally rather than psychologically, a point to which we will return later. Fifth, French-speaking respondents were more modern than English-speaking respondents, but this relationship was reversed for the

parents. The latter may be due to higher level of education in the English-Canadian sample, and may be partially explained by historical events in the province of Quebec before and after 1960. Sixth, there were very pronounced inverse relationships between education and "objective" socio-economic status, on the one hand, and measures of parental Traditionalism, Personality Belief, and Role Preference, on the other. Seventh, there was no clear indication that mothers' scores on T, P, and R had any effect on their children's SRD scores.

We regard some of the apparent non-findings as interesting in themselves. As in the case of the relationships for which there were some warrant, more refined analyses require doing in order to tease out their meaning.

CHAPTER 4

THE GENESIS OF IMAGERY

We will present two clusters of findings in this chapter. The first cluster implicates group life in the genesis of sex-role imagery. The family and the peer group are perhaps the two most potent groups in which man ever participates. In the family, children learn how to relate to people in positions of authority. In their relationships with parents children first come in contact with legitimate authority and with the necessity of deferring to others' wishes. It is also the context in which we first sense rebellious impulses against important, loved figures on whom we are greatly dependent. It is a micro-society within which we first learn about the division of labour. We believe that children learn very important lessons about the nature of social structure from their relations to their parents. They form images which they transfer to the larger world, often discovering in their relations with others their relations with those first important figures of authority.

The peer group occupies a central place, too, because it is in this setting that they learn how to relate to others who are nominally their equals. They learn both to share and to compete. From these experiences with brothers, sisters, and age-mates outside the family, they derive some very important lessons. These lessons, too, they apply to their relations with work-mates, spouses, friends, and others of similar status throughout life.

We may suppose, too, that people have difficulties in adult relationships to the extent that they have been deprived of the vital experiences which generally are found only in the family and the peer group. The child deprived of one or both parents, deprived in a psychological sense, is deprived also of fundamental experiences with society. The child who is a social isolate, lacking brothers or sisters or the companionship of friends is likewise robbed of significant opportunity to learn to relate in a reasonably full and adequate way to people of similar position in life (Brim, 1960; Guntrip, 1961).

Because of the significance we attribute to the family and to the peer group, we seek in them clues for the origins of the psychological ghosts that man takes to be the sexes.

The second cluster of findings is best thought of as correlates and consequences of SRD rather than as determinants.

We will consider the following behaviour: dating, attitudes toward school, grades, and obedience to parents. Certain of these behaviours are correlated with SRD in such a way as to confirm children in their ways of thinking about the sexes, if not to determine these patterns of thought.

For example, a girl who believes that higher education and a vocation outside her home are not rightfully hers, is less likely to expend herself in her studies than is a girl who thinks otherwise. Poor grades and low motivation have the effect of closing avenues of opportunity which might have remained open had she seen more varied outcomes as legitimate. She is thereby confirmed in her role and in her current way of thinking. With marriage and the birth of children, most women pass the point of any practical return, either in their thinking or in their vocation. We will discuss more fully the self-justifying nature of thought in the next chapter.

Social Differentiation and Imagery. We will report evidence bearing on the relations between SRD and three kinds of social differentiation. First, we consider some ways in which parents themselves may be differentiated in their activities. We believe that their division of labour influences the thinking of their children. We are not concerned at this point with the problem of role modelling and identification of the children with one parent or the other. Regardless of whom a child models himself after, we are trying to discover how sex becomes an axis of meaning in his orientation to the world. The same perspective governs our analyses of the other forms of social differentiation.

Second, we will present some findings on the significance of power in the family and SRD. Parents do not covet for themselves the exclusive right to formulate family policy. They share their jurisdiction with their children subject to various constraints and incentives. They have some idea of the relationship between the growth of maturity and the exercise of responsibility, according to which they apportion legitimate influence to their children. They give their sons some measure of power commensurate with what they believe is needed, with what can be borne at the moment, and with what they believe is required if their sons are to grow to be the kind of men they desire. The same logic prevails for girls, but the outcome may be substantially different.

Third, some evidence suggestive of relations between experiences in friendship groups and SRD will be discussed. We will look at the degree of structure in children's interaction

with the sexes. Three kinds of situations may roughly be distinguished. At one extreme is the situation in which both sexes are present, but in which the sexes of the participants are irrelevant. In the second situation, members of the other sex are simply excluded. In the third, both sexes are present, but their interaction is carefully regulated. The structure of the situation is not indifferent to their joint presence. We believe that it is in these two latter kinds of situations that SRD is promoted. The mechanics of the two processes will be explored in the following chapter.

Parental Role Differentiation. Children were asked to describe their parents on a number of rating scales. Two types of indices were extracted. The first of these is a measure of semantic differentiation (Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum, 1957). Children were asked to describe their parents using 10 bipolar scales. The concepts "my father" and "my mother" and the scales for measuring them appear in Appendix B, Booklet #1, items 77 and 81. The method of constructing the index is the same as that used for the SRD indices. It is possible that some of the relationships obtained are a function of the method of measurement itself because of the same kind of response required of the subjects. Future analyses will involve factor analysis of the descriptions of the parents, thus yielding a full-fledged semantic differential treatment of the data. For the present, however, we will simply report on whether there is any relationship between semantic differentiation of the parents and SRD.

The second type of measurement was intended to get at the structural differentiation of the parents. We initially posited three ways in which parents might become role differentiated. These are: discipline (parents relative to children), power (husband and wife relative to each other), and support (parents relative to children). These are presumed to be dimensions of the family structure, and we hypothesized that the more sharply parents' role were determined according to sex, the greater would be children's SRD. In other words, we are rooting SRD in the very structure of the family. If sex is a basis of differentiation of each person's duties and rights within the family, then we suppose children's attitudes toward the sexes will reflect this fact. And if sex is unimportant as a basis of role assignment in the family, then children will think in "modern" or non-differentiated ways. Thus, we make the assumption that mind is a derivative of social structure, in this case, family structure. We make the further assumption that children extrapolate from these experiences to the world in general. Hence the family, the earliest socializing structure, is the child's primary source of images.

The effects of semantic differentiation, in light of our methodological caveats, are rather modest, although such effects as appear are primarily in the area of relations to others, i.e., SRD-Authority Relations and SRD-Peer Relations. For the most part, however, there appears to be little relation between semantic differentiation and the other SRD indices. The major differences that did emerge are reported in Table D-15.

Parental discipline was defined by 10 items such as "scolds and punishes the children when they don't behave" (Appendix B, Booklet #2, items 18 through 27). This index measures the degree to which the parents' disciplinary authority is perceived by their children to be specialized. We found strong relationships for all the SRD measures except those involving SRD-Authority Relations and SRD-Peer Relations which far exceeded the common level of all the others. The data for these two indices are reported in Table D-16. There we observe that 39 per cent of subjects who perceived their parents' disciplinary behaviour to be differentiated tended also to think of the sexes in a highly differentiated way, so far as authority relationships are concerned. This compares with just over 21 per cent of the subjects who perceived little difference between their parents in their disciplinary behaviour. The relationship was equally strong for SRD-Peer Relations, where nearly 40 per cent of respondents who perceived their parents as highly differentiated tended also to segregate the sexes on this SRD index. Approximately 22 per cent of the "low" group thought in high SRD terms, i.e., in differentiated ways.

The second structural characteristic is specialization in the area of socio-emotional activities. These were captured by items such as "enjoys and takes time to talk with the children". The seven items of this kind appear in Appendix B, Booklet #2, items 28 through 34. Again, all the SRD measures were consistently and systematically related to what we have designated theoretically as the independent variable. Even SRD-Feminine Rôle was related, so that the more differentiated parents were perceived to be in their socio-emotional activity, the more respondents thought of the sexes as socio-psychologically distinct. However, the pattern in the case of SRD-Feminine Role, while present, was not especially strong. The distributions for SRD-Traits and SRD-Jobs were quite significant, but those for SRD-Authority Relations and SRD-Peer Relations were very pronounced, as in the case of the discipline variable. The data relating socio-emotional specialization and SRD-Authority Relations and SRD-Peer Relations are summarized in Table D-17. SRD-Traits and SRD-Jobs are summarized in Table D-18.

The third and last measure of parental role specialization we will consider is that of parental power. In the first structural determinant, we were looking at the distribution of power viewed vertically, that is, from child to parent, from subordinate to superior. Now, we look at the distribution of power between the parents as husband and wife, rather than as father and mother. The data reporting on this third variable are presented in Table D-19.

In all cases, there is a noticeable relationship between differentiation of Power and SRD, although in the case of SRD-Feminine Role it is not so strong as it is for all the other measures. We note, for example, that 41.4 per cent of respondents who saw one parent as having considerably more power than the other tended also to assign different personality attributes to the sexes. This compares with 28.8 per cent of respondents who reported very little differences in power between their parents.

SRD-Authority Relations and SRD-Peer Relations again show the effects most clearly. In each case, approximately 39 per cent of subjects who thought one parent had much more power than the other also believed that the sexes are quite distinct, as defined in their relations to others. The spread, in each instance, was about 17 percentage points more than among subjects who perceived little differentiation of power.

Child-Power. We have presented some evidence for a relationship between family structure and SRD. Another aspect of family structure is the amount of power or influence that a young respondent wields in his family. We will now consider some data bearing on a possible relationship between the amount of power a respondent believes he exercises, and his thinking about the sexes.

A word of caution, first. Subjects were asked to indicate how much "say" they had with respect to 15 different activities, such as what time to go to bed (Appendix B, Booklet #2, item 44). It should be borne in mind that this is their report, and this may or may not correspond to "reality". If there is any relationship between this variable and the nominally dependent variable of SRD, the relationship could well go in the opposite direction or, more likely, be circular. A circular relationship is one in which effects feed back on their own causes to augment or diminish their presence. It is a process of mutual escalation. Finally, any relationship with SRD-Authority Relations is most economically interpreted as instrument error because a number of the items tapping SRD-Authority Relations

also tap the power dimension (e.g., "do what their parents say").

First, there is no clear and consistent evidence over all of a relationship between subject's power and SRD. Second, in the data for the sexes taken separately, there is some suggestion of a direct relationship between power and SRD for boys and no relationship for girls. Third, we specified these relations even further, within each language and age group.

Consider English-speaking boys, age 9 to 11. These data are reported in Table D-20. There were marked positive relationships within this group between the power or "say" which boys claimed, and SRD-Traits and SRD-Peer Relations. Furthermore, the direction of the differences relating power and SRD-Behaviour, SRD-Jobs, SRD-Authority Relations and SRD-Feminine Role were consistent, though certainly not large. There is some indication, then, that high child-power and the tendency to sex-type go together, at least among boys in this language and age group. Lacking a French-speaking male sample in the same age range, we could not assess the generality of this relationship.

There was a similar tendency for English-speaking boys in the 12-14 age bracket. Again, the results were interesting but scarcely spectacular. They were quite pronounced for SRD-Peer Relations and SRD-Authority Relations, and "in the direction" for SRD-Behaviour, SRD-Jobs, and SRD-Feminine Role. The data for SRD-Peer Relations are reported in Table D-21. The data at the intermediate age group confirm the findings at the younger age level.

English boys, 15 and over, provided some evidence for the same relationship as the younger boys. This was most apparent for SRD-Peer Relations, and to a lesser extent for SRD-Behaviour and SRD-Authority Relations. Only for SRD-Behaviour was there any suggestion of such a trend in the French-speaking sample, and this only in the older of the two age categories. The relevant data appear in Table D-21.

Among English-speaking girls, age 9-11, there was no consistency in the distributions of SRD as functions of child-power. All six SRD measures showed some systematic relationship to our concept of power, however, among the girls in the middle age category. In four of them, in fact, the distributions were quite healthy, although one of them is SRD-Authority Relations. The other three sets of data appear in Table D-22.

Four of the six SRD measures yielded similar distributions among French-Canadian girls, age 12-14. Only the distributions of SRD-Behaviour and SRD-Authority Relations were especially pronounced, and the former appears in Table D-23. Only SRD-Jobs yielded a significant relationship in the oldest group, while SRD-Behaviour and SRD-Feminine Role were in the same direction, although more modestly. Table D-23 also contains the data for SRD-Jobs.

The rough outline of the picture which emerged has the following features: boys who segregated the sexes psychologically tended also to claim a significant share of familial power, more so among the English-Canadians than the French-Canadians, and more so among the younger children than the older. Conversely, boys who have little power tend to make fewer distinctions between the sexes. Among girls, the relationship seems to be reversed. The less power a girl reported, the more she differentiated between the sexes, though this trend was stronger among the English-speaking girls than French-speaking girls, and among the intermediate age group than the other two groups. Our summary of these findings should, of course, be treated as hypotheses.

In the data we have found some indications of the importance of the structure of the family in determining the child's cognitive development. We suspect that the process of socialization of children's thinking processes continues for some time, rather than ending within a mere few years of birth.

We turn next to a consideration of our respondents' participation in peer groups.

Integration and Interaction in Peer Groups. We asked our subjects to estimate the amount of their interaction with boys and girls (Appendix B, Booklet #1, item 108). Eighteen behaviours were specified, such as "go to movies". The scale for each behaviour, for each sex, had three points, labelled "never", "sometimes", and "often". The relevant data are presented in Table D-24.

It can be seen that highly segregated, differential interaction was associated with segregated, differentiated imagery. It is noteworthy that the effect was most pronounced for the SRD-Peer Relations. In other words, when subjects reported differential interaction with the sexes, they tended also to attribute distinct forms of behaviour toward peers in boys and girls their age. About 38 per cent of the high differential interaction group scored at the high end of

SRD-Peer Relations, compared with 23 per cent of subjects in the low differential interaction group. Although in the "right" direction, the distribution of SRD-Feminine Role was not significantly related to what we have defined as the independent variable.

We do not propose that the relationship between sexually segregated relations and SRD is causal in any simple way. The analyses performed so far have not demonstrated that SRD is a simple function of sexually integrated versus segregated experiences in friendship groups. When we discussed the influence of children in their families, it was probably more reasonable to hold that parents are structurally and strategically superior to their children in determining how much influence their offspring have on family policies, other things being equal. In their friendship outside the family, however, it may be that children are likely to choose age-mates according to their images of the sexes.

If sex-role images have an effect on children's preferences for companions, it is not immediately obvious just what direction these preferences would take simply on the basis of SRD. Boys who see the sexes as psychologically different may associate with other boys, or they may associate with girls "because" they see them as different. In other words, knowing how a person perceives the sexes is not itself a sufficient condition for predicting whether he will associate with one sex or the other.

We contend that direction is conferred by normative injunctions. Groups in which it is normatively important to associate with one's own sex will resolve the problem of direction. In adult society, for instance, fraternal organizations have rules that bar the opposite sex even though any given member may himself think of the sexes in reasonably modern terms. And frequently pre-adolescent and adolescent society is highly aware of when and under what conditions the sexes may interact. It is principally this kind of reasoning that has prompted us to favour the view that structure determines thought. Until it has been demonstrated empirically, however, we should not preclude the possibility that the specification of sufficient dimensions of SRD provides a necessary and sufficient set of conditions for predicting the direction of interpersonal preferences, if not actual patterns of relations. Consequently, we have opted for the position that we are dealing with a process of escalation, in which each determinant feeds upon its own effects. A child from a sexually structured family may be drawn to gangs that share and confirm his feelings about SRD.

Some Pre-Adolescent and Adolescent Behaviours. There are a number of other behaviours that interest us, and that we suspect bear some systematic relationships to SRD. We will consider, in turn, dating, reactions to school, grades and obedience.

(1) Dating. We asked our respondents whether they dated and how often. Over all, there were modest trends in a positive direction. Children who said they dated tended also to score higher on SRD. Breaking the data down by language, age, and sex, we have made the following observations. First, among English-speaking girls who said that they date, there was a general trend to sex-type. For the French-Canadian girls, the results were small and inconsistent. Of 18 separate sub-groups of English-speaking girls, 15 were in the direction mentioned. The most striking distributions occurred among the 12-14 age girls for SRD-Behaviour and SRD-Feminine Role. These data appear in Table D-25.

The age range 12-14 seemed to be the most critical for the boys in both language groups. Dating seemed to have had a more significant impact on the boys than on girls; or, to state it more cautiously, there was a stronger relationship between male dating and SRD. Table D-26 contains the data for both language groups, age 12-14.

The data tended in the same direction among French-Canadian and English-Canadian boys who were 15 and older, but they were not so clear cut as were those in the intermediate age group.

(2) Attitudes toward school. Our respondents were asked how much they liked school (Appendix B, Booklet #1, item 121). Some quite interesting and quite strong trends emerged here. Again, the age group 12-14 stood out. Table D-27 summarizes the data for boys and girls, of both ethnic groups, in this age bracket.

Apart from the tables presented here, the trends for the girls are not especially striking. For boys, however, the data showed a clear trend: boys who made a sharp distinction between the sexes were also more likely to reject school.

The pattern we found in the 12-14 age category was also present in the older boys of both language groups. Although somewhat more modest, this tendency warrants attention.

(3) Grades. Children were asked what their usual grades were (Appendix B, Booklet #2, item 121). For boys in both language groups, relationships between grades and SRD were few, tenuous, and inconsistent as to direction. In the five female groups there were 17 distributions in which at least one end of the SRD distribution spread was 10 or more percentage points. All except one of these were in the direction suggesting an inverse relationship between grades and SRD. Doing poorly academically was linked with thinking in traditional terms about the sexes.

The relationship between grades and SRD was most pronounced in the 15-and-over age category, less so in the group 12-14, and least or absent in the age range 9-11. Table D-28 summarizes the data bearing on this relationship in the English-speaking, age 15-and-over sample. In view of the small number of "A" students, some caution in evaluating the strength of the finding is in order.

Two features of the data are worth repeating: the relationship between grades and SRD was virtually non-existent for boys but quite evident for girls, and the relationship for girls grew stronger with age. The former result makes sense in light of the conflict that we believe girls experience between academic achievement and traditional feminine role fulfilment. There should be only a chance relationship for boys because sex-typing in their case has little implication for success in school. A boy who conceives the sexes as distinct should be neither more or less assiduous in the pursuit of his studies than a boy who downplays their differences.

The relationship with age should become more accentuated as girls who hold traditional beliefs about themselves fall farther and farther behind. In the early years of school, the relationship should not show up because school attendance and attainment does not yet imply commitment to a career or to "unfeminine" activities. As they progress through school, girls are more likely to become psychological dropouts for one of two reasons.

Girls who segregate the sexes in their thinking should be less attracted to attainments and futures premised on more modern conceptions of their sex. These attainments and futures are not incentives for them, and consequently do not impel them to acquire strategic intellectual skills. Girls who do not segregate the sexes psychologically and socially may, nonetheless, experience conflicts between the inter-

personal rewards controlled and administered by the other sex and achievement in school. The detection of an inverse relationship between grades and SRD seems to favour the former determinant. The latter determinant may be more formidable in more advanced grades than are represented in our sample, a possibility to which we will return in the next chapter. For the moment, however, intelligent girls must play "dumb" to attract boys who think it is appropriate for girls to be "dumb".

Finally, Table D-29 reports the breakdown of subjects in each language and age grouping according to their grades. In every case, the direction of the difference for grades of "A" favours the girls, especially in the 12-14 age category in English Canada. About 20 per cent of the girls and 12 per cent of the boys reported "A" averages. The point of this comparison is simply to illustrate the absence of superior academic performance on the part of the boys in our sample.[1]

---

[1] The reader is reminded that we are dealing with self-reported grades. A limitation we regard as more serious is the tendency for academically poorer students to be under-represented in the English-speaking sample. This possibility is discussed in Appendix A which deals with the methodology of the study. It should be noted that there was no evidence of a sex bias in the recruitment of the sample, at least in the community which was singled out for more detailed analysis of the characteristics of the respondents. Nor was there any indication of an interaction between sex and grades in the decision by parents to permit participation or to refuse it.

We should note, in passing, that the higher proportion of poor students in the French-speaking sample (Table D-29) may be accounted for largely by the bias introduced into the English-speaking sample. Virtually all the Quebec children we approached were in fact questioned, compared to perhaps two-thirds of the children of the parents canvassed in the other provinces.

We have commented on this last matter because some readers may be tempted to interpret the data contained in Table D-29 in a descriptive way. This is not a descriptive study, and we doubt that the sample, as it stands, can sustain such inferences. We are not really interested in describing some statistical artifact, some mythical "Canadian family". We hope to acquire some theoretical grasp of selected empirical relationships obtained from a sample of Canadian children (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

(4) Obedience. We asked our subjects what they would do if their parents forbade them to associate with their friends (Appendix B, Booklet #1, item 119). Children who said they would "sneak" to see their friends scored somewhat higher on five of the six SRD measures than children who said they would either comply or defy. Breaking the data by sex, scarcely any effect was found for boys. The relations for girls were too weak, and inconsistent to support theorizing.

This is the second of two chapters summarizing our results. We have found some evidence for the following propositions, all of them related to the development of sex-role imagery: that parental role differentiation, especially in the domain of power relative to each other, has some bearing on the amount of differentiated thinking about the sexes; that boys who have some influence in the family and girls who have little influence, are likely to draw sharp distinctions between the roles of the sexes; and that children who associate with peers of the same sex or in activities that take account of sex tend to think in relatively traditional ways about the sexes. Some secondary findings suggested relationships between school grades, in the case of girls, attitudes toward school, in the case of boys, and dating behaviour, on the one hand and images of the sexes, on the other. Much remains to be done in the way of more refined analyses. In further treatment of the data we hope to explore those conditions which maximize the relationships so far uncovered, and those which lay bare any that are "in" the data, but have not yet emerged. It is the purpose of research not merely to describe, but to specify the boundary conditions of theoretical propositions.

Although our data do not readily lend themselves to causal inferences, we will try in the next chapter to suggest what they may mean. At times, what we have to say will sound causal. If so, the reader is encouraged to regard these statements as hypotheses, given that we have found some empirical clues that there are relationships to be investigated further. For the rest, we are simply trying to make some sense, making as few assumptions as possible, of what is a complex and sensitive problem area.

CHAPTER 5

THE SOCIAL ORIGINS OF MIND

We have been most impressed with the directed or intential nature of human action. We have assumed that the grounds of action are twofold: premises and knowledge. The premises are typically unverbalized assumptions about identity and goals. They are, at their core, ideological in nature. They are assumptions about what is essential (identity) and what is worthwhile (goals). Critical knowledge concerns what is instrumental for goal attainment. It is very mundane and very practical.

We have borne in upon the first of these two elements. We want to know something about the premises of social action. The premises in question concern the sexes: who they "really" are, what it means in our society to be a "man" or a "woman". Our SRD measure has been geared to this. Premises figure significantly in any discussion of social order, and it is Goffman's (1959) views that we consider next.

The Significance of Social Order. It is argued that men, in their everyday interactions, participate in events whose structure lends itself to dramaturgic analysis. Interactants find themselves in situations where the problem of social order must be resolved before they can predict each other's behaviour, predict their own behaviour or "know themselves". Social order is achieved through commitment to a common definition of the situation (Weinberg, 1965, 1966).

The prevailing definition arises "silently", initially through the presentation of self by the various actors. Each actor makes implicit claims about who and what he is. His partners are morally obliged to honour his claims, to grant the assumption that he is who and what he claims to be. Neither need make the additional commitment that these presentations are eternally and truly so. They need cnly show loyalty to a working set of assumptions, a fiction or myth whose chief merit is that honouring it permits the actors to get about their business (Garfinkel, 1967; Vaihinger, 1911).

But sometimes we fail to follow through on the social reality to which we are tacit partners. We may behave in a way that contradicts our self-presentation when, for instance, we display ignorance in an area where we have claimed expertise. Or we may behave in a way that makes it difficult for our partners to follow through on their part of the bargain. That is to say, we behave out of face.

The effect of acting out of face is to destroy the social organization that has subsumed our behaviour. The definition of the situation that provides a set of actors with a common set of premises is jeopardized, and the psychological state of embarrassment is felt. Until the relationship can be restored under the governance of the same, a new, or a revised definition, the actors are anomic. They don't know what to do. More profoundly, they don't know what to assume, thus destroying the socio-logic of their actions.

The orientation just described has its fullest statement in the many works of Goffman (1959, 1961, 1963, 1967). It is a view that regards man as an actor or a part of a social system. According to this view, man is not in the first instance an agent giving expression to his driving impulses. He is a social unit trying to perform commonly understood social scripts.

We make the assumption that actors, when they come into contact with each other, need not negotiate a contract entirely anew. They are, to a significant degree, scripted through socializing processes that provide them with common assumptions. This means that there are dominant beliefs which are instantly fed into any new situation. One such set of assumptions is the set of dominant images we all share, in varying degrees, of the sexes.

When men and women encounter each other, there are highly salient understandings of who they are. They are so fundamental and so deeply implanted, in fact, that they are ordinarily submerged in awareness. They become problematic or enter awareness only when one of the parties behaves in a way that suggests that he does not subscribe to the prevailing script. In this case, it is necessary to enter negotiation to determine just what assumptions shall prevail, and whether the participants are motivated to construct a new definition. Fear that one or other of the parties will not accept a new arrangement prompts many actors to honour the cultural arrangements. It is the extent to which a person is disposed one way, and opts for another, that measures the degree of alienation he or she experiences. For example, a woman whose talents and values dispose her to act in one way, but who feels that she thereby endangers a valuable relationship, is to that extent alienated from herself.

The problem is one many able women have encountered. Women in university are often confronted with this dilemma, and they frequently resolve it in favour of the cultural

stereotypes governing relations between the sexes. One can see the hidden irony in the preference of many parents that their daughters not go too far in university, "because they really don't need that much education". They don't really need it if it succeeds in bringing into awareness a conception of the self that runs counter to what most relationships in our society can sustain. In this connection, consider the relationship reported in Chapter 3, where women who had completed university were significantly more modern in their conceptions of the sex roles than women who had gone no farther than elementary school.

A Correspondence. The point of the present study is to examine some of the antecedents that have generated prevailing definitions of the sexes. There are two ways in which the problem can be approached. The first is to consider the mechanisms by which specific learnings are acquired. For example, some researchers ask about the conditions of reinforcement to which a child is subjected, such as the kinds and patterning of reinforcements administered (Bandura and Walters, 1965). We have followed a second course. We are interested in determinants one step further removed, in the actual structure of the family. Obviously, a complete analysis would involve both kinds of considerations for a truly social psychological explanation.

We have made an assumption supported in some measure by the data, that role differentiation has its counterpart in SRD. There was evidence that differentiation of the parents according to discipline, power, and support was related to differentiated thinking about the sexes. Recall the barren data relating T, P, and R in the mothers and SRD in the children. It would appear percept outweighs precept. What their parents do speaks louder than what they espouse. The general absence of relations also holds true for social class and parental education. The point of all this is to say that if sex makes a difference in the organization of the family, then it will make a difference in the thinking of the children.

It is also noteworthy that boys who wielded power in the family were somewhat more likely to sex-type. The opposite relation seemed to hold for girls. These findings can be understood in the following way. We assume, first, that the parents have the major power in the family. They may choose to lessen their power by sharing it with their offspring. By sharing it with their sons, they confirm a conception of the male role as dominant and effective. By withholding it from their daughters, they confirm a conception of the female role as receptive and passive. The male does, and the female is

done to. Again, our argument is that the structuring of the family, in this case the child's role, has ramifications for mind (Bales, 1951; Cooley, 1909).

But the family is obviously not the only social system in which children participate. The importance of the peer group has many times been documented. For our purposes the significance of interaction between the sexes lies in the fact that it provides children with a source of information about the opposite sex. If interaction is virtually non-existent, then the individual cannot rely upon first-hand experience to monitor his thinking. A similar situation exists when blacks and whites interact on unequal terms or not at all. Unchecked by social reality, stereotypes are free to develop. They follow their own logic in what is a relatively closed informational system. Or children of both sexes may interact, but their interaction may be highly sex-typed. If boys know other boys principally through tackle football, and girls through touch football, then they have quite distinct kinds of experiences with the sexes. It is out of such different experiences that different images emerge and are maintained. Therefore, we argue here, too, that when sex makes a difference structurally, then it will make a difference psychologically. Obviously, though, there must be reasons for differential interaction with the sexes when we do find it. Part of the explanation presumably lies in the ideas children have about each other. But we may suppose that we are analyzing a system that feeds upon its own effects. Differentiated thinking produces differentiated interaction, which may, in turn, accentuate differentiated thinking, and so on.

Finally, by way of explanatory principles, we cite what we will call a "role activation" hypothesis. The data are not as clean and as strong as they might be, or as we would like them. But we found some indication, in Chapter 4, that boys particularly, who dated tended also to think in high SRD terms. One explanation for this finding is that, when people relate to others in relationships where sex is the axis of meaning, then formalistic matters will become salient. Consider a different situation in which boys and girls interact, as in the classroom. Presumably the premise of their relationship is academic and only broadly social in a socio-emotional sense.

When they date, though, their sex roles define their relationship, so that they relate to each other in these terms. This means that they do not so much relate to each other as young people, but as girl to boy and *vice versa*. Consequently, this primary experience in a sexually structured relationship is internalized as a set of premises.

What we have done so far is, first, to elaborate a point of view on the nature of social interaction; and second, to suggest that mind is a product of social structure, with corresponding axes. Next, we will discuss the continuing nature of socialization.

The Continuing Nature of Socialization. The last decade has witnessed a growing debate about the role of conflict in social order. It has been argued that the disposition to assume social order, or to define social systems as in equilibrium, has disguised some of the more significant problems of social life. Coercion as a basis of social control is attracting more interest. Value consensus no longer seems to be adequate to the task of explaining why civil society perseveres. The war in Vietnam, for instance, has underscored the limited contribution of consensus to the maintenance of American society. It has exposed the indispensible contribution of coercion and force.

The writer subscribes to this revised view. We believe that the traditional view of socialization, which holds that most of what is significant takes place early in life, makes sense within an equilibrium or consensus framework. This view holds that the major values and commitments are fixed early, and that the rest of life is an unfolding, a working out of the logic of these values.

The orientation taken here is that each person continues to be socialized throughout life, but not in the passive way suggested by that verb. The individual is engaged in a continuing process of discovery. In some sense, this is the natural state of the organism. But social institutions function in such a way as to limit and control this process of discovery and this, too, is what is meant by socialization (Szasz, 1961). In other words, in the interest of social control, people are socialized to "the limited view," women especially.

This we observed in the children we studied. They obviously acquired certain dispositions toward the sex roles early in life. But these belief systems continued to take shape, so that between 12-14 and 15+, SRD increased notably among boys. Since their capacity for understanding increased with physical maturity and with the new experiences that only adolescence could bring, the respondents added dimensions, particularly social dimensions, to their definitions of the sexes. These experiences appear to have had the effect of increasing SRD. As they participated in more structural situations in which sex made a difference, so they came more firmly to believe that the sexes are different. And so they are, in a self-fulfilling way. Successive commitments to feminine options further tie women to their fates both psychologically and socially (Festinger, 1957). According to dissonance theory, the effects are even more pronounced when a girl believes she is exercising choice. The major premise of dissonance theory is that necessity, especially when it is willed, is the mother of virtue.

We will do three things in the remainder of this chapter. First, we will consider a cognitive principle that goes far in explaining mental adaptation to circumstances. Second, we will consider two studies that underscore some of the pressing issues to which we have referred. Third, we will indicate some research that should be done, and conclude with some theoretical observations about the problem of social change in the domain of sex relations.

On the Perils of Explanation. Biological principles have once again become formidable contenders for the explanation of social phenomena. Analyses rooted in the notion of instincts were prevalent earlier in the century (Allport, 1968, provides a valuable historical perspective), but later fell into disrepute. The last decade or so, however, has witnessed a vigorous resurgence of biological conceptions in the works of the ethologists and their popularizers (for example, Ardrey, 1966; Lorenz, 1952, 1966; Morris, 1967; Tiger, 1969). They have sought to account for those collective experiences that have been so much a part of our past such as the state, war, and relations between the sexes. Applying an evolutionary framework, the ethologists have sought to explain prevailing mores in terms of population pressures, differential survival rates, and resultant variations in gene pools (Gottesman, 1968,

discusses behavioural genetics). Attention has been directed also to the behavioural mechanisms in the individual organism in order to understand how biological propensities become transformed into behaviour. Tiger's interesting deployment of the ethological thesis to the phenomenon of sex differences invites our attention.

Many details of Tiger's analysis warrant examination, but we will limit ourselves to three issues. First, we should not lose sight of the fact that Tiger's reasoning and evidence are strictly analogical. No amount of detailed and sophisticated review of the evidence should obscure Tiger's overriding assumption that relatively unabridged principles can be generalized from a number of levels of the animal kingdom to its most complex level. In no way do we deny our animal nature when we assert that there are occurrences at the human level that are found only in truncated or programmed form elsewhere in the phylogeny. We contend that man's capacity for social organization, for example, is scarcely acknowledged in works such as Tiger's.

Working within a single level of analysis, we concur with the scientist's aesthetic preference for an economy of assumptions. Working at different levels of analysis, however, the quantity of assumptions granted is less significant than their kind and their appropriateness to their respective levels. It is our view that sex role behaviour, so far as it interests us, is largely relational in nature. There is, as yet, neither promise nor reason to suppose that ethological research will generate at its level of analysis the "rules of combination" needed to understand human social organization.

We can also respond to the scientist's preference for economy by arguing that much social behaviour is understood and predicted by assumptions quite different from those of the ethologists. In the absence of knowledge, it makes some sense to apply in a reasonably straightforward fashion principles tested and validated elsewhere in the animal kingdom. But we object to the practice of introducing assumptions to a domain of behaviour governed by principles of social organiztion, of which we already have some knowledge and then confusing the original with evidence in the new domain. As hypotheses they enjoy no special advantage until validated.

Second, Tiger favours the position that the least variable part of a system should be examined first as a determinant of more variable parts. This assumption must be rejected for several reasons. Variation in effects requires variation in determinants. If the nominally independent variable does not vary, it is hardly a variable, and cannot _by itself_ account for variant effects. We must look elsewhere for the critical determinants, although we admit that the invariant factor may be a necessary condition. We assert only that it is not a sufficient condition, and it is to such other conditions that we have turned in this study. Thus, we have argued, _variation_ in the structural differentiation of the family is associated with _variation_ in sex-role imagery. By failing to distinguish between human institutions and the people who man them, Tiger unfortunately has lost sight of an equally plausible set of alternative determinants embodied in social organization. This is indeed a strange omission for a professional sociologist, social organization being the central phenomenon of the discipline. He rather looks to biological mechanisms which, by themselves, cannot sustain the logic by which acts are tied together into extremely complex systems of interaction. Not only do principles of social organization offer leverage on the problem of historical constancy in the sex roles, but they also offer leverage to explain variation in them.

Third, Tiger virtually ignores bonding in female groups. He acknowledged this as a "serious deficiency," but strangely relegates mention of it to a six-line footnote (p. xii). He says he will propose in a future publication "that all-female groups differ structurally from all-male groups, are generally less stable over time, and considerably less common for a variety of reasons". We believe that there are valid social organizational explanations for such tendencies in female groups. For example, it should come as no surprise that women whose self-definitions are derived preponderantly from their relations to their husbands and children, and whose contacts with the outside world are mediated for the most part by their husbands, will be less likely to participate in long-lived, stable groups. Nor should it be surprising that women whose role-definition assigns to them the responsibility of caring for children both day and night will, practically speaking, be less likely to find either time or energy for the kind of commitment to a group that makes it stable. The imperatives

to which women must ordinarily respond are strangely absent in Tiger's discussion, and therefore his analysis seems even less credible. Furthermore, the explanation offered here lends itself to testable derivations. We would predict, for instance, that women who subscribe to a modern conception of their role will be more likely to participate vigorously and continuously in non-family groupings than women who subscribe to a traditional conception of their role. In passing it might be noted that Tiger's position is relatively sterile as a source of testable predictions.

Moreover, we believe that it is a gross oversight, if not outright theoretical bias, to dismiss evidence of bonding in women because it is not entirely similar to bonding in men. Quite apart from the objections raised above, it is difficult to escape the impression of circularity in Tiger's analysis. One gets the impression that Tiger superficially considered some apparent differences between men's and women's groups, and then attributed to the sexes genetic properties commensurate with the observed differences. He then reverses direction and explains presumed effects by presumed causes. In short, bonding behaviour in the sexes has the strange appearance of being both cause and effect. 1/

1/ This is a threat to our own data, and one which has concerned us. When children reported differentiated family structure, on the one hand, and differentiated images of the sexes, on the other, there was a similar danger of circularity. Our defence is two-fold. First, the children in this study were asked to describe events which were at least different, e.g., to indicate which parent decides what, and to what degree; and to indicate the suitability of different bahaviours for boys and girls their own age. In other words, the targets of their imagery differed (barring artifactual correlations). Furthermore, we rejected any relationships in which correlations were built-in, as in the relationship between Child Power and SRD-Authority Relations (Chaper 4).

Second, we accept the desirability of independent indicators for the various theoretical constructs whose associations we wish to examine. This means, for example, that future research should attempt to obtain different indicators of parental differentiation, and use the children simply for measuring the dependent variable of interest, SRD.

We do not wish to belabour our objections to Tiger's treatment of sex differences, although we believe much more remains to be said. Nevertheless, some readers will no doubt insist, if not Tiger's explanation, then what? They may concede that the social organizational thesis is plausible but argue that it leaves unanswered the question of origins. Where, if not from their biological requirements, did humans ever derive the prevalent idea that women possess a peculiar affinity for familial and domestic responsibilities? Although the question is speculative and any answer is insusceptible to testing, we will advance one possible explanation.

Perhaps the most vigorous single area of research in contemporary social psychology deals with cognitive and affective dynamics. The most persuasive set of explanations are the "balance theories." The seminal insights of Heider (1944, 1946, 1958) have given birth to a number of variants of the original model (Cartwright & Harary, 1956; Festinger, 1957; McGuire, 1960; Newcomb, 1959; Osgood & Tannenbaum, 1955; Rosenberg, 1960; and others). All these hypotheses postulate a tendency to psychological consistency in the individual. They assume that people try to keep their mental furniture in order, and that they experience discomfort when relations among them are dissonant or incongruent. The mental furniture consists of perceptions, beliefs, attitudes, values, and relations among them.

For example: if _A_ loves _B_, but sees that _B_ does not reciprocate, a state of imbalance is said to exist. _A_ attempts to restore balance by trying to change _B_'s feelings toward her, or by modifying her own feelings toward _B_ or: if _A_ feels indifferent toward _B_, but for some reason expends a great deal of effort on behalf of _B_, she experiences dissonance. It is dissonant because, considering her feelings alone, she would not have done so much. If her actions cannot be "undone," or if she must continue her sacrifices for some time, then she may change her feelings toward _B_, perhaps even developing a strong attachment or love for _B_.

Heider has called the process "unit formation." There is a tendency to unite psychologically events already linked in some way. A woman carries a fetus for nine months, gives birth, and then nurses her infant. She and her child

are "linked" in peoples' minds in a way that the father and child have not been. There is a strong tendency for both the woman herself and for others to perceive her and her child as a unit. In technologically and organizationally less complex societies, we should expect the logic of this association to be especially compelling. Presumably an observer would experience some imbalance or tension if A were described as the mother in all the ways cited, and yet B were said to "be responsible" for the welfare of the child.

But note: the compelling naturalness of the mother-child image is conferred, not by a former biological symbiosis, but by the laws of mental functioning. We unite them in our minds because it is economical psychologically to do so. In other words, we are locating what appears to be the obvious and natural union of mother and child not in their biology, but in the eyes of the beholder. As such, no natural law is violated when mother seeks employment outside the home, leaving her child in the care of someone else.

Increasingly, today, the mental configuration of the mother-child relationship is becoming a less dominant thought pattern. It is less likely to be segregated in the thinking of the college-educated young wife, and is more likely to interact with other attitudes. She is now concerned with the promotion of balanced states elsewhere in her thinking. One such relationship is the perception that she has certain capacities and needs, but she is denied self-fulfilment. The price of balance in her imagery of herself as mother to her child may be imbalance in even more important configurations.

We have been urging in the foregoing the benefits of employing known principles of social and cognitive organization to the explanation of the social functioning of the sexes. Biological analogies are appealing in their descriptive simplicity. They inject a note of nostalgia by re-establishing in a literate way our biological ancestry. A sense of place and history is won again, and age-old problems of war and social order are given perspective. But at this juncture analogical thinking, appealing as it is, accomplishes little in the actual understanding of human society.

How Expectancies Victimize. There is in social psychology a tradition of research that shows the effects of prestige and other characteristics of the communicator upon attitude change. The same statement, attributed to the statesman or the international villain of the day, produces quite different effects. Goldberg (1968) has recently shown the same phenomenon when men versus women are identified as communicators.

A guiding assumption in Goldberg's experimental investigation was the contention that perception of differences often leads to differences in valuation. That is, differences are frequently taken to mean deficiencies. First, Goldberg had 50 occupations rated by a panel of judges for their association with the sexes. Two occupations were thereby identified as feminine, two as masculine, and two as neuter. Then articles were selected from the professional journals of each field. They were edited, abridged to a length of about 1500 words and put in booklets. Each booklet contained three articles by authors of each sex, e.g., John T. McKay or Joan T. McKay. The same article was attributed sometimes to a man, and sometimes to a woman. Subjects were requested to rate each article on a number of criteria, such as persuasiveness, style, and the professional competence of the author.

The subjects, who were female, generally rated articles attributed to women as less desirable than the same articles attributed to men. This finding was most pronounced in the masculine disciplines, as expected. Goldberg predicted that this "anti-female" trend would be reversed in the feminine disciplines. But this was not the case. Goldberg concluded, "On all nine questions (criteria), regardless of the author's occupational field, the girls consistently found an article more valuable -- and its author more competent -- when the article bore a male name" (p. 30).

Horner (1968), in her doctoral dissertation, has similarly reported results which are theoretically interesting and practically disturbing. She was working in an area -- need achievement -- in which there has been a great deal of sophisticated research over a number of years. One of its limitations, however, has been the inability of researchers to deal adequately with achievement behaviour in women. They have been quite successful where men are concerned, but women have "eluded" them.

In her investigation Horner found it necessary, at least in the case of women, to propose a new concept. She called it the "motive to avoid success." In her experiments the presence of this motive was inferred from stories told to verbal leads or cues. Subjects were judged to be fearful of success if there was evidence in their stories of occasions when success led to negative consequences.

Horner found that although only 10 per cent of her male subjects scored high on fear of success, 62 per cent of the females did. Horner reports some other findings which are of interest to us. First, there was "a trend for Honors women (e.g., those who are probably highly able and motivated to achieve and who have a previous history of success) to show more evidence of Fear of Success Imagery than Non-Honors women." Second, "those showing evidence of Fear of Success perform better when working in a non-competitive setting for intrinsic reasons than when working in a mixed sex competitive setting against others." And, third, "Subjects with high Fear of Success Imagery report on a questionnaire that it is significantly less important to do well in the competitive situations than in the non-competitive situation" (p. 119).

Horner's work raises a number of interesting questions. She wonders, for instance, what the effects of co-education may be on girls. Such schools may, in a strangely perverse way, actually contribute to the development of fear of success in girls. Unlike boys, girls are in a fundamentally conflictful situation. If they pursue academic prowess and the rewards that go with intellectual attainment, they may forfeit certain other rewards, primarily social and sexual. Accordingly, as they succeed academically, they may, <u>in general</u>, fail socially with boys. While achieving even as Horner's Honors students did, they may develop a fear of what their achievement is simultaneously costing them in other areas of their lives. Members of the Women's Liberation Movement are aware of the significance of the implications of Horner's findings when they exclude men from their meetings. Consistent with Horner's results is the finding reported here that girls who are most traditional in their thinking about the sex roles tended also to obtain lower grades.

Some Needed Research. It is trite to say that the present study has posed more questions than it has answered. Yet it is true. There are significant problems to be addressed, but few seem to be doing so.

First, we need to know more about the antecedents of SRD. This will require further elaboration of the structure of the family and other settings in which children participate, and, more particularly, the development of tools for measuring the properties ascribed to such micro-social structures. Our research used the respondents themselves to define the events to which they were responding. This was acceptable as far as it went, because we make the phenomenological assumption that how things are perceived determines how they are responded to. It is valuable, though, to relate images to events, physically defined, to which they supposedly correspond. We should also like to know more about the intervening social psychological processes by which structural events become the stuff of children's psychological structure. A child is not a member of a single structure. He is located at the intersection of a number of groups, so that we should like to know something about the interaction among groups at their point of overlap, the psychological processes of the individual.

Second, we would like to find out more about the consequences of SRD. We have made a vigorous case for a multitude of effects or implications. Some of these ideas should be put to experimental test. For instance, would SRD operate to organize subjects' perceptions and recall in the Kuethe experimental paradigm?

Third, we need to assess the costs of particular ways of thinking and behaving. The Goldberg and Horner studies are certainly suggestive in this respect. Some centuries ago, technology was such that brute strength was clearly an asset. Today our society is increasingly based not on force but on information, which controls force. The kinds of skills that become critical and scarce are those concerned with the processing of information. A society that leaves unexploited such capacities incurs hidden costs.

And what do these patterns of thought and behaviour cost the individual. We must learn more about the effects of talents developed and wasted, and of talents latent, but neither developed nor used. For example, we should know more about what becomes of women at university who show a strong sense of self while they are there. Anyone who teaches has met many women who are very much in contact with themselves, aware of and excited by their skills, but fearful of what the social system has in store for them when they leave university. We must get some idea of what they do later in life, perhaps 10 years later, and explore the conditions that free or imprison them.

Fourth, we need to know something about the conditions that affect the development of sex consciousness in women. Marx saw class consciousness as critical in the evolution of society. He speculated about the social conditions that promote consciousness of class, as opposed to what he called a "false class consciousness." It could be argued that women who accept their traditional identity, particularly in an information age, are themselves not in touch with their "real" being, and are thus alienated from themselves. The value-free research question to be put, then, concerns the antecedents and processes whereby women become dissatisfied and act.

Finally, we need to know more about the development of SRD. Our research has suggested that the critical determinants of SRD are to be found in the role differentiation of the family and in the differentiation of interaction between the sexes. We have identified vertical and horizontal dimensions in the family and peer groups, respectively. But each of these determinants can also be viewed as dependent and requiring explanation. Why, for instance, are some families highly differentiated and others less so?

It is appropriate to conclude this chapter with some suggestions for research. The topic of women is too little researched today, and there has been little inclination on the part of social scientists to change matters. More especially, there has been little interest, except among anthropologists, to adopt radical assumptions as heuristic.

The next chapter advances some proposals for social change. The last chapter is a review of the terrain covered by this inquiry.

CHAPTER 6

SOCIAL CHANGE

We will consider in this chapter a number of suggestions for social change. They are premised on the kind of previous analysis: that is, that patterns of thought originate in patterns of interaction. But first, we wish to register a few disclaimers.

Some Disclaimers. Anyone who recommends social change takes as his implicit or explicit point of departure certain assessments of the status quo. He must recognize: first, that the consequences of any system of arranging human relationships will be neither totally good nor totally bad; and second that the value of social practices lies not in what they are in theory but in what they mean to the people who take part in them. We should avoid simplistic all-or-none thinking about the current situation or about any arrangements likely to replace it.

Even patterns of behaviour widely regarded as morally abhorrent have their merits. That is, they probably benefit somebody, someplace, sometime, somehow. The wife who is denied the opportunity of developing intellectually or vocationally nevertheless gains in some ways. So long as she "knows her place", so long as she is content to live out the life of wife and mother, she is spared the mental and emotional anguish of having to choose between possibly contradictory ways of expending herself. And she avoids the strife that may follow when she pursues ambitions outside the family, perhaps in opposition to her husband's wishes. This is not to justify the traditional role of women, but simply to point out that it serves some purpose, however perverse its other effects may be.

Moreover, we must not lose sight of the various ways in which value judgments affect the weights one assigns to the consequences of prevailing social practices. What one person sees as redemptive, another may consider demeaning. Values also figure significantly in people's attitudes to social change and whether they can tolerate the disruption and conflict that sometimes accompany it.

For some people, conflict, disagreements, uncertainty, and the violation of prevailing standards of behaviour are so undesirable that they should be minimized wherever and however possible. For other people, the prospect of non-fulfilment of the individual personality, whatever the psychic costs to the individual and whatever the social costs to units such as the family, is scarcely to be tolerated. Those people regard with suspicion structure, which they see as limiting rather than enabling, coercive rather than liberating, denying rather than assenting.

Third, the most effective method of bringing about change is not necessarily frontal attack. We make the assumption that freedom is neither identical with nor the antithesis of structure. "Freedom" is very importantly a property of the person, and is not resolvable in any simple fashion to social structural facts such as the passage of legislation. Men or women cannot be made free by law. What we <u>can</u> do is provide the conditions for freedom. "Enabling" legislation can create the means and the incentives for people who wish to use them. We can have change and stability simultaneously by maintaining some relation between modes of thought and feeling and ways of behaving.

Fourth, we need make few uncharitable assumptions about what moves people in authority. Legislators and businessmen are no less subject to the prevailing myths than are others. They, too, subscribe in large measure to the dominant ideology. Leverage over their thinking must, therefore, be sought in their conceptions of the natural social order, e.g., notions of economic rationality, self-fulfilment, competence.

Fifth, we should avoid the temptation of regarding men as the enemy of women. It may be fashionable in some circles to argue this way; but for analytic purposes, if for no other reason, we should at least acknowledge that many women share traditional views of their roles. We must try to influence the minds and lives of women, as well as the hiring practices of business men. We are less committed to establishing blame than we are to identifying potent determinants of behaviour. Understanding the origins of belief systems will carry us farther in shaping the course of social process.

Sixth, we should exercise restraint in drawing analogies between women and other minority groups. We have ourselves referred to the plight of Indians or blacks where doing so clarified the situation of women, as in their portrayal in the mass media, but there are differences worth noting. For example, however else women may have been penalized, they have nevertheless generally shared in the material and social rewards of their husbands' success. On the face of it, this seems fair enough. But in fact it implies that women are not expected to succeed on their own. A vicarious sense of achievement is little recompense for self-fulfilment foregone.

The situation of women differs, too, in their distribution in the social system. Unlike other minority groups, women have not been segregated on reserves or in ghettos, in fact, they have been blessed with the singular honour of being allowed to live and sleep with members of the dominant group, to live intimately with them, unlike members of many minorities. A consequence of their dispersal is their relative inaccessibility to "outside agitators." For these and other reasons, the development of a "sex consciousness" has lagged behind the development of other politically relevant consciousnesses, such as class, culture and race.

Seventh, changing conceptions of the sex roles will have other consequences, some of them not so obvious. This follows from our view that sex-role imagery does not occur in isolation. McClelland (1961) makes a similar assumption in his study of achievement motivation and societal process.

According to McClelland, women occupy an extremely strategic position within the family, especially in so-called underdeveloped nations of the world. More than men, women are integrated into the family and isolated from the external social world. Because they have less intensive and extensive contact with the larger society, women are less vulnerable to new and different ideas. At the same time, as mothers, they present to their children a more static conception of the social order. In other words, women are culture-bearers and culture-transmitters, and their personal experiences are least likely to threaten or modify the culture which they bear and transmit.

McClelland argues that the standard of living in the underdeveloped societies will rise only as their people acquire a market morality and an other-directed orientation. This change requires that the monopoly which mothers enjoy over their children be broken. He then suggests strategies that should have maximum psychological leverage on the family and hence on the society. He believes that the growth of new behaviour patterns waits upon changes in the family structure and the creation of a new incentive structure.

The point of this intellectual exercise is to identify the matrix of beliefs and behaviours of which SRD is a part. It may be argued that as women move into spheres traditionally reserved for men, they will themselves become more "masculine." We are proposing that men will also tend more to resemble women as segregated images of the sexes erode. "Resemblance" is used here in a strictly psychological sense. Women will wish to develop their potentials and in a greater and more interesting variety of ways. Men may well be "feminized" in the sense of worrying less about their virility. Freed from rigid beliefs about what it means to be a man (Jourard, 1968), they may be less inclined to act aggressively in the service of threatened masculine identities.

Finally, the proposals advanced here are not premised exclusively on legislation. Nor do we make allowance for federal versus provincial jurisdictions when legislative efforts are indicated. Nor do we concern ourselves with the matter of financing our recommendations. All these issues are clearly of signal importance. However, we define our task in terms of what requires doing, at least in principle, if we are serious about changing people's images of the sexes, or permitting greater opportunity to those whose images have already changed. The question is whether society can accommodate people freed from prejudiced thinking, i.e., prejudgments, about men and women.

The writer's position. In the abstract, it can be said that man or woman is happiest who knows no alternatives, and hence desires none. This is a static view which overlooks two important forces at work in Western society. The first is simply the changing requirements of advanced society, and the second is the changing nature of childhood socialization.

The kind of society we know today is increasingly tied to the mastery of information. The mundane affairs of the work world place a premium on understanding and the ability to process information. This capacity, it should be noted, is quite independent of physical prowess and strength. Rather, information commands force, so that a decision may release the explosive power of a hydrogen bomb. We make no assumption, in this kind of society, that brilliant men need be well endowed in any physical sense other than ordinary health. Nor should we expect one's sex to be particularly germane to information processing unless, for example, a woman has been psychologically crippled by a view of herself which denies these capacities.

Important forces have also been set in motion in recent generations in our schools. With the advent of universal education, especially education that places boys and girls in contact with each other and in contact with the same subject matter, new implications are being realized. We believe that girls in school are subjected to subtly different, and some not so subtly different, injunctions about desirable behaviour. In school, boys and girls do develop ideas that they are different kinds of people.

But girls are simultaneously receiving existential injunctions. These orginate not so much in their teachers or in their classmates, but in the exercise of new skills and capacities (White, 1959). They experience themselves in a way that hints at an independent self with its own psychology, rather than an organically given psychology. The message is not so clear for girls as it is for boys, partly because girls are subjected to many contrary forces. These forces work in a way that dissociates the meaning of their experiences from their developing self-images (Rogers, 1959). Society makes it legitimate for boys, in a way it does not for girls, to find satisfaction in their own competence and to assimilate feelings of competence into their images of themselves. Even so, there is an implied logic in the successes that girls experience in the education system. Girls tend to do what they can do.

The point of the structural changes advocated in this report is the liberation of women: to allow them to more clearly identify their idiosyncratic needs; to allow them to develop self-conceptions enriched by a breadth of awareness not permitted by the traditional feminine role; to allow them to commit themselves to activities of their own choosing.

Self-actualization should be the goal. Social structures should be instrumental for this goal, not ends in themselves. An example may clarify this notion.

The marital relationship is a social structure, comprised of expectations, norms or rules of conduct, and customary ways of behaving. Such a structure constitutes a kind of constitution governing the relationship between a husband and a wife. In countries like Canada, the marital relationship is being terminated with increasing frequency. More husbands and wives are saying, in effect, that they are willing to end their relationship when it no longer contributes to their satisfaction. Divorce is a statement that a particular marriage was not a sufficiently satisfactory means to personal ends. Just as a businessman gives up practices that yield insufficient profits, so husbands and wives terminate relationships that do not provide an adequate return on their investments (Thibaut and Kelley, 1959). Norms and laws do not make this proposition any less true. They only erect barriers to dissolution and sometimes disguise the fundamental process of exchange at work.

It is the writer's view that many of women's relationships are similarly hedged in by norms, laws and custom. Unfortunately, the costs inflicted are likewise disguised, so that we identify only with difficulty the crippled human that is woman. In fact, we tend to regard her as a given in nature, and a necessary element in the natural social order.

The proposals set forth below will offend some as too conservative and too slow in their effects. This is partially true. First, at the risk of thinking dichotomously, we insist that structure not greatly supersede the individual, even in producing change. The individual woman must be permitted "choice" where she is "now", psychologically. Whatever structural innovations are introduced must not be more coercive than most women experience today. Our proposals are structural in the sense that they make available to women resources and incentives that have been in short supply until now. We cannot force women to choose them.

Second, we want to create the conditions for continued change. We should make change in the lives of individual women a live option, and we should not try to predict where the future will take them. Today's reforms may be tomorrow's limited vision. Our innovations should leave the future open.

Structural Conditions Facilitating Personal Growth

1. Integrated peer relations. Boys and girls do not always seek interaction "with their own kind," but much childhood interaction is officially segregated. The adult community endorses notions of differentness through its sponsorship of sexually segregated youth groups such as the Boy Scouts, Girl Guides, Cadets, and summer camps.

We propose that youth organizations be integrated from the earliest school years on. Boys and girls typically attend co-educational schools, but go their separate ways after school hours. Their extracurricular experiences contribute significantly to the mystification of the sexes. Racially segregated experiences are known to foster racial myths. It should not be surprising that sexually segregated experiences foster sexual myths. At the least, they unfortunately provide a sterile environment in which traditional views carried over from the home environment enjoy immunity.

2. Cross-sex educational experiences. Sexual bias, especially in the manual skill areas, should be eliminated. At some time in their academic careers boys should receive instruction in home economics and other skills traditionally associated with the feminine role. Girls should be encouraged to become competent in traditionally masculine activities, such as auto mechanics and industrial arts. This kind of education should contribute to the erosion of sex-typed non-intellective activities, and should make people of either sex more competent to care for their own needs.

3. Counselling. Boys in school receive educational and vocational counselling that is, in some measure, geared to their abilities and motivation. A wide range of career alternatives matches the wide range of human material.

Girls, though, are consigned either to role of housewife or to one of a very few occupations. They find very little support for the kinds of ambitions nurtured in boys. The social system conspires to deprive girls of genuine opportunities to develop fully. Parents, teachers, counsellors, religious

authorities, boys, and girls themselves, erect a formidable web of expectations and sanctions whose effect is to encapsulate girls. The naturalness of the female role in fact resides in this interpersonal structure, so that if a girl is to develop fully as a human being, she must neutralize it.

It is exceptional indeed for a young girl to recognize the essentially coercive significance of her interpersonal relations. The authority of adults and the massiveness of the consensus confer a legitimacy that she will rarely question. If she does question it, she has little chance of resisting it at costs she can endure. Even for the autonomous female who has some sense of herself, there is the tendency to make peace with the system and even to commit herself to the role that is her prison (Festinger, 1957).

It is therefore imperative that latent feminine aspirations receive some support and legitimacy. Counselling of girls should be greatly expanded in the schools. The fact that counsellors are so often uncritical in their understanding of sex roles indicates a failure in their education. We need counsellors who understand that sexual prejudice is little more acceptable than racial prejudice. Enlightened counselling would be one small breach in an otherwise coercive network of relations. Not only will intellectual enrichment liberate women, but it should also contribute greater awareness in their daughters and greater tolerance in their sons.

4. Occupational attraction and opportunities. Efforts to liberate women will ultimately founder unless a genuine opportunity structure is assured. The work world must be made more attractive, and women must be convinced that training and education will indeed be rewarded by opportunity. Women are unlikely to make a sustained effort to realize their potential so long as they see little probability of success. The changes proposed here, often urged but never effected, must be acted on if any real progress is to be expected.

First, human rights legislation must concede women the rights now conceded, at least in principle, to coloured citizens: an equal opportunity to be hired, equal pay for equal work, and competitive opportunities for advancement. Conferring these rights on paper is obviously no guarantee that they will be honoured. It will be necessary, therefore, to create the office of ombudswoman. Her jurisdiction should extend to the private sector of the economy, as well as to the public or governmental sector.

Second, women must be assured that pregnancy and childbirth do not compromise their careers. Pregnancy leaves should be instituted. Making pay during this period contingent upon return to their work for some minimum period of time would be an incentive to continued employment. Paternity leave should be available, too, so that the new mother could return to work almost immediately if she and her husband judged her job more important than his.

Third, there must be day-care centres. We wish to indicate two reservations concerning this oft-mentioned reform. These centres should be staffed by professional child care workers, rather than well-meaning but myth-ridden housewives. We are by no means advocating an extended period of professional training. However, workers should be educated to think critically, and in a social scientific way, about the implications of their beliefs and behaviour vis-a-vis their charges. We gain little if we merely replace uncritical mothers with uncritical professionals.

Our second reservation is simply that day-care centres are of limited value if they merely release mothers from the unpaid drudgery of housework for the paid drudgery of dull and undemanding jobs. Most women now work primarily to supplement their husbands' incomes. This fact should underscore the very special economic position women occupy in their families. As wives and mothers, they sell their services for little in return. The hours are long, the financial rewards minimal, and the (intellectual) working conditions demeaning. And when the husband's pay is insufficient, the wife is offered on the market for income matching the challenge of her employment.

A mother who works in a job that places few demands on her is not too different from a mother who remains in the home. The working mother has probably taken her job for purely financial reasons rather than reasons of self-fulfilment. Her children usually perceive this, and this perception confirms rather than challenges traditional role definitions. The working mother is thus seen as engaging in paid employment which proves rather than refutes traditional conceptions. Her participation in the labour market is merely an exception to the preferred state of affairs.

5. Intellectual enrichment. We observed that women who attended university were most likely to entertain "modern" or less differentiated conceptions of the sexes. It is likely that the relationship is circular and cumulative, rather than simply acquired through exposure to new ideas. Even so, it is evident that not all women who attend university "find" themselves. We believe that attendance at university does not of itself generate self-awareness and self-respect. Intellectual stimulation and challenge that universities sometime provide is probably the agent of growth. We have three recommendations about university education.

First, women should be offered bursaries or scholarships. Financial assistance, enlightened career counselling and day-care services would permit more women to educate themselves further.

Second, programming on the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation should be radically upgraded, especially during the daytime hours. It is unfortunate that the Government-owned network should expend so much on frivolous forms of entertainment that private broadcasters can probably handle better. It is ironic that Government should conspire with other institutions in the preservation of vestigial social roles. And not incidentally, this means that the CBC participates significantly in promoting a "false consciousness" in women.

The CBC should carry a minimum of several hours per day of lecture and serious discussion programmes. College credit should be given for the successful completion of television courses supplemented by some classroom attendance. The spirit of this recommendation requires that such programmes be available in the afternoon, rather than during the "ghetto" hours of 6 or 7 a.m.

The third proposal requires some reform in the structure of our universities. At least one university in each province should institute a programme of "field teaching". Teachers would go into the homes and lead classes and discussions attended by small groups of women in the neighbourhood. Such a peripatetic university would quite literally bring learning back to the people. Women who would never consider attending a university might discover in themselves unsuspected needs and capacities.

Community libraries would have to be enriched. Universities, for their part, would have to ignore organizationally the different academic backgrounds that women would bring to their

livingroom courses. A special certificate, such as an Associate Arts certificate, might be introduced. The purposes of universities might require rethinking. It would be most unfortunate if bureaucratic rigidities, academic arrogance and sheer indifference prevented our centres of learning from creating the conditions necessary for a large part of the population to learn and to liberate themselves.

Most of the recommendations made here are depressingly familiar. Most briefs to the Royal Commission on the Status of Women mentioned day-care centres, for example. The problem is less one of investigating what should be done than of finding the purpose and resolve to do it.

CHAPTER 7

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Three major findings were reported in our study, and around them we have constructed most of our theoretical scaffolding.

First, in general, there was evidence of a positive relationship between parental role differentiation and sex-role differentiation. In order of increasing predictive potency, the measures of parental role specialization were: discipline, socio-emotional or caring, and power (as between the parents).

Second, boys who shared noticeably in the distribution of power within their families tended to sex-type more than boys who had little power. The relationship was reversed for girls, so that the less power they reported, the higher were their SRD scores.

Third, there was a clear tendency on the part of subjects who interacted differently with the sexes to think in segregated ways about the sexes.

There were three other kinds of findings of note. First, the various measures of SRD were generally quite independent of each other. There was a definite indication of greater test-retest reliability of the images of the sexes defined in terms of social structure than of those defined in forms of individual psychology. It appeared that children in the age range studied were more certain about the meaning of masculinity and femininity when they thought in terms of potential jobs or relations to other people, than when they thought in terms of personality dispositions.

Second, there was some indication that sex-role imagery was associated with specific other behaviours. Children who dated were somewhat more prone to sex-type. This was especially true of English-speaking girls, for boys of both language groups, and for the 12-14 age category. Boys, but not girls, showed an inverse relationship between attitude toward school and SRD. Boys who disliked school scored higher on SRD. There was an interesting relationship between grades and SRD among girls, but not among boys. Girls who sex-typed were less likely to do well academically than those who did not sex-type.

Third, there was pronounced inverse relationships between social class and education, construed as independent or predictive variables, and the parental measures of Traditionalism, Personality Belief, and Role Preference. Mothers from the working class, or who had gone no farther than elementary school, were significantly more traditional on all three measures than were mothers from the upper class or mothers who had gone to university.

Those are the major findings of the investigation, stripped of the caveats we have introduced throughout the report. Further analyses remain to be done so that we can further explicate the meaning of what we consider interesting results. What follows are some propositions, part of a developing theoretical scheme which we hope will encompass the present relationships and new ones, as they emerge. We will present these propositions as hypotheses, rather than as firm and final conclusions. They are inductions from the the first three findings summarized above.

(1) A correspondence. There is at least a limited correspondence between the structure of the family and the mind of the child. Bases of structural differentiation in the family tend to have their counterpart in axes of meaning in the child's psychological structure. We have inferred that, if traditional ways of thinking are to be changed, then at least one of two things must happen. First, to the extent that the genesis of thought is rooted not in what parents say, but in the way they assume different family functions, then their functions must be changed. Second, even if traditional ways of thinking are established, there are perhaps liberating experiences that may either diminish their effect or generate dissatisfaction with them and with a social system which "requires" them. Education at the university level may, under certain circumstances, provide these liberating experiences.

(2) System openness. When people engage in segregated and restricted interaction with other people, as with the opposite sex, two consequences are likely. First, failure to interact with "the other side," whether that other side is a race or a sex, robs people of corrective information about the other side. Stereotypes are most likely to arise and to be sustained when they are immune to reality testing. We can think that blacks are intellectually inferior when we do not interact with them, and where little contradictory information is possible. The same logic applies to men's relations or non-relations with women.

Second, differential interaction is likely to sustain initial conceptions of differentness. When men relate to women in particular kinds of situations, and not in others, then inferences rooted in the observed differences are readily attributed to women and sustained in a circular kind of reasoning. Atkinson (1964) following Lewin, has identified this historically-primitive form of scientific thought as Aristotelian in its logic. It is a view that characterized the "natural" propensity of an object, its "essential nature," according to its modal way of behaving. There are "causal tendencies which are intrinsic to different objects" by virtue of their respective class memberships.

(3) Role documentation. When people interact with others in relations whose axis of meaning is sexual, they will tend to attribute sexual role characteristics to the actors themselves. We are economical in our thinking. We tend to associate the part played with the actor, so that one becomes the other. This means that, if one is to identify himself as something other than the role which he or she occupies, then he or she must deviate from role prescriptions. Validation of identity requires deviance from role prescriptions. Even on so modest a scale, however, the deviant is ordinarily restored to accepted modes of action. This is not to say that girls and women do not deviate, nor is it to say that departure from the modal role invalidates the principle. It is only to identify one set of forces that works on females, or one set of costs which they must ordinarily incur, if they are to establish an identity independent of their class membership.

We concluded this study with some thoughts on the nature of social change and with some specific recommendations. Our guiding assumptions were: (1) that efforts to effect change in social arrangements should be tied in to the value of self-fulfilment; (2) that women, like men, are complex creatures with an extremely great variety of untapped capacities and unrecognized and unmet needs; (3) that the kinds of changes envisaged create incentives for women to develop, and do not presume to force growth and the attainment of freedom; (4) that the kinds of changes required attack the structure of interaction settings and of social systems out of which SRD is generated.

Chief among our recommendations were proposals designed to promote co-educational youth groups, the acquisition of non-intellective skills usually associated with the other sex, improved counselling of girls, the promotion of occupational attraction and practical opportunities, and the

revitalization of our universities to bring intellectual enrichment to the lives of housewives in their homes.

We conclude this report with a plea. The writer believes that interest in "women's rights" is transient. It is too easy to identify an historical phase with historical necessity. So long as racial strife and unpopular wars set the tone of people's thoughts, they are likely to show some small measure of interest in the status of women. But when racial strife abates, for whatever reason, and when unpopular wars end, then we are faced with the possibility that citizens and governments alike will show less enthusiasm for the subject matter of this report. We are reminded that there have been other periods of intense interest in women's rights. As Frieden (1963) has observed, interest waned then, too.

It is the writer's opinion that only a continuing of empirical data can pick up where enthusiasm leaves off. If ours is an information society, especially one which is persuaded by cost-benefit analyses, then it is imperative that research on the subject of women not depend upon the establishment of Royal Commissions. It is too important a matter to wait upon unlikely historical accidents.

APPENDIX A

METHODOLOGY

APPENDIX A

METHODOLOGY

Four issues will be considered in this appendix. First, we will discuss problems associated with the selection of the sample, and the characteristics of it. Second, the questionnaires will be described. There were two per child, one per mother, and one per home-room teacher. Third, some data will be presented bearing on differences between respondents and children whose parents refused to permit their participation in the study. Fourth, the instruments used to measure SRD will be assessed in terms of their test-retest reliability.

The Sample. The sample was selected with a couple of constraints very much in mind. The first of these was the necessity of completing the study within a year and a half, from conception of the problem to the final report. The following phases had to be allowed for in the time available: (1) formulation of the problem and statement of relevant theory; (2) selection of the sample, starting from the various provincial Departments of Education, and working down through the educational hierarchy all the way to individual school principals in some jurisdictions; (3) review of the research literature and collection of relevant measuring instruments, a task which has continued throughout the life of the project; (4) construction and pretesting of numerous questionnaires with children, parents, and teachers; (5) printing the final version of all instruments; (6) distribution of the questionnaires in British Columbia, Nova Scotia, Ontario, and Quebec; (7) proofing and indexing completed forms; (8) keypunching and verifying respondents' precoded answers onto data cards; (9) development of computer programmes, preparation of the data on magnetic tape for running and computer analysis; and finally, (10) interpretation of the results and preparation of the final report.

The second constraint was the necessity of conducting a study across the breadth of the country, and yet keeping costs at a reasonable level. In the absence of a trained staff of interviewers in the field and considering that our sample consisted of school-age children whose days are spent in school, it was decided to use a self-administered questionnaire. The children's own teachers were able to assist us since the forms were administered in class. This not only conserved funds, but ensured that the children were answering the forms in the presence of someone they knew.

Having chosen the above procedure, the most serious hurdles were (1) obtaining the approval of school boards for entry into their systems, and (2) obtaining the written consent of parents. It was originally assumed that the name of the Commission would go a long way to win both kinds of approval. Perhaps it did; but we were surprised at the caution, indeed trepidation evinced by many of the school boards. Unfortunately, this occurred in certain centres of population considered most important for the study. Several examples will suffice.

In Community A, the board's approval was sought and initially obtained. A set of the questionnaires was sent for the perusal of staff professionals, and no objection to its content was registered. Some time later, a member of the project presented himself to distribute the forms to the schools in the system. By this time, school authorities were expressing some concern about the "sensitivity" of the study. This was a surprise, since the questionnaires in no way touched upon the delicate area of sexual behaviour itself. The objections were to questions about such things as how much education the child's father had. Even after patient negotiations, school officials decided not to participate in the study. Eleventh hour contacts with several smaller boards produced a few more subjects to replace the sizable urban population that had been lost.

Community B officials were informed by Community A officials of the "sensitive" nature of the questionnaire. They, too, decided to withdraw from the study as administration was about to begin, even though they had not inspected the forms themselves.

Communities C and D were afraid of adverse publicity in the mass media in connection with their collaboration in the project. In Community C, a reporter was preparing a feature story on the "misuse" of children's time in school by participating in the study. Officials in Community D reversed an earlier decision to co-operate. They were still reacting to a recent case involving the use of a four-letter word in a textbook.

Finally, there were several boards, as in Community B, which agreed to our entry into their system. But they were anxious about the possible consequences if their collaboration were known, so a promise was exacted from the project director that they would in no way be identified as having participated.

Sixty per cent of school boards approached consented to the study with confidence in the study's worth and the good faith of the researchers and the Commission. The remaining 40 per cent refused either at once or later.

Since a strictly random sample was out of the question, it was decided to attempt to get a sample with as much heterogeneity or internal differentiation as possible. This meant selecting schools to include the French and English languages, Roman Catholics and Protestants, a cross-section of social class, rural and urban environment, and a range of grades and ages. A rather large sample would permit rather detailed cross-tabulations, based on sufficient size samples in each cell, in order to test for interaction effects.

The total sample of children who completed both booklets numbered approximately 7,500. They were distributed among the provinces as follows: 15 per cent (British Columbia); 20 per cent (Nova Scotia); and 33 per cent from each of Ontario and Quebec. There were about 30 per cent from rural homes (rural and village schools, and consolidated township schools), and 70 per cent from urban homes.

The majority of the children were Roman Catholic, largely because of the French-speaking sample. Boys and girls were almost equally represented. Grouping the subjects by age, the total sample was distributed as follows: age 11 and under, age 12, and age 13, each about 15 per cent; age 14, 30 per cent; and age 15 and over, 25 per cent. The French-speaking children tended to be older than the English-speaking children because grades eight to ten were sampled in Quebec and grades five to nine in the other provinces.

We chose the age range of 10 to 16 for two reasons. First, we wanted children old enough to be able to complete the forms themselves. Second, we wanted to sample a school population not yet depleted by post-16-year-old dropouts. These practical reasons were supported by our theoretical assumption that significant events, such as dating, are taking place in this age group and affect the broad contours of children's sex-role imagery. The early preschool years are obviously important, but the fuller social significance and definition of children's beliefs and attitudes materialize and crystallize during the school years.

The parents of nearly 5,500 of the children's sample completed the parents' questionnaire. Five thousand of this figure were mothers, and the remainder were stepmothers,

fathers and guardians. About 15 per cent were from British Columbia, 20 per cent from Nova Scotia, and 33 per cent from each of Ontario and Quebec.

Delineation of the sample should not obscure our research purposes. Some readers will be tempted to read descriptive generalizations into the data; for example, differences between French and English-Canadians. This would be a misuse of the data.

We wish to induce theoretical generalizations. Our goal is the generation of what Glaser and Strauss (1967) have labeled "grounded theory". We have, therefore, assembled a large and heterogeneous sample of children, the better to sample theoretical relationships. In other words, our purposes are analytic and explanatory, rather than merely descriptive.

The Instruments. A total of some 30 children's questionnaires were constructed and pretested during the summer of 1967. It was necessary to rely primarily upon children using local playgrounds because of the late date. Our requirements for the questionnaires were: (1) that the concepts be readily understandable by children in grade five, about 10 years old, and that they not be so age-specific as to offend more mature subjects of ages 16 and 17; (2) that the instructions be sufficiently specific and understandable so that little intervention by teachers would be required; (3) that the instruments be brief enough to complete in approximately 45 minutes apiece.

All of these goals were met to a large extent, but unfortunately not completely. The forms proved difficult in places, especially in Part 4 of Booklet 1, for pupils in grade five. This meant that the administering teachers had to do more explaining than was expected. And Booklet 1 required more time than the allotted 45 minutes.

Much effort went into the development of the scales to measure the SRD variables. They appear as Part 1, Booklet 1, and Parts 4 and 8, Booklet 2. In each case, the universe of content to be tapped by a scale was defined and its internal composition specified. Then items were selected which we hoped represented the domain of the universe of content. We selected items we judged normatively good or bad in content, and which seemed to vary in degree of sex-typing. Normative content would permit separate indices of evaluation of the sexes to be derived; and varying the degree of sex-typing

would, we hoped, yield a relatively normal distribution of scores, rather than produce a dichotomy or bunch subjects at one end.

All SRD scales were presented as seven-point rating scales. If children had any difficulty understanding them, the teacher likened them to thermometers, "except that they measure something else." Abstract as they were, the scales appear to have been quite well understood by the respondents.

One additional sex-role scale was included in the children's form. It consisted of eight items taken from Kammeyer's (1964) scales, seven of them from his role scale, and the other one from his personality belief scale. This scale was included to function as a "tracer" so that we could better relate our work to Kammeyer's, and particularly our SRD measures to what he means by traditional and modern feminine roles. Pretesting indicated that children had some difficulty understanding those questions, particularly the personality items, so an abridged version of Kammeyer's scale was adopted. This was labeled SRD-Feminine Role.

Finally, scales and questions were constructed to get at a number of variables which were hypothesized to be related in some way to the major dependent variables. Some of the independent variables were: birth order and number of brothers and sisters; size and sex composition of peer group, and perception of one's own role in it; amount of agreement between parents and peers about desirable behaviour; smoking and dating behaviour; the distribution of parental responsibilities; amount of power in determining what the family does; religion and religiosity of self and family; father's occupation and education; mother's occupation and education; the amount and kind of feeling expressed between the parents; school grades; and educational and occupational aspirations. Sociometric questions were also included. These asked the respondents to identify children in their classroom according to a number of criteria, e.g., popularity, influence, masculinity, femininity, liking for school.

During the latter part of the summer of 1967, as the English forms began to firm up, work began on the French version of all the forms. French forms were translated for meaning rather than literally. Pretests with French-Canadian children indicated quite clearly that older children would have to be sampled because of the greater complexity of the French format. The Quebec portion of the study lagged because of the time required to go from one language to the other.

This meant that administration of the French forms did not take place until approximately a month after the administration of the English forms was completed.

Two other questionnaires were developed during the summer. The most important of these was the "Parent's Questionnaire", to be answered by the mothers of children participating in the study. This form was sealed in an envelope and taken home by the child to his mother. If she completed the form, the child returned it to school in an envelope which had also been provided by the project. The mother's responses to the questionnaire, innocuous as it was, were strictly confidential (assuming that her child did not open the envelope).

The major ingredients of the mother's questionnaire were: a scale specially developed to measure traditionalism (loyalty to traditional institutions, such as the church, state, family, and school); Kammeyer's two scales measuring conceptions of the feminine role; the distribution of authority and tasks between the parents; and information about the father's job and the mother's, if she had one.

The teacher's questionnaire included questions tapping the following: the extent of sex-typing of pupil's behaviour, a sociometric describing members of the class (as popular, tomboyish, influential, academically capable, etc.); rules of the school; personal background; and measures of traditionalism and the two Kammeyer scales.

Participation Bias. One of the sources of bias in the sample has already been mentioned. That was the willingness or unwillingness of various school boards to permit their systems to be included in the sample. The effect of this decision was felt largely in terms of the representativeness of the sample. It is probably safe to assume that this organizational bias did not interact significantly with respondents' answers on the questionnaires.

But there is another bias at the level of the respondent. It was necessary in all three of the English-speaking provinces to use letters of permission. The letter indicated who was sponsoring the study, what the purpose of it was, and that the areas of behaviour asked about would not be especially personal. Parents were further assured that neither the school system nor the government would have access to the data. Parents were asked to return a consent slip to the school if they wished their children to be included in the sample. They were

also asked to return the slip even if they wished their children to be excluded, so that we would know the permission letter had reached them. Our policy required the exclusion of children who did not return the permission slip, as well as those whose parents did not want them included.

As might be expected, the rate of participation varied greatly among school systems. Although the over-all rate of approval was approximately 66 per cent, school systems varied from 33 to nearly 100 per cent consent. Did the co-operative families differ from the unco-operative families? If so, how? It is possible that whatever factors led some to consent and others to refuse may interact with such relationships as may emerge. The effect of this kind of interaction would be to limit the generality of our findings.

One school system offered to help us answer this question. We were allowed to hire two of their professional staff to tabulate information from confidential school records which are maintained for all children in their charge. Hiring their own staff permitted them to honour the confidentiality of their records, while at the same time giving us some valuable information. We provided a detailed code for analyzing the school records, and they submitted this information to us on an anonymous basis, indicating only whether the children were participants or non-participants in the study. It is this information that we report next.

There were 90 children in grade five who were permitted to take part, as opposed to 234 in the same grade who were not given permission. The figures for grade seven were 114 and 161, respectively. Our observations are therefore based on 204 participants and 395 non-participants for a total of 599.

First, some "non-differences". There was no bias as to sex. Boys were no more or less likely to be found among the non-participants than were girls. The two groups did not differ with respect to physical mobility; that is, the non-participant group was no more likely to include children whose families were mobile or transient. No differences emerged for the family's religious affiliation, children's physical handicaps or absenteeism from school The two groups were made up equally of native-born and immigrant children.

There was a significant tendency in both grades five and seven for the non-participants to be drawn from the working class, as measured by Blishen's scale for Canada (1968). One or both of the parents of non-participants

were more likely to be new Canadians. So far as individual characteristics of the children are concerned, non-participants were significantly older than their classmates and scored lower on standardized intelligence tests. Non-participants in grade seven did less well academically, although there was no evidence of such a trend in the grade five sample.

Social class seems to be a common denominator running through the differences between the two groups. Just what it is about social class that should make a difference is less obvious. We did note significant relationships between social class and a number of other characteristics. Working-class children, for example, tended to be older than their classmates, did less well academically, and appeared less intelligent. Working-class children in the sample were also compared with working-class children who were not in the sample. There were no significant differences between them on the information available.

It may well be that the lower rate of participation for working-class children can be attributed to working-class suspicion of a middle-class institution, with its middle-class values, teachers and administrators. It was the author's impression that some school systems had better relations with their clientele than others. It may be the case that distrust and conflict in a school system first manifests itself in the loss of working-class cooperation.

Test-Retest Reliability. If one uses a yardstick, he naturally expects repeated measurements of the same object to yield roughly the same magnitudes. Psychological scales cannot be trusted quite so readily. An intelligence test yields one score on one occasion and frequently a different score on a later occasion. Social scientists are realistic enough not to expect the same score on different occasions for a variety of reasons, and so they inject a number of cautions (Webb, Campbell, Schwartz and Sechrest, 1966). If the same score cannot be obtained on two occasions, nonetheless it is hoped that people will at least score in the same relative order on repeated testings. If Jim scores higher than John at time 1, then it is hoped the same order will be preserved at time 2, even if their respective scores fluctuate.

In the absence of information testifying to the merits of the SRD measures early in our analyses, we decided simply to trichotomize subjects' scores. That is, the entire distribution of scores was divided into thirds, high, medium and

low. A subject was then assigned to one of these thirds on the basis of his score. We took this conservative position in order not to claim greater precision for the various instruments than they had demonstrated. Correlation coefficients for approximately 160 boys and girls are summarized in Table A-1. We report, also, correlations for Ontario boys and girls, separately, and for Quebec boys and girls, separately.

Several features of Table A-1 warrant comment. First, only one of the correlations reaches the desirable level of .90 (Quebec boys on the power measure). This fact justifies our treating the different variables as trichotomies, and our policy of looking at both ends of SRD measures when run against the independent or explanatory variables.

Second, SRD-Traits and SRD-Behaviour were noticeably less reliably measured than were the other indices. This means that children were more consistent in their judgments of the sexes about jobs and relations with others than they were about personality traits and behaviour. In other words, there was greater clarity in their conceptions of the sexes when the sexes were defined relationally and social structurally, than when they were defined psychologically or abstracted from social situations.

One of the implications of the previous finding is that we should have more confidence in empirical relations involving the social structural indicators of SRD. To the extent that the Traits and Behaviour scales failed to validly tap the constructs they were designed to tap, then we should expect to find little in the way of significant relationships. That is, if our hypotheses are correct, and if the constructs are validly measured, then we should expect to obtain consistent and significant distributions of SRD as functions of their determinants. But if the indicators are deficient, then we should find "chance" or random distributions of SRD even if the hypotheses are correct. In any event, a note of caution concerning SRD-Traits and SRD-Behaviour is advised.

Third, we note that there is consistently greater reliability in the French-speaking sample than in the English-speaking sample, and this is particularly true for the SRD-Traits and SRD-Behaviour indicators. In fact in all 14 comparisons the Quebec children were more reliable than their Ontario counterparts. We attribute this rather striking finding to the span of time between the test and retest. The two testings of the Ontario children were separated by five to

TABLE A-1

TEST-RETEST RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS FOR SIX MEASURES OF SRD, AND FOR MEASURE OF CHILD'S POWER IN HIS FAMILY

	Traits	Behaviour	Jobs	Peer Relations	Authority Relations	Feminine Role	Power	Approximate Sample
Total	.50	.49	.75	.70	.70	.75	.69	161
Ontario girls	.17	.20	.71	.70	.70	.73	.57	54
Ontario boys	.51	.47	.64	.61	.61	.64	.65	52
Quebec girls	.71	.71	.76	.73	.73	.78	.76	28
Quebec boys	.80	.76	.83	.70	.70	.82	.90	27

six weeks compared to two to three weeks for the Quebec children. We note, too, that SRD-Traits and SRD-Behaviour fared considerably better when only two or three weeks elapsed. In fact, all the reliability coefficients exceeded .71 in the Quebec subsample, even though the number of children on which each coefficient was based did not exceed 30. This suggests that perhaps the reservations expressed above are unduly pessimistic. Even so, it seems better not to claim too much for the indices.

APPENDIX B

Permission letter to parents

Children's booklets #1 and #2*

*Major items from Booklets #1 and #2. Original numbering of items is retained.

NATIONAL STUDY OF CANADIAN YOUTH

Dear Parent,

You may recall that the Government of Canada recently established a Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada. In order to make its report to the Government, and so that it may base its conclusions and recommendations on a body of fact, the Commission is currently sponsoring a number of research projects to obtain such basic information.

One of the studies is being conducted at the University of Waterloo. It involves the study of a select sample of young people from across Canada, in order to determine the ways in which their conceptions of the roles of boys and girls develop as they mature.

We are seeking your permission to include your son or daughter in this study.

While we will not ask questions which are very personal, we nevertheless wish to assure you that all answers given will be strictly confidential. They will remain in the hands of the project director and will be used only for the purpose stated. Neither the school nor government will have access to them. We are interested in group tendencies, and not in particular individual's answers.

Would you kindly sign the form below, indicating with a check mark whether or not we may include your son or daughter in the study. Even if you decide that you want him to be excluded from the study, please send the form back to school with him so that we know you have received it.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Yours very truly,

Dr. Ronald D. Lambert, Project Director
Departments of Sociology and of Psychology
University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario

NATIONAL STUDY OF CANADIAN YOUTH

I am willing to permit my son or daughter to participate in the study described above ....

I wish my son or daughter to be **excluded** from the study described above ....

Student's Name ....

Parent's Signature ....

Children's Questionnaires

Booklet #1

Part 1

In this part of the questionnaire, we are interested in how you think boys and girls your age actually act. We want to know what they are really like.

Look at item #1 below. We want to know in this item how tough boys and girls your age really are. If it is very true that boys your age are generally tough, then you would circle "7", the highest number on the boys scale. If it is not true that boys your age are generally tough, then you would circle "1", the smallest number on the boys scale. Or, if you think that it is partly true that boys your age are tough, then you would circle one of the numbers between "1" and "7" depending on how true you think it is. After you tell us how tough boys your age generally are, then you would tell us how tough girls your age generally are. And then you would go on to the next item.

Please do not skip any items or any scales.

Description	Boys Your Age							Girls Your Age						
1. tough	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. hardworking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. sneaky	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. generous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. noisy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. outgoing and friendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. awkward and clumsy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. trustworthy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. obedient	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. mischievous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. careful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. bossy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

In the following items, we would like to know whether these are the sorts of things boys and girls your age should or should not do. How suitable are they for boys your age? How suitable are they for girls your age? If you think something is alright for boys your age to do, or something they should do, then you would circle "7", the highest number on the boys scale. But if you think it is something which is really not suitable or is something which should not be done, then you would circle "1" on the boys scale. Or you would circle a number between "1" and "7", depending on how súitable it is for boys your age to do. Then tell us about girls your age. Please do not skip any items or any scales.

Actions	Boys Your Age	Girls Your Age
13. cry when hurt	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
14. do dishes	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
15. play rough sports	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
16. dance	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
17. play softball	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
18. go out alone after dark	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
19. swear	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
20. learn to cook and bake	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
21. show-off	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
22. make their own beds	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
23. go on dates	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
24. go on a long trip alone	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Next, we would like to know how suitable some jobs are for boys and girls when they grow up. Circle "7" if you think a job is really quite suitable, "1" if you think it isn't suitable, and a number between "1" and "7" if it is only partly suitable. The more suitable the job is, the higher the number you would circle. Do this for boys and for girls. Do not skip any items or any scales.

Jobs		Boys When They Are Grown Up	Girls When They Are Grown Up
25.	medical doctor	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
26.	cashier in a restaurant	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
27.	bus driver	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
28.	librarian	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
29.	grade school teacher	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
30.	cook	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
31.	clerk in a store	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
32.	scientist	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
33.	Prime Minister of Canada	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
34.	usher in a movie theatre	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
35.	principal of a school	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
36.	a judge	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Part 2

56. We would like to know what you think about the following things. Put a check mark beside each item in the column which says how much you agree or disagree.

	1 Agree	2 Agree a little	3 Don't know	4 Disagree a little	5 Disagree
57. It is more important for a boy to go to university than a girl.					
58. It is the main duty of the wife to keep her husband and children happy.					
59. It is the father's job to punish the children.					
60. A woman's place is in the home.					
61. Men are better leaders than women.					
62. Some jobs are "women's work" and other jobs are "men's work" and it is easy to tell the difference.					
63. The husband should have the final say about really big decisions in the family.					
64. Women should not have authority over men.					

Part 3

Now we would like to know how you feel about some things. The pages are divided into quarters, and at the top of each quarter of the page is a word we would like you to describe. Here is how to do it.

Pretend that somebody is telling us how he feels about <u>babies</u>.

He might describe <u>babies</u> this way:

good	1	(2)	3	4	5	6	7	bad
useful	1	2	3	4	5	(6)	7	useless
tough	1	2	3	4	5	6	(7)	soft

He thinks that babies are usually good, so he circled "2". He thinks they are quite useless because they can't do anything, so he circled "6". And he thinks that babies are very soft, so he circled "7".

So the words at the two ends of each scale tell you what the scale means. All you have to do is circle the number on each scale which tells us how you feel about the thing you are describing.

Be sure to circle one and only one number on each scale. Do not skip any items.

77. <u>MY FATHER</u>

good	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	bad
useful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	useless
first	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	last
smart	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	stupid
square	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	cool
tough	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	soft

selfish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unselfish
friendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unfriendly
kind	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	cruel
important	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unimportant

81. MY MOTHER

good	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	bad
useful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	useless
first	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	last
smart	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	stupid
square	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	cool
tough	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	soft
selfish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unselfish
friendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unfriendly
kind	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	cruel
important	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unimportant

83. I AM

good	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	bad
useful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	useless
first	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	last
smart	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	stupid
square	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	cool
tough	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	soft
selfish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unselfish

friendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unfriendly
kind	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	cruel
important	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unimportant

Part 5

103. Sometimes friends and parents don't agree on everything. Please tell us if your friends and your parents agree or disagree about the following things. Check one of the spaces after each of the items beginning on the next page.

	1 Disagree	2 Disagree a little	3 Usually agree
1. what clothes to wear			
2. when to come in the house			
3. what to do in free time			
4. when to do chores			
5. what to spend money on			
6. when to do homework			
7. what friends to have and spend time with			
8. where to go to have fun			
9. how to behave around grownups			
10. how to behave when with boys			
11. how to behave when with girls			
12. how to act and what to do at school			

108. Now we would like to know <u>what you do when you are with your friends</u>. Below are some things which young people sometimes do. Tell us what you do when you are with friends who are boys by checking a space for each item in the Boys column. And then tell us about your friends who are girls by checking a space for each item in the Girls column. <u>Be sure to answer both Boys and Girls columns</u>.

	BOYS			GIRLS		
	1 never	2 sometimes	3 often	1 never	2 sometimes	3 often
1. play games						
2. go to movies						
3. talk about boys						
4. play sports						
5. talk about our families						
6. listen to radio or records						
7. spend time goof-ing around						
8. talk about girls						
9. watch television						
10. go car riding						
11. do chores						
12. talk about personal problems						

	BOYS 1 never	 2 sometimes	 3 often	GIRLS 1 never	 2 sometimes	 3 often
13. do school work						
14. go on dates						
15. getting into trouble with grownups						
16. going to club, church, and other group meetings						
17. going on hikes, bike rides						
18. fighting						

109. Do any of your good friends smoke? 1 ... yes 2 ... no

110. Do you smoke? 1 ... yes 2 ... no

111. If you answered yes in question 110, how much do you smoke?

1 ... about 1 cigarette a day
2 ... about 2 to 5 cigarettes a day
3 ... about 1/2 package a day
4 ... about 1 package a day
5 ... more than 1 package a day

112. If you answered no in question 110, have you ever tried a cigarette?
1 ... yes 2 ... no

---

113. Do any of your friends date? 1 ... yes 2 ... no

114. Do you date? 1 ... yes 2 ... no

115. If you answered yes in question 114, how often do you date?

1 ... just on group dates

2 ... just on very special occasions

3 ... about once a month

4 ... about twice a month

5 ... about once a week

6 ... more often than once a week

116. If you answered yes in question 114, how many boys (girls) have you dated?

1 ... one 2 ... two 3 ... three to five 4 ... five to ten

5 ... more than ten

119. If your parents didn't like one of your friends, what would you do? (check one)

1 ... stop seeing my friend

2 ... keep seeing my friend, but not tell my parents

3 ... keep seeing my friend and let my parents know that I was

Part 6

121. How much do you like school? (Be as frank as you can)

1 ... I hate it

2 ... I don't like it

3 ... sometimes I don't like it

4 ... like it and don't like it about the same

5 ... I like it some

6 ... I like it

7 ... I like it very much

Booklet #2

Part 1

In this part of the questionnaire, we would like you to tell us about the kinds of things your mother and father do around the house. Use the scales in the 1st column to describe your father or stepfather. Use the scales in the 2nd column to describe your mother or stepmother.

For example, look at the 1st item below. If your father often "does the shopping", then circle "7" on the father's scale. If he never does the shopping, then circle "1" on the father's scale. Or, if he shops some of the time, then circle a number between "1" and "7 ", depending on how often he shops. Then tell us about your mother on the mother's scale. And then go on to the next item.

Do not skip any items or any scales in the two columns.

		FATHER	MOTHER
1.	does the shopping	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2.	gets father's break-fast on work days	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3.	repairs things around the house	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4.	cleans up the house after visitors leave	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5.	does the evening dishes	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6.	moves heavy furniture	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7.	looks after the children in the evening and on the weekends	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7

		FATHER							MOTHER						
8.	does the family laundry	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9.	drives the family car	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10.	helps the children with their school work	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11.	writes excuse notes when children are absent from school	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12.	visits relatives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13.	talks with the neighbours	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14.	goes to meetings and clubs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15.	goes out with his or her friends	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16.	goes to church	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17.	answers the telephone when both are at home	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

The following items are answered the same way you answered the last ones. Again, "1" means never and "7" means usually. The bigger the number between "1" and "7", the more usual it is for your father or your mother to act that way. Do not skip any items. Be sure to circle a number on each scale in each column.

		FATHER							MOTHER						
18.	scolds and punishes the children when they don't behave	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19.	threatens or warns the children	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

		FATHER							MOTHER						
20.	tells the children when to come in the house	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21.	sees to it that the children do their home-work	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22.	tells the children what they can and can't do	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23.	explains to the children what is expected of them and why	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24.	finds out when you do something you shouldn't have done	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25.	sees to it that the children do their errands	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26.	makes you feel guilty or bad when you do something you shouldn't have	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27.	whose punishment or disapproval you dislike or fear the most	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28.	takes the children places	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29.	enjoys and takes time to talk with the children	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30.	notices when the children are unhappy and tries to cheer them up	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	FATHER							MOTHER						
31. does things with the children	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32. makes you feel that what you do and think is important	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33. says "hello" when the children come in and says "good night" when they go to bed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34. helps you with things when you're having trouble with it	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35. has the most to say about what big things are bought	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
36. has the most to say about how the children are to be punished	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
37. has the most to say about where to go on family outings	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
38. has the most to say about what jobs are to be done around the house and who is to do them	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
39. has the most to say about how much allowance the children will get	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
40. has the most to say about who to have into the house	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
41. has the most to say about what you will wear	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Part 2

In this section, we would like to know what part you play in your family. Please give us as accurate a picture as you can.

44. We would like to know what kinds of things you help your parents decide. What do you have a say in? How much do your parents take into account your opinions and what you want when they decide things? Put a check mark beside each item below in the column which says how much of a say you have.

		1 No Say at all	2 Some Say But not much	3 Quite a Lot of Say	4 a Lot of Say
1.	What time to come in at night.				
2.	How much homework to do, and when				
3.	What chores to do around the house, and when				
4.	Where to go on family outings				
5.	What clothes to wear to school				
6.	Who to chum around with				
7.	What time to go to bed				
8.	Who to date and who not to date				
9.	What to do with your money				
10.	What to do in your spare time				

	1 No Say at all	2 Some Say But not much	3 Quite a Lot of Say	4 a Lot of Say
11. How much allowance you get				
12. What to read and what not to read				
13. What to watch and what not to watch on television				
14. What family things to buy				
15. Where the family will go on vacation				

Part 3

53. What is your family's religion?

1 ... Roman Catholic

2 ... United Church

3 ... Anglican

4 ... Presbyterian

5 ... Lutheran

6 ... Baptist

7 ... Greek Orthodox

8 ... Jewish

9 ... Other

54. Would you say that your family is a religious family?

1 ... yes   2 ... just kind of religious   3 ... no

55. How often does your father go to church? (check one answer only)

1 ... never

2 ... few times a year

3 ... once a month

4 ... twice a month

5 ... once a week

6 ... more than once a week

56. How often does your mother go to church? (check one answer only)

1 ... never
2 ... few times a year
3 ... once a month
4 ... twice a month
5 ... once a week
6 ... more than once a week

57. How often do you go to Sunday School or to church? (check one answer only)

1 ... never
2 ... few times a year
3 ... once a month
4 ... twice a month
5 ... once a week
6 ... more than once a week

78. How far did your father go in school? (check one answer)

1 ... part of grade school

2 ... all of grade school

3 ... part of high school

4 ... all of high school

5 ... business school

6 ... technical school

7 ... part of university

8 ... all of university

9 ... all of university and some more

---

79. Does your father have a job?

1 ... yes, full time 2 ... yes, part time 3 ... no

---

81. What is your father's job? (if you don't have a father or a stepfather, then tell us what your father's job used to be.)

....

....

....

82. What does (or did) your father do in his job? (Please tell us all you can.)

....

....

....

---

83. Does your father like his job? (Check one answer)

1 ... yes, very much
2 ... yes
3 ... yes and no about the same
4 ... I don't know
5 ... no
6 ... no, very much

84. Is your father's job the kind you would like to have? (check one answer)

1 ... yes, very much
2 ... yes
3 ... I don't know
4 ... no
5 ... no, very much

92. How far did your mother go in school? (check one answer)

1 ... part of grade school

2 ... all of grade school

3 ... part of high school

4 ... all of high school

5 ... business school

6 ... technical school

7 ... part of university

8 ... all of university

9 ... all of university and some more

---

93. Does your mother have a job?

1 ... yes, full time   2 ... yes, part time   3 ...no

94. If you answered yes in question #93, what is your mother's job? Please tell as much as you can.

....

....

95. If your mother has a job, does she like it? (check one answer)

1 ... yes, very much   3 ... yes and no about the same   5 ... no

2 ... yes   4 ... I don't know   6 ... no, very much

97. If your mother has a job, what is the main reason why she does? (check one answer)

1 ... because my father wants her to

2 ... because we need the money

3 ... because she likes her work

4 ... so she can have her own money

5 ... so she can get out of the house

6 ... other (what?..)

7 ... I don't know

100. Do you wish your mother did not have a job?

1 ... yes   2 ... sometimes   3 ... no

101. If your mother does not have a job, would she like to have a job?

1 ... yes, very much   2.... yes, a bit   3 ... no

4 ... I don't know

102. If your mother does not have a job, why does she not have a job?

1 ... she can't find one

2 ... the children are too young

3 ... she believes she should not have a job

4 ... my father doesn't want her to work

5 ... there is too much to do at home

6 ... other (what?..)

7 ... I don't know

Part 7

121. What kind of grades do you get in school? (If you don't actually get grades, then estimate or guess.)

1 ... mostly D's   2 ... mostly C's   3 ... mostly B's

4 ... mostly A's

122. How far do you want to go in school?

1 ... end of grade school

2 ... end of technical or business school

3 ... end of high school

4 ... end of university

---

123. What do you want to do or be when you grow up?

....

....

....

124. What kind of a job would you most like to have when you grow up? (check one answer.)

1 ... a job where I work mostly with my brains

2 ... a job where I work mostly with my muscles

125. What kind of a job would you most like to have when you grow up? (check one answer)

1 ... a job where I can tell others what to do

2 ... a job where I can be my own boss

126. What kind of a job would you most like to have when you grow up? (check one answer)

1 ... a job where I can make a lot of money

2 ... a job where I can help other people

---

127. Here are ten things which may help a person to do well in the world. Put a check mark beside the two things which you think are most important.

1 ... good character

2 ... people your family knows

3 ... brains

4 ... money

5 ... hard work

6 ... good luck

7 ... appearance, how you look

8 ... friends

9 ... education

10 ... not being afraid

Part 8

We are interested in this section in how boys and girls your age behave with other people Remember, "7" means often, "1" means never, and the numbers between "1" and "7" mean sometimes. The higher the number you circle, the more often boys or girls do what you are describing. Circle only one number on each scale. Do not skip any items or any scales.

		BOYS YOUR AGE	GIRLS YOUR AGE
128.	do what their parents say	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
129.	try hard to please the teacher	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
130.	help parents with household chores	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
131.	tell parents where they are going	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
132.	come in when they are supposed to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
133.	ask their parents for money	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
134.	wear what they want to school	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
135.	tell their parents when they think they are wrong	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7

136.	pick their own friends	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
137.	decide for themselves what they want to be when they grow up	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
138.	stick up for their brothers and sisters	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
139.	obey older sisters	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
140.	help younger brothers and sisters	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
141.	keep secrets which their friends tell them	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
142.	share things with boys and girls their age	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
143.	tell younger brothers and sisters what to do	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
144.	tell off girls your age	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
145.	swear in front of boys	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
146.	tell girls your age what to do	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
147.	tell boys your age what to do	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

APPENDIX C

Letter to parent

Parents' questionnaire*

*Only Part 5 of the Parent's Questionnaire is reproduced here.

NATIONAL STUDY OF CANADIAN YOUTH

Dear Parent,

The enclosed questionnaire is part of a larger national study being conducted on behalf of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada. You recently permitted your son or daughter to participate in this study, and for this we wish to thank you.

We are asking for your cooperation in completing this questionnaire. It will supplement your son or daughter's view of the roles of boys and girls. Since the Commission is concerned principally with Canadian women, we are asking the mothers of the school children to answer the questionnaire. However, if a mother is unable to answer the form, we should be pleased if the father would do so.

We wish to emphasize that your answers are strictly confidential. They will be used only by the researcher and only for the purpose mentioned. To ensure your anonymity, we would appreciate it if you would seal the questionnaire, when completed, in the enclosed envelope and then ask your son or daughter to return it promptly to school. The researcher will code the questionnaire and it will thereafter be identified only by a code number. Our interest is in group tendencies, and not in individuals' answers.

Finally, it is most important to the success and accuracy of the study that all questions be answered as frankly and as completely as possible.

Thank you for your assistance.

Yours very truly

Dr. Ronald D. Lambert, Project Director
Departments of Sociology and of Psychology
The University of Waterloo
Waterloo, Ontario

Parent's Questionnaire*

Part 5**

> This is the last part of the questionnaire. It contains a number of statements with which you may agree or disagree. Please circle the answer which best represents your feelings about each statement. Please answer all items. Alternative answers are as follows: A=Agree; AS=Agree Somewhat; U=Uncertain; DS=Disagree Somewhat; D=Disagree.

		1	2	3	4	5
80.	A son or daughter's marriage partner should be someone who is acceptable to his or her parents.	A	AS	U	DS	D
81.	When a nation is at war, it doesn't really matter whether the cause is right or wrong, one must support his country.	A	AS	U	DS	D
82.	Children should be taught to have a lot of respect for their parents.	A	AS	U	DS	D
83.	Teachers should at all times present a "respectable" image to the community.	A	AS	U	DS	D
84.	Generally speaking, it is best all around if a boy and a girl getting married are of the same religion.	A	AS	U	DS	D
85.	Our kind of government works best when there are only two major political parties.	A	AS	U	DS	D
86.	A marriage is really complete only if there are children.	A	AS	U	DS	D

---

* Only Part 5 of the Parent's Questionnaire is reproduced here.

** Items comprising the Traditionalism Scale:
80-84, 87-90, 93-96;

Feminine Personality Belief Scale:
97, 98, 100-103;

Feminine Role Preference Scale:
104-107, 109-111, 113, 114.

		1 A	2 AS	3 U	4 DS	5 D
87.	It is important to teach a child as early as possible the manners and morals of his society.					
88.	Morality depends on one's belief in a Supreme Being.	A	AS	U	DS	D
89.	Children should learn the value of hard work and self-discipline.	A	AS	U	DS	D
90.	Traditional ways of doing things should be retained because they have with-stood the test of time.	A	AS	U	DS	D
91.	Tuition fees at University should not be dropped because people appreciate only what they have to work and sacrifice for.	A	AS	U	DS	D
92.	Young people should get only as much education as they will really need in their chosen vocation.	A	AS	U	DS	D
93.	People must learn to respect authority if they are to get along.	A	AS	U	DS	D
94.	How well people do in this world depends on their motivation and ability.	A	AS	U	DS	D
95.	Teachers should instil correct values and attitudes in their pupils.	A	AS	U	DS	D
96.	The free enterprise system is the basis for Canada's high standard of living.	A	AS	U	DS	D

		1	2	3	4	5
97.	The reasoning ability of men is greater than that of women.	A	AS	U	DS	D
98.	Women are more sympathetic than men.	A	AS	U	DS	D
99.	It goes against nature to place women in a position of authority over men.	A	AS	U	DS	D
100.	Women are more emotional than men.	A	AS	U	DS	D
101.	Men are more aggressive than women.	A	AS	U	DS	D
102.	Women are more sensitive than men.	A	AS	U	DS	D
103.	Men are better leaders than women.	A	AS	U	DS	D
104.	In marriage, the major responsibility of the wife is to keep her husband and children happy.	A	AS	U	DS	D
105.	It is more important for a girl to learn social poise than for her to have high grades.	A	AS	U	DS	D
106.	A woman's place is in the home.	A	AS	U	DS	D
107.	A girl has more responsibilities toward her grandparents, aunts and uncles than a boy does.	A	AS	U	DS	D
108.	The unmarried mother is morally a greater failure than the unmarried father.	A	AS	U	DS	D

		1 A	2 AS	3 U	4 DS	5 D
109.	A girl can be too bright for her own good.					
110.	Some jobs are "women's work" and other jobs are "men's work" and it isn't hard to tell the difference.	A	AS	U	DS	D
111.	One of the most important things a mother can do for her daughter is prepare her for the duties of being a wife.	A	AS	U	DS	D
112.	A wife should fit her life to that of her husband.	A	AS	U	DS	D
113.	It is more important for a boy to go to college than a girl.	A	AS	U	DS	D
114.	It is better for a boy to be good at mathematics than to be good at art.	A	AS	U	DS	D
115.	The most important quality of a real man is ambition.	A	AS	U	DS	D
116.	One of the most important jobs of the father is to discipline the children.	A	AS	U	DS	D
117.	In marriage, the husband should make the major decision.	A	AS	U	DS	D

APPENDIX D

Tables

TABLE D-1

RELATION BETWEEN SEX OF RESPONDENT AND SRD-BEHAVIOUR AS A FUNCTION OF LANGUAGE GROUP AND AGE

Language Group	Age	Sex	SRD-Behaviour Low	Medium	High	Totals
English	9 - 11	Girls	205 (37.9)*	144 (26.6)	192 (35.5)	541
		Boys	86 (18.5)	121 (26.1)	257 (55.4)	464
	12 - 14	Girls	550 (33.9)	546 (33.7)	525 (32.4)	1621
		Boys	302 (21.8)	484 (34.9)	602 (43.4)	1388
	15+	Girls	85 (22.8)	136 (36.6)	151 (40.6)	372
		Boys	43 (11.5)	114 (30.5)	217 (58.0)	374
French	12 - 14	Girls	392 (54.1)	196 (27.1)	136 (18.8)	724
		Boys	205 (37.4)	192 (35.0)	151 (27.6)	548
	15+	Girls	293 (51.2)	161 (28.1)	118 (20.6)	572
		Boys	141 (24.1)	211 (36.1)	232 (39.7)	584
Both	9+	Girls	1525 (39.8)	1183 (30.9)	1122 (29.3)	3830
		Boys	777 (23.1)	1122 (33.4)	1459 (43.4)	3358

*Figures in brackets in this and succeeding tables are per cents. Rows sum to 100 per cent within errors of rounding.

TABLE D-2

RELATION BETWEEN SEX OF RESPONDENT AND SRD-JOBS, AS A FUNCTION OF LANGUAGE GROUP AND AGE

Language Group	Age	Sex	SRD-Jobs Low	Medium	High	Totals
English	9 - 11	Girls	135 (24.8)	179 (32.9)	230 (42.3)	544
		Boys	80 (17.2)	154 (33.0)	232 (49.8)	466
	12 - 14	Girls	551 (33.9)	559 (34.5)	512 (31.6)	1622
		Boys	342 (24.5)	471 (33.8)	581 (41.7)	1394
	15+	Girls	123 (32.9)	128 (34.3)	122 (32.7)	373
		Boys	105 (28.0)	123 (32.8)	147 (39.2)	375
French	12 - 14	Girls	409 (56.5)	222 (30.6)	94 (12.9)	725
		Boys	165 (30.3)	204 (37.4)	176 (32.3)	545
	15+	Girls	297 (52.2)	186 (32.7)	86 (15.1)	569
		Boys	174 (29.7)	204 (34.8)	208 (35.5)	586
Both	9+	Girls	1515 (39.5)	1274 (33.2)	1044 (27.2)	3833
		Boys	866 (25.7)	1156 (34.3)	1344 (39.9)	3366

TABLE D-3

RELATION BETWEEN SEX OF RESPONDENT AND SRD-FEMININE ROLE, AS A FUNCTION OF LANGUAGE GROUP AND AGE

Language Group	Age	Sex	SRD-Feminine Role Low	Medium	High	Totals
English	9 - 11	Girls	226 (40.4)	200 (35.7)	134 (23.9)	560
		Boys	115 (22.8)	154 (30.5)	235 (46.6)	504
	12 - 14	Girls	737 (45.1)	536 (32.8)	361 (22.1)	1634
		Boys	373 (25.6)	451 (30.9)	632 (43.4)	1456
	15+	Girls	139 (36.7)	134 (35.4)	106 (27.9)	379
		Boys	77 (19.5)	116 (29.4)	201 (51.0)	394
French	12 - 14	Girls	450 (61.6)	203 (27.8)	78 (10.7)	731
		Boys	159 (27.9)	212 (37.2)	199 (34.9)	570
	15+	Girls	300 (52.2)	186 (32.3)	89 (15.5)	575
		Boys	159 (26.2)	192 (31.7)	255 (42.1)	606
Both	9+	Girls	1852 (47.7)	1259 (32.5)	768 (19.8)	3879
		Boys	883 (25.0)	1125 (31.9)	1522 (43.1)	3530

TABLE D-4

RELATION BETWEEN SEX OF RESPONDENT AND SRD-AUTHORITY RELATIONS, AS A FUNCTION OF LANGUAGE GROUP AND AGE

Language Group	Age	Sex	SRD-Authority Relations			Totals
			Low	Medium	High	
English	9 - 11	Girls	242 (44.9)	140 (26.0)	157 (29.1)	539
		Boys	213 (46.6)	135 (29.5)	109 (23.9)	457
	12 - 14	Girls	538 (33.5)	567 (35.3)	500 (31.2)	1605
		Boys	628 (45.2)	485 (34.9)	277 (19.9)	1390
	15+	Girls	101 (27.2)	142 (38.3)	128 (34.5)	371
		Boys	131 (35.0)	133 (35.6)	110 (29.4)	374
French	12 - 14	Girls	198 (27.4)	258 (35.7)	266 (36.8)	722
		Boys	222 (40.4)	190 (34.6)	137 (25.0)	549
	15+	Girls	156 (27.4)	183 (32.1)	231 (40.5)	570
		Boys	177 (30.9)	217 (37.9)	178 (31.1)	572
Both	9+	Girls	1235 (32.4)	1290 (33.9)	1282 (33.7)	3807
		Boys	1371 (41.0)	1160 (34.7)	811 (24.3)	3342

TABLE D-5

CORRELATION MATRIX OF THE SIX SRD MEASURES

SRD

SRD	Traits	Behaviour	Jobs	Authority Relations	Peer Relations	Feminine Role
Traits	7547*	.30	.22	.27	.24	-.04**
Behaviour	7523	7576	.33	.17	.21	-.23
Jobs	7511	7542	7628	.10	.11	-.25
Authority Relations	7325	7351	7396	7562	.61	.01
Peer Relations	7325	7351	7396	7562	7562	-.01
Feminine Role	7535	7564	7617	7549	7549	7875

*Cells of the major diagonal contain total number of respondents per scale. Cells below contain the total for both scales on which the correlation is based.
**SRD - Feminine Role is keyed in the opposite direction so that these correlations are "positive".

TABLE D-6

CORRELATION MATRIX OF MEASURES OF TRADITIONALISM, PERSONALITY BELIEF, AND ROLE PREFERENCE SCALES

Scales		T	P	R
	T	5552*	.35	.49
Scales	P	5534	5548	.47
	R	5538	5538	5559

*Cells in major diagonal and below contain the relevant numbers of respondents.

TABLE D-7

TRADITIONALISM, PERSONALITY BELIEF, AND ROLE PREFERENCE AS FUNCTIONS OF LANGUAGE GROUP

Traditionalism

Language Group	Traditional	Transition	Modern	Totals **
English	810 (22.4)*	1536 (42.5)	1267 (35.1)	3613
French	796 (41.7)	780 (40.9)	332 (17.4)	1908

Personality Belief

	Traditional	Transition	Modern	Total
English	1173 (32.5)	1126 (31.2)	1312 (36.3)	3611
French	739 (38.8)	653 (34.2)	515 (27.0)	1907

Role Preference

	Traditional	Transition	Modern	Total
English	828 (22.9)	1309 (36.2)	1481 (40.9)	3618
French	826 (43.2)	648 (33.9)	436 (22.8)	1910

*Rows in this and following tables sum to 100 per cent, within errors of rounding.

**Total includes 255 male respondents. There is no evidence of sex differences on T, P, and R.

TABLE D-8

TRADITIONALISM AS A FUNCTION OF EDUCATION

	Traditionalism			
Education	Traditional	Transition	Modern	Total
grade school	725 (37.8)	791 (41.3)	401 (20.9)	1917
business school, part high school	584 (26.9)	939 (43.2)	650 (29.9)	2173
high school	194 (22.2)	373 (42.7)	307 (35.1)	874
university	72 (16.3)	169 (38.3)	200 (45.4)	441

TABLE D-9

PERSONALITY BELIEF AS A FUNCTION OF EDUCATION

Education	Personality Belief			Total
	Traditional	Transition	Modern	
grade school	793 (41.4)	614 (32.0)	509 (26.6)	1916
business school, part high school	748 (34.4)	716 (33.0)	708 (32.6)	2172
high school	237 (27.1)	281 (32.2)	355 (40.6)	873
university	107 (24.3)	115 (26.1)	219 (49.7)	441

TABLE D-10

ROLE PREFERENCE AS A FUNCTION OF EDUCATION

Education	Role Preference			Total
	Traditional	Transition	Modern	
grade school	868 (45.1)	677 (35.2)	379 (19.7)	1924
business school, part high school	545 (25.1)	833 (38.4)	794 (36.5)	2172
high school	136 (15.5)	317 (36.2)	422 (48.1)	875
university	56 (12.7)	100 (22.7)	285 (64.6)	441

TABLE D-11

TRADITIONALISM AS A FUNCTION
OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

	Traditionalism			
Social Class*	Traditional	Transition	Modern	Total
I	73 (20.3)	153 (42.6)	133 (37.0)	359
II	32 (22.9)	50 (35.7)	58 (41.4)	140
III	89 (23.0)	163 (42.1)	135 (34.9)	387
IV	279 (26.5)	452 (43.0)	320 (30.4)	1051
V	707 (30.9)	949 (41.4)	634 (27.7)	2290
VI	349 (31.9)	476 (43.5)	270 (24.7)	1095

*As measured by Blishen's scale (1967);
I= Upper Class; VI = Lower Class.

TABLE D-12

PERSONALITY BELIEF AS A FUNCTION
OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

	Personality Belief			
Social Class*	Traditional	Transition	Modern	Total
I	107 (29.8)	118 (32.9)	134 (37.3)	359
II	50 (35.7)	37 (26.4)	53 (37.9)	140
III	129 (33.4)	120 (31.1)	137 (35.5)	386
IV	390 (37.0)	322 (30.6)	341 (32.4)	1053
V	786 (34.4)	744 (32.5)	756 (33.1)	2286
VI	390 (35.7)	357 (32.7)	345 (31.6)	1092

*As measured by Blishen's scale (1967);
I = Upper Class; VI = Lower Class.

TABLE D-13

ROLE PREFERENCE AS A FUNCTION
OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

Social Class*	Role Preference: Traditional	Transition	Modern	Total
I	46 (12.9)	122 (34.2)	189 (52.9)	357
II	28 (20.0)	48 (34.3)	64 (45.7)	140
III	68 (17.6)	138 (35.7)	181 (46.8)	387
IV	275 (26.1)	379 (36.0)	398 (37.8)	1052
V	739 (32.3)	805 (35.1)	747 (32.6)	2291
VI	427 (39.0)	382 (34.9)	286 (26.1)	1095

*As measured by Blishen's scale (1967)
I = Upper Class; VI = Lower Class.

TABLE D-14

CORRELATION MATRIX RELATING THE
THREE PARENTS' VARIABLES, TRADITIONALISM,
PERSONALITY BELIEF AND ROLE PREFERENCE TO THE
SIX CHILDREN'S SRD VARIABLES

SRD

Parents' Measures	Traits	Behaviour	Jobs	Authority Relations	Peer Relations	Feminine Role
Traditionalism	-.01 (5331)*	.02 (5349)	.03 (5379)	-.02 (5361)	.03 (5361)	.07 (5543)
Personality Belief	-.02 (5328)	-.03 (5346)	-.02 (5375)	-.04 (5357)	-.02 (5357)	.10 (5539)
Role Reference	.00 (5338)	-.01 (5356)	.01 (5386)	-.04 (5368)	.02 (5368)	.16 (5550)

*Number of respondents on which correlation is based.

TABLE D-15

RELATIONS BETWEEN SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIATION OF PARENTS AND SRD-BEHAVIOUR, SRD-AUTHORITY RELATIONS AND SRD-PEER RELATIONS

SRD Variable		Levels of SRD: Low	Medium	High	Totals
SRD-Behaviour	Low	890 (36.3)	769 (31.4)	791 (32.3)	2450
	Medium	835 (31.5)	867 (32.7)	948 (35.8)	2650
	High	607 (28.3)	680 (31.7)	859 (40.0)	2146
SRD-Authority Relations	Low	1010 (41.7)	804 (33.2)	610 (25.2)	2424
	Medium	974 (36.8)	949 (35.9)	724 (27.4)	2647
	High	646 (30.0)	727 (33.7)	783 (36.3)	2156
SRD-Peer Relations	Low	923 (38.1)	825 (34.0)	676 (27.9)	2424
	Medium	863 (32.6)	1000 (37.8)	784 (29.6)	2647
	High	590 (27.4)	801 (37.2)	765 (35.5)	2156

TABLE D-16

RELATIONS BETWEEN PERCEIVED ROLE DIFFERENTIATION OF PARENTS WITH RESPECT TO DISCIPLINE AND SRD

SRD Variable	Parental Different-iation	Level of SRD: Low	Medium	High	Totals
SRD-Authority Relations	Low	1159 (46.7)	792 (31.9)	531 (21.4)	2482
	Medium	847 (34.4)	913 (37.1)	704 (28.6)	2464
	High	616 (27.4)	755 (33.6)	877 (39.0)	2248
SRD-Peer Relations	Low	1058 (42.6)	870 (35.1)	554 (22.3)	2482
	Medium	753 (30.6)	950 (38.6)	761 (30.9)	2464
	High	572 (25.4)	783 (34.8)	893 (39.7)	2248

TABLE D-17

RELATIONS BETWEEN SOCIO-EMOTIONAL DIFFERENTIATION OF PARENTS AND SRD-AUTHORITY RELATIONS AND SRD-PEER RELATIONS

SRD Variable	Socio-Emotional Differentiation	Level of SRD: Low	Medium	High	Totals
SRD-Authority Relations	Low	1166 (48.5)	723 (30.1)	514 (21.4)	2403
	Medium	831 (33.8)	931 (37.8)	609 (28.4)	2461
	High	625 (26.8)	806 (34.6)	899 (38.6)	2330
SRD-Peer Relations	Low	1059 (44.1)	793 (33.0)	551 (22.9)	2403
	Medium	722 (29.3)	974 (39.6)	765 (31.1)	2461
	High	602 (25.8)	836 (35.9)	892 (38.3)	2330

TABLE D-18

RELATIONS BETWEEN SOCIO-EMOTIONAL DIFFERENTIATION OF PARENTS AND SRD-TRAITS AND SRD-BEHAVIOUR

SRD Variable	Socio-Emotional Different-iation	Level of SRD			Totals
		Low	Medium	High	
SRD-Traits	Low	860 (35.7)	798 (33.1)	750 (31.1)	2408
	Medium	776 (31.7)	880 (36.0)	790 (32.3)	2446
	High	607 (26.3)	784 (33.9)	920 (39.8)	2311
SRD-Behaviour	Low	859 (35.4)	769 (31.7)	797 (32.9)	2425
	Medium	767 (31.4)	810 (33.1)	869 (35.5)	2446
	High	679 (29.2)	727 (31.3)	916 (39.4)	2322

TABLE D-19

RELATIONS BETWEEN DIFFERENTIATION OF PARENTAL POWER AND SRD

SRD Variable	Differentiation of Power	Level of SRD: Low	Medium	High	Totals
SRD-Traits	Low	938 (37.2)	860 (34.1)	726 (28.8)	2524
	Medium	721 (30.9)	833 (35.7)	780 (33.4)	2334
	High	584 (25.3)	769 (33.3)	954 (41.4)	2307
SRD-Behaviour	Low	956 (37.7)	803 (31.7)	777 (30.6)	2536
	Medium	704 (30.1)	785 (33.6)	850 (36.3)	2339
	High	645 (27.8)	718 (31.0)	955 (41.2)	2318
SRD-Jobs	Low	960 (37.5)	889 (34.7)	710 (27.7)	2559
	Medium	776 (33.0)	819 (34.8)	756 (32.2)	2351
	High	655 (28.1)	729 (31.2)	951 (40.7)	2335
SRD-Authority Relations	Low	1175 (46.6)	817 (32.4)	528 (21.0)	2520
	Medium	757 (32.3)	904 (38.5)	685 (29.2)	2346
	High	690 (29.6)	739 (31.7)	899 (38.6)	2328
SRD-Peer Relations	Low	1075 (42.7)	889 (35.3)	556 (22.1)	2520
	Medium	677 (28.9)	935 (39.9)	734 (31.3)	2346
	High	631 (27.1)	779 (33.5)	918 (39.4)	2328
SRD-Feminine Role	Low	1047 (40.0)	860 (32.8)	711 (27.2)	2618
	Medium	862 (35.4)	803 (33.0)	770 (31.6)	2435
	High	838 (34.9)	739 (30.8)	826 (34.4)	2403

TABLE D-20

RELATIONS BETWEEN CHILD-POWER AND SRD-TRAITS AND SRD-PEER RELATIONS IN ENGLISH-SPEAKING BOYS, AGE 9-11

SRD Variable	Child-Power	Level of SRD: Low	Medium	High	Totals
SRD-Traits	Low	73 (37.6)	45 (23.2)	76 (39.2)	194
	Medium	45 (23.6)	55 (29.3)	88 (46.8)	188
	High	15 (15.6)	36 (37.5)	45 (46.9)	96
SRD-Peer Relations	Low	94 (49.5)	48 (25.3)	48 (25.3)	190
	Medium	72 (38.5)	52 (27.8)	63 (33.7)	187
	High	28 (30.4)	23 (25.0)	41 (44.6)	92

TABLE D-21

RELATIONS BETWEEN CHILD-POWER AND SRD IN BOYS

SRD Group	Child-Power	Level of SRD Low	Medium	High	Totals
SRD- Peer Relations English-language age 12-14	Low	129 (41.5)	107 (34.4)	75 (24.1)	311
	Medium	187 (31.4)	238 (40.0)	170 (28.6)	595
	High	162 (28.8)	211 (37.5)	190 (33.7)	563
SRD- Peer Relations English-language age 15+	Low	30 (44.1)	15 (22.1)	23 (33.8)	68
	Medium	32 (26.0)	44 (35.8)	47 (38.2)	123
	High	48 (23.0)	82 (39.2)	79 (37.8)	209
SRD- Jobs French-language age 15+	Low	127 (32.5)	120 (30.7)	144 (36.8)	391
	Medium	51 (31.1)	72 (43.9)	41 (25.0)	164
	High	12 (18.6)	21 (32.8)	31 (48.4)	64

TABLE D-22

RELATIONS BETWEEN CHILD-POWER AND SRD, IN ENGLISH-SPEAKING GIRLS, AGE 12-14

SRD Variable	Child-Power	Level of SRD: Low	Medium	High	Totals
SRD-Traits	Low	103 (28.9)	119 (33.3)	135 (37.8)	357
	Medium	187 (33.5)	198 (35.4)	174 (31.1)	559
	High	283 (36.8)	251 (32.6)	236 (30.6)	770
SRD-Peer Relations	Low	151 (43.1)	105 (30.0)	94 (26.9)	350
	Medium	192 (34.5)	208 (37.3)	157 (28.2)	557
	High	217 (28.3)	323 (42.1)	228 (29.7)	768
SRD-Feminine Role	Low	131 (36.1)	134 (36.9)	98 (27.0)	363
	Medium	239 (42.2)	197 (34.7)	131 (23.1)	567
	High	402 (51.7)	225 (28.9)	151 (19.4)	778

TABLE D-23

RELATIONS BETWEEN CHILD-POWER AND SRD IN GIRLS

SRD Group	Child-Power	Level of SRD Low	Medium	High	Totals
SRD-Behaviour French-language age 12-14	Low	161 (51.3)	78 (24.8)	75 (23.9)	314
	Medium	144 (55.8)	68 (26.4)	46 (17.8)	258
	High	104 (55.6)	60 (32.1)	23 (12.3)	187
SRD-Jobs French language age 15+	Low	162 (50.9)	109 (34.3)	47 (14.8)	318
	Medium	95 (50.3)	60 (31.7)	34 (18.0)	189
	High	63 (66.3)	25 (26.3)	7 (7.4)	95

TABLE D-24

RELATIONS BETWEEN DEGREE OF DIFFERENTIAL INTERACTION WITH THE SEXES AND SRD

SRD Variable	Differential Interaction	Level of SRD: Low	Medium	High	Totals
SRD-Traits	Low	905 (36.3)	831 (33.3)	760 (30.4)	2496
	Medium	726 (31.1)	824 (35.3)	783 (33.6)	2333
	High	459 (26.1)	613 (34.9)	684 (39.0)	1756
SRD-Behaviour	Low	905 (36.2)	795 (31.8)	802 (32.1)	2502
	Medium	662 (28.3)	801 (34.2)	879 (37.5)	2342
	High	546 (31.0)	521 (29.6)	696 (39.5)	1763
SRD-Jobs	Low	986 (39.2)	827 (32.9)	702 (27.9)	2515
	Medium	719 (30.6)	804 (34.2)	830 (35.3)	2353
	High	497 (28.0)	596 (33.5)	684 (38.5)	1777
SRD-Authority Relations	Low	1078 (43.4)	797 (32.1)	608 (24.5)	2483
	Medium	757 (32.3)	870 (37.1)	718 (30.6)	2345
	High	548 (31.1)	618 (35.0)	598 (33.9)	1764
SRD-Peer Relations	Low	1024 (41.2)	877 (35.3)	582 (23.4)	2483
	Medium	645 (27.5)	926 (39.5)	774 (33.0)	2345
	High	473 (26.8)	617 (35.0)	674 (38.2)	1764
SRD-Feminine Role	Low	958 (37.6)	856 (33.6)	737 (28.9)	2551
	Medium	883 (36.8)	783 (32.6)	735 (30.6)	2401
	High	658 (36.4)	566 (31.3)	582 (32.2)	1806

TABLE D-25

RELATIONS BETWEEN DATING VERSUS NON-DATING BEHAVIOUR AND SRD, AMONG ENGLISH-SPEAKING GIRLS AGE 12-14

SRD Variable	Do you date?	Levels of SRD Low	Medium	High	Totals
SRD-Behaviour	Yes	171 (29.3)	211 (36.2)	201 (34.5)	583
	No	394 (36.3)	353 (32.5)	339 (31.2)	1086
SRD-Feminine Role	Yes	238 (40.2)	199 (33.6)	155 (26.2)	592
	No	522 (47.8)	352 (32.3)	217 (19.9)	1091

TABLE D-26

RELATIONS BETWEEN DATING BEHAVIOUR AND SRD,
AMONG FRENCH AND ENGLISH-SPEAKING BOYS, AGE 12-14

SRD Variable	Do you date?	Levels of SRD Low	Medium	High	Totals
SRD-Traits (English-language)	Yes	170 (31.5)	204 (37.8)	165 (30.6)	539
	No	346 (39.2)	302 (34.2)	235 (26.6)	883
SRD-Behaviour (English-language)	Yes	102 (18.9)	181 (33.6)	256 (47.5)	539
	No	205 (23.2)	312 (35.3)	368 (41.6)	885
SRD-Authority Rel. (English-language)	Yes	219 (40.7)	197 (36.1)	130 (23.8)	546
	No	417 (47.7)	305 (34.9)	153 (17.5)	875
SRD-Peer Relations (English-language)	Yes	173 (31.7)	186 (34.1)	187 (34.2)	546
	No	285 (32.6)	352 (40.2)	238 (27.2)	875
SRD-Behaviour (French-language)	Yes	100 (31.9)	117 (37.4)	96 (30.7)	313
	No	105 (43.8)	74 (30.8)	61 (25.4)	240
SRD-Authority Relations (French-language)	Yes	122 (38.4)	99 (31.1)	97 (30.5)	318
	No	107 (44.2)	88 (36.4)	47 (19.4)	242

TABLE D-27

RELATIONS BETWEEN ATTITUDE TO SCHOOL AND SRD, BOTH SEXES, BOTH LANGUAGE GROUPS, AGE 12-14

SRD Variable	Attitude to school	Levels of SRD Low	Medium	High	Totals
SRD-Traits English-language Girls	negative	171 (30.8)	183 (32.9)	202 (36.3)	556
	both	129 (35.5)	135 (37.2)	99 (27.3)	363
	positive	262 (35.6)	243 (33.1)	230 (31.3)	735
SRD-Behaviour French-language Girls	negative	169 (50.1)	90 (26.7)	78 (23.1)	337
	both	12 (35.3)	11 (32.4)	11 (32.4)	34
	positive	189 (62.0)	74 (24.3)	42 (13.8)	305
SRD-Traits English-language Boys	negative	159 (30.3)	181 (34.5)	184 (35.1)	524
	both	92 (31.0)	127 (42.8)	78 (26.3)	297
	positive	259 (44.3)	189 (32.4)	136 (23.3)	584
SRD-Behaviour English-language Boys	negative	103 (19.6)	168 (32.0)	254 (48.4)	525
	both	54 (18.2)	101 (34.1)	141 (47.6)	296
	positive	147 (25.1)	220 (37.5)	219 (37.4)	586
SRD-Authority Relations English-language Boys	negative	218 (41.7)	182 (34.8)	123 (23.5)	523
	both	128 (43.1)	100 (33.7)	69 (23.2)	297
	positive	283 (48.4)	213 (36.4)	89 (15.2)	585
SRD-Behaviour French-language Boys	negative	97 (34.4)	94 (33.3)	91 (32.3)	282
	both	12 (31.6)	11 (28.9)	15 (39.5)	38
	positive	93 (41.3)	84 (37.3)	48 (21.3)	225

TABLE D-28

RELATIONS BETWEEN SELF-REPORTS OF GRADES AND SRD AMONG ENGLISH-SPEAKING GIRLS, AGE 15 AND OVER

SRD Variable	Grade	Levels of SRD: Low	Medium	High	Totals
SRD-Traits	C & D	89 (42.0)	62 (29.2)	61 (28.8)	212
	B	58 (34.9)	54 (32.5)	54 (32.5)	166
	A	14 (56.0)	6 (24.0)	5 (20.0)	25
SRD-Behaviour	C & D	46 (21.5)	74 (34.6)	94 (43.9)	214
	B	39 (23.5)	60 (36.1)	67 (40.4)	166
	A	9 (36.0)	11 (44.0)	5 (20.0)	25
SRD-Jobs	C & D	71 (33.3)	64 (30.0)	78 (36.6)	213
	B	52 (31.3)	63 (38.0)	51 (30.7)	166
	A	10 (38.5)	11 (42.3)	5 (19.2)	26
SRD-Authority Relations	C & D	60 (28.2)	76 (35.6)	77 (36.2)	213
	B	43 (25.9)	68 (41.0)	55 (33.1)	166
	A	6 (23.1)	17 (65.4)	3 (11.5)	26
SRD-Peer Relations	C & D	60 (28.2)	81 (38.0)	72 (33.8)	213
	B	48 (28.9)	74 (44.6)	44 (26.5)	166
	A	6 (23.1)	14 (53.8)	6 (23.1)	26
SRD-Feminine Role	C & D	75 (34.2)	74 (33.8)	70 (32.0)	219
	B	62 (36.5)	63 (37.1)	45 (26.5)	170
	A	11 (42.3)	10 (38.5)	5 (19.2)	26

TABLE D-29

SCHOOL GRADES BY LANGUAGE GROUP AND AGE

	Sex					
	Girls' Grades			Boys' Grades		
	A	B	C&D	A	B	C&D
Eng., 9-11	23.6*	52.5	23.9	22.0	50.6	27.4
12-14	20.5	52.8	26.6	12.5	47.4	40.1
15+	6.3	41.0	52.8	5.3	39.5	55.3
Fr., 12-14	8.8	59.4	31.8	4.9	45.3	49.8
15+	2.6	35.7	61.6	2.2	27.0	70.8

*Percentage of three grades within a sex and row. Figures were computed for SRD - Feminine Role.

References

Allport, G. The historical background of modern social psychology. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson eds. The Handbook of Social Psychology (2nd edition). Don Mills. Addison-Wesley, 1:1-80. 1968.

Ardrey, R. The Territorial Imperative. New York, Atheneum, 1966.

Atkinson, J.W. An Introduction to Motivation. New York, Van Nostrand, 1964.

Bales, R.F. Interaction Process Analysis. Cambridge, Mass., Addison-Wesley, 1951.

Bandura, A. & R.H.Walters. Social Learning and Personality Development. New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1965.

Barber, T.X. & M.J.Silver. Fact, fiction, and the experimenter bias effect. Psychological Bulletin Monograph. 70, No. 6, Part 2: 1-29. 1968a.

Barber, T.X. & M.J.Silver. Pitfalls in data analysis and interpretation: A reply to Rosenthal. Psychological Bulletin Monograph. 70, No. 6, Part 2: 48-62. 1968b.

Bem, D.J. An experimental analysis of self-persuasion. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology. 1: 199-218. 1965.

Bem, D.J. Inducing belief in the false confessions. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology. 3: 707-710. 1966.

Blishen, B.R. A socio-economic index for occupations in Canada. Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology. 4: 41-53. 1967.

Brim, O., Jr. Personality development as role-learning. In I. Iscoe & H. Stevenson, eds. Personality Development in Children. Austin, University of Texas Press, 127-159. 1960.

Bruner, J.S., J.J.Goodnow, & G.A.Austin. A Study of Thinking. New York, Wiley, 1956.

Cartwright, D. & F. Harary. Structural balance: A generalization of Heider's theory. Psychological Review. 63: 277-293. 1956.

Cooley, C.H. Social Organization. New York, Scribners, 1909.

Festinger, L. A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance. Evanston, Ill., Row Peterson. 1957.

Friedan, B. The Feminine Mystique. New York, Norton, 1963.

Garfinkel, H. Studies in Ethnomethodology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice Hall, 1967.

Glaser, B. & A. Strauss. The Discovery of Grounded Theory. Chicago, Aldine, 1967.

Goffman, E. The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. New York, Doubleday Anchor, 1959.

Goffman, E. Encounters. Indianapolis, Ind., Bobbs-Merrill, 1961.

Goffman, E. Behaviour in Public Places. New York, Free Press, 1963.

Goffman, E. Interaction Ritual. Chicago, Aldine, 1967.

Goldberg, P. Are women prejudiced against women? Trans-Action. 28-30. April 5, 1968.

Gottesman, I.I. Biogenetics of race and class. In M. Deutsch, I.Katz, & A.R.Jenson, eds. Social Class, Race, and Psychological Development. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 11-51. 1968.

Guntrip, H. Personality Structure and Human Interaction. New York, International Universities Press, 1961.

Heider, F. Social perception and phenomenal causality. Psychological Review. 51: 358-374. 1944.

Heider, F. Attitudes and cognitive organization. Journal of Psychology. 21: 107-112. 1946.

Heider, F. The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations. New York, Wiley, 1958.

Hess, E. Attitude and pupil size. Scientific American. 212: 46-54. April 4, 1965.

Horner, M.S. Sex Differences in Achievement Motivation and Performance in Competitive and Non-Competitive Situations. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1968.

Johnson, H.M. Sociology: A Systematic Introduction. New York, Harcourt, Brace and World, 1960.

Jourard, S. Healthy personality and self-disclosure. In C. Gordon & K.J.Gergen, eds. The Self in Social Interaction. New York, Wiley, 423-434. 1968.

Kammeyer, K. The feminine role: An analysis of attitude consistency. Journal of Marriage and the Family. 24: 295-305. 1964.

Kammeyer, K. Birth order and the feminine role among college women. American Sociological Review. 31: 508-515. 1966.

Kammeyer, K. Sibling position and the feminine role. Journal of Marriage and the Family. 29: 494-499. 1967.

Kluckhohn, F. & F.L.Strodtbeck. Variations in Value-Orientations. New York, Harper & Row, 1961.

Kuethe, J.L. Social schemas. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. 64: 31-38. 1962a.

Kuethe, J.L. Social schemas and the reconstruction of social object displays from memory. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. 65: 71-74. 1962b.

Lorenz, K. King Solomon's Ring. London, Methuen, 1952.

Lorenz, K. On Aggression. New York, Harcourt, Brace & World, 1966.

McClelland, D.C. The Achieving Society. Princeton, N.J., Van Nostrand, 1961.

McGuire, W.J. A syllogistic analysis of cognitive relationships. In M.J. Rosenberg, C.E. Hovland, W.J. McGuire, R.P. Abelson, & J.W. Brehm, Attitude Organization and Change. New Haven, Yale University Press, 65-111. 1960.

Maccoby, E.E., ed. The Development of Sex Differences. Stanford, Calif., Stanford University Press, 1966.

Milgram, S. Behavioral study of obedience. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. 67: 371-378. 1963.

Morris, D. The Naked Ape. London, Jonathon Cape, 1967.

Newcomb, T.M. Individual systems of orientation. In S. Koch, ed. Psychology: A Study of a Science. 3:384-422. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1959.

Osgood, C.E., G.J.Suci, & P.H.Tannenbaum. The Measurement of Meaning. Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Osgood, C.E. & P.H.Tannenbaum. The principle of congruity in the prediction of attitude change. Psychological Review. 62: 42-55. 1955.

Pettigrew, T. Continuing barriers to desegregated education in the South. Sociology of Education. 38: 99-111. 1965.

Rogers, C. A theory of therapy, personality, and interpersonal relationships, as developed in the client-centered framework. In S. Koch, ed., Psychology: A Study of a Science. 3: 184-256. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1959.

Rosenberg, M.J. A structural theory of attitude dynamics. Public Opinion Quarterly. 24: 319-340. 1960.

Rosenberg, M.J. The Logic of Survey Analysis. New York, Basic Books, 1968.

Rosenthal, R. Experimenter Effects in Behavioral Research. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1966.

Rosenthal, R. & L. Jacobson. Pygmalion in the Classroom. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968a.

Rosenthal, R. Experimenter expectancy and the reassuring nature of the null hypothesis decision procedure. Psychological Bulletin Monograph. 70(6) Part 2: 30-47. 1968b.

Rotter, J.B. Social Learning and Clinical Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1954.

Schachter, S. & J.E.Singer. Cognitive, social and psychological determinants of emotional states. Psychological Review. 69: 379-399. 1962.

Skinner, B.F. Verbal Behavior. New York, Appleton-Century, 1957.

Szasz, T.S. The Myth of Mental Illness. New York, Hoeber-Harper, 1961.

Thibaut, J. & H. Kelley. The Social Psychology of Groups. New York, Wiley, 1959.

Tiger, L. Men in Groups. London, Nelson, 1969.

Vaihinger, H. The Philosophy of "As If". Translated by C.K. Ogden. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1952 (1911).

Webb, E.J., D.T.Campbell, R.D.Schwartz & L. Sechrest. Unobtrusive Measures: Nonreactive Research in the Social Sciences. Chicago, Rand McNally, 1966.

Weinberg, M.S. Sexual modesty, social meanings, and the nudist camp. Social Problems. 12: 311-318. 1965.

Weinberg, M.S. Becoming a nudist. Psychiatry. 29: 15-24. 1966.

White, R.W. Motivation reconsidered: The concept of competence. Psychological Review. 66: 297-333. 1959.