CHAPTER II.

HYPOTHESIS...

Theories of sex role development.

Role learning through modeling.

Role learning through cognitive concept development.

Role learning through interaction.

NULL HYPOTHESIS FOR THE PRESENT RESEARCH.

(1) There is no difference in the sex-role preference scores of boys and girls of 3 to 5 years of age.

(2) There is no relationship between the sex-role preference of children from three different socio-economic levels.

(3) There is no relationship between the age of the child and his sex role preference as measured on ITSC.

(4) There is no relationship among the three different subparts of the ITSC.

(5) There is no relationship between the sex of the child and his performance on the vocabulary test.

(6) There is no relationship between the socio-economic status of the child and his performance on the vocabulary test.

(7) There is no relationship between the age of the child and his performance on the vocabulary test.

(8) There is no relationship between the child's performance on the vocabulary test and ITSC.

(9) There is no relationship between the 'Draw-a-man' test and ITSC.

(10) There is no relationship between the 'Draw-a-man' test performance of the child and his/her Socio-economic Status.

--- oOo ---

In any maiden research effort in a relatively unstudied area of inquiry, the investigator is very likely to find himself/herself with decision problems. There are usually a variety of possible ways to begin and the problem is to choose one. But which one ? once the first step is somehow decided upon and taken, which of the second steps should then be followed? And so the decision making continues until the research program comes to its natural terminus. The decisions made at each choice point are obviously not randomly made. Rather, they derive from some overall plan of action.

Different researchers and social scientists have developed some tentative theories about how sex role development takes place. In the present case, there definitely is a context and associated theories of sex-role development. The researches available can be grouped in 3 sub categories.

(a) Role learning through following a model.

(b) Role learning as one of the aspects of cognitive development.

(c) Role learning through interaction with those who have acquired roles already.

(a) Role Learning through Modeling: This theory is related to concepts of social learning.

As children grow and develop, they typically acquire a wide array of knowledge and skills with respect to the objects in their environment, both human and non-human. An important subset of their acquisitions regarding human objects, that is, in the area of

social learning, undoubtedly includes that complex of abilities which have been variously called role taking, role perception, role playing, role enactment, empathy, person perception and the like, Flavell et.al. (1968).

Piaget (1926) argued that the child is at first an egocentric organism, unwittingly the prisoner of his own individual perspective and largely ignorant of and unconcerned with the differing perspectives of other people.

Thus as Piaget views it the developmental progression from this initial egocentrism toward the acquisiton of various skills of the role taking xvariety could add into our understanding of the child development in this area.

Just what are these "various skills of the role taking variety" for which there appear to be so many confusing near synonyms in the literature ?

Sarbins review of the area (1954) although diverging at certain points is acceptable. As Sarbin puts it, the basis and essential ingredient of any sort of skill sequence in this area appears to us to be that process in which the individual some how cognizes, apprehends, grasps, certain attributes of another individual. The attributes in question are mainly of the type that could be described as inferential rather than directly perceptible, for example, the other's needs, his intentions, his opinions and beliefs and his emotional, perceptual or intellectual capacities and limitations.

Tagiuri and Petrullo (1958) have in mind the same class of attributes in their definition of person perception.

> Indeed, when we speak of person perception or of knowledge of persons, we refer mostly to the observations we make about intentions, attitudes, emotions, ideas, abilities, purposes, traits, events that are inside the person.

The role taker's estimate of these attributes is normally a synthesis of information from two sources: (a) his knowledge of people and their behavior in various situations (including, perhaps, some previous knowledge of this particular other & his habits), (b) perceptual input from the overt behaviour of the other or from other cue sources in the immediate citation. Thus the role taking is based on an integration of the subjects' preexisting role expectations and his current role perception. The process of obtaining information about the others internal events is often called 'discrimination of role attributes. However and adequate overview of behaviour in the general role taking domain therefore requires an examination, not of role attribute discrimination alone, but also of the variety of contexts in which it is observed.

Sarbin (1954) makes an important distinction between role enactment and role taking. In the former, the subject actually takes on the role attributes of the other and behaves overtly in accordance with them. For example, the child who plays the mother's role vis-a-vis her dolls, or the man who acts the part of an executive once he is promoted to this position.

More generally, distinction can be made between two major types of contexts in which role attribute discrimination figures as an initial, instrumental response. First, one determines the nature of the other's role, (be it a socially defined, enduring role or some transistory one which the culture has not named, and then one proceeds to fulfill that role oneself. One can play the role overtly or covertly. As a further complication regarding the overtness dimension, Maccoby (1959) has suggested that many adult social roles (for example, that of "mother") are initially practical during childhood.

Another type of role taking begins as usual by discriminating the others' role attributes and will frequently go beyond this to assume these attributes. The subject seeks out the others" role attributes, not to play out his role, but to understand it and understand it from his own. In all cases, the essential process consists of discriminating the other's role attribute for the purpose of "behaving appropriately" within the confines of one's own role. Piaget callesd attention to this apprent dependence of effective communication on role taking skills in his early writing (1926). To the extent that the child fails to discriminate these role attributes of the other he will have difficulty in communicating with others.

The conceptualization of role taking and communication behaviour, role attribute discrimination serves as an instrument of communication. Mead, Piaget and Vugotsky have contributed in this area.

According to Mead, the fundamental human acquisition is the capacity to utilize significant symbols, (Mead 1947, Smith 1948). The basic paradigm is a two person, communicative interaction in which person A makes a gesture which B perceives. This gesture is a significant symbol if it calls out, the same response. Thus meaningful human communication involves not only communication in the sense in which birds and animals communicate with each other, but also an arousal in an individual making them the same responses which they explicitly arouse or are supposed to arouse in other individuals, the individuals to whom they are addressed. A child acquires a repertoire of actions by practicing covertly the actions characteristic of the adults with whom he interacts most frequently and who control the resources that he needs. Certain of the response tendencies thus acquired may not manifest themselves overtly until a much later time. Actions which are part of adult role behavior (e.g. to discipline a child) will remain latent until a situation arises in which the individual can appropriately play the adult role, some times even until the child himself becomes a parent. Not all features of parental behavior are equally well learned by the child through covert - role practice, he should learn verbal behavior more efficiently than motor skills by this means, and may learn the responses of others while failing to learn the cues which guided the responses. Thus covert role playing is a means of learning not only adult like social actions directed toward others, but of learning reactions toward the self (Maccoby 1959). Maccoby's notion of rehersal involves practicing adult social roles, those involved in competitive or co-operative social enterprises or in communication. In the enviornment of the child effective role taking models to

imitate are always available to the child and it may be these models which may instigate repeated imitative behavior of the covert and solitary variety. Miller and Dollard (1941) belive that a child learns to respond as his same sex parent does through the process of immitation.'

This kind of learning behavior has been called either matched dependent behavior or copying. According to Miller and Dollard (1941) and Kagan (1958) initially the imitative act is accidental (occurs by chance) and can be reinforced only if some drive is reduced by reproducing the response. This view emphasizes direct reward from the social environment (such as praise or expression of affection) as strengthling a person's tendency to imitate a model.

Mowrer, utilizes the term developmental identification and difines it as imitating and reproducing the behavior of a "model in order to reproduce habits" of the beloved and longed for parent" (1950). Thus, in his view, most imitation of a model is the result of a desire to reproduce behavioral responses which have acquired secondary reward value through association with a nurturant and affectionate model. It is the self rewarding aspect of certain imitative acts that Mowrer (1950) emphasizes as opposed to Miller and Dollard's (1941) emphasis on direct reward from the social environment.

Lynn (1962) also discusses secondary reward value and its role in sex role identification of children, particularly girls. Through learning the appropriate identification, each sex acquires a different method of learning which is later applied to all kinds of learning in general.

In learning the mother identification lesson, the little
girl acquires a learning method which primarily involves
(a) personal relationship and (b) Imitation rather than
restructuring the field and obstracting principles. In
solving the masculine role identification problem, the
boy acquires a learning method which primarily involves
(a) finding the goal (b) restructing the field and
obstracting principles (Lynn 1962, P. 281)

Sanford's (1959) concept of identification is smimilar
except for the motive behind it. He states :-

The individual may be observed to respond to the
behavior of other people as objects by imitating the
same behavior in himself. The individual strives to
behave in a way that is exactly like that of an object
(Sanford 1955, P. 107).

Role learning through cognitive concept development:

Strauss (1956) has an entirely different viewpoint from
the modeling or the interactional theory. He defines the idea of a
"system of roles" as a network involving classes of persons, acts
and privileges.   In//far as there is agreement among role players
on what classes of acts go with what classes of persons, there are
smoothly functioning relationships among them. When there is a
misunderstanding about classes of persons which accompany categories
of persons, role relationships are disturbed. In other words, a
"system of roles" can be called a conceptual system wherein the
classes or concepts are defined in terms of various reciprocal
relationships. Oranges and lemons are classes included in citrates,
which in turn are fruits; so that apples and oranges are related
by definition.

Strauss (1956) claims that the modeling and reinforcement
theories of role learning miss an important point. Many role

relationships are extremely abstract (for example: those that exist between white and Black or between a wife and a husband). The relationships are made manifest through concrete visible acts but their abstractness or after their impersonality is made clear when one tries to explain them to children or when representatives of these classes of persons plead before courts of law. Strauss states :

> To place so much reliance on direct interpersonal learning of roles both under estimates the conceptual character of roles and understresses the interpretive character of direct perception (Strauss, 1956, P. 212).

Even those role relationships that seem very concrete and visible, e.g. those between a teacher and a pupil, are abstract in that much of their meaning is not visible to the youngster and only gradually will he discover the fuller extent of this set of relationships. Newcomb's (1950) remark in connection with language development is relevant to the problem of role learning as a part of concept development. He recognizes that the process of role learning is greatly influenced and facilitated by the development of language.

Strauss (1956) believes that concepts do not remain static after the prelingual years but rather that they undergo constant change.

> Hypothetically, one could imagine that while formation of a given concept X may be prerequisite to others, formation of the others might leave concept X unchanged. This does not happen as there is propulsive and interacting character to naming and renaming. As new classifications are formed, old ones change, become revised and qualified so that little remains of the initial or early meanings of concepts. (Strauss, 1932, P. 285).

As one reaches adulthood, his concepts reach a peak in appropriateness, scope and completeness through constant modification. They also are, from an adult's point of view, more knowledgeable and less erroneous. This circumstance implies that the child's initial concepts or graspings of roles are not deficient but only are deficient in ways not necessarily accidental. If his conceptualization is erroneous, it nevertheless has its own organization (Strauss, 1956).

It is interesting to note the congruence between Piaget's formulations (Maier 1965) that concepts develop by age 10 or 12 and Brown's (1957) research finding on sex-role preference (third and fourth grade children make many more appropriate choices for their sex-role as compared to younger children, particularly pre-school age children). The findings seem to support the view presented by Strauss.

Role learning through interaction:
Maccoby (1959) Mussen and Distler (1959) and Parsons (1955) have paid attention to a different theoretical structure called the "power theory of identification". This theory proposes that the child identifies with a parent who is both an effective reinforcer and an effective punisher. In other words, the child is believed to identify most readily with a parent who is powerful figure.

Parsons (1955, 1958) has described the role theory in detail. He explains sex-role development in further detail too. First, identification is considered as encompassing the behaviors

a child learns in the context of a social role with a parent
(i.e. the internalization of a reciprocal role relationship).
Accordingly, the learned behaviors need not be those typical of
the adult but, rather, are those systematically elicited and rein -
forced in the course of a child's interaction with the adult. The
child makes a series of successive identifications, first with the
mother, then with the same sex parent and then with other adults of
the same sex and with peers. The first identification (both the
son's and the daughter's identifying with the mother) is not sex-
role identification. Later identifications with other adults and
with peers, however, are examples of sex-role identification. After
the initial identification with the mother, it is really the father
who initiates in boys and girls the development of different
behavior patterns, namely, masculine and feminine. The father does
so by forming differential role relationships with the son and with
the daughter.

Secondly, Parsons regards the basic difference between
masculinity and femininity to be a matter of a difference between
instrumental and an expressive orientation. The feminine expressive
role is distinguished by an orientation of giving rewarding
responses in order to receive such responses. The instrumental
orientation, in contrast, is defined as goal-directed behavior with
the goals transcending the immediate interactional situation. Since
the interaction is viewed as primarily a means to an end, the
instrumental role player cannot be primarily oriented to the
immediate emotional responses of others toward him. Rather than
trying to elicit positive responses from others, as the expressive

person does, instrumental role playing requires an ability to tolerate the hostility which it very likely will elicit.

Further, it is the father alone who is capable of engaging in both expressive and instrumental behavior. As a son, he has received emotional and expressive responses from his mother and goal-oriented instrumental responses from his father. He thus learns to be expressive in his behavior while he interacts with his daughter and instrumental while he interacts with his son. The mother, on the other hand, received emotional responses from both her mother and father while she was in the role of daughter. She never had to confront an interactional situation wherein the other party had an instrumental orientation. She thus learned to assume an emotional attitude and expressive orientation toward children of both sexes. Hence, as boys and girls grow up, only boys learn the instrumental orientation through their interactions with their fathers, so that they can deal effectively with the non-familial as well as the familial environment (the male role includes going out of the home for wage earning). Boys thus retain the capacity to respond in either an expressive manner or an instrumental manner depending upon the situation, whereas girls develop the skill to respond only in an expressive and emotional manner (Parsons 1955, 1958).

Johnson (1963), obviously in agreement with Parsons, proposes that the crucial factor in learning the masculine sex-role for males and the feminine sex-role for females is identification with the father.

Johnson explains the process :-

> The expressive role player is oriented toward the
> relationship among actors within a system. He is
> primarily oriented to the attitudes and feelings of
> those actors toward himself and toward each other...
> by being solicotous, appealing and "understanding",
> a woman seeks to get a pleasurable response by
> giving pleasure. (Johnson, 1963, P. 320-321).

It seems appropriate theoretically that expressiveness
is a direct sensitivity and responsiveness to the attitudes and
reactions of others and that it is learned through reciprocal
interactions with an expressive partner in relatively permissive
context of mutual gratification. The instrumental role player's
orientation involves " a disciplined pursuit of goals that
transcend the interactional situation". He is disposed to view the
interaction as a means to an end. He must resist pressures to
become emotionally involved in the immediate situation itself
(Johnson 1963, P. 321).

The instrumental orientation is opposite to the expressive
one and thus it seems unlikely that the former orientation can be
developed in a love-oriented or a "pleasing" context (Johnson 1963)
When a male child becomes too dependent on parental love, he cannot
function adequately and aggressively in his peer relations even
though his parents expect it of him (Green, 1946). Bronfenbrenner's
(1961), exploratory study of four hundred tenth grade students
supported the hypothesis that love-oriented socialization technique
may foster the internalization of adult standards and the development
of socialized behavior but they may also have the effect of
undermining capacities for initiative and independence, particularly

in boys. Johnson (1963), thus proposes that an instrumental orientation will have to be inckulcated by one who bases his demands not on love, but on objective punishment or deprivation.

Studies by Sears, Maccoby and Levin (1957), Miller and Swanson (1960), support the above assumption. They report that love-orientated techniques seem to produce guilt while physical punishment, threats and withdrawal of tangible privileges are likely to produce outward aggression in the child. According to Johnson (1963), male socialization requires a "push" into instrumentality which female socialization does not. The initial identification with the mother is basexd on "fear of loss of love" for both boys and girls but this is not true of sex-role identification. The mechanism of internalization for the boy is "fear of overt punishment" and a desire for "respect" while for the girl it is "love-reciprocity" that develops mature expressiveness. It is a positive motivation to get love by giving love (the defining attribute of femininity) rather than the negative aspect of "fear of loss of love ".

--- oOo ---