DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 222 285 PS 013 148

AUTHOR Huston, Aletha C.
TITLE Sex Typing and Socialization.
PUB DATE Aug 82
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association (90th, Washington, DC, August 23-27, 1982). Matrix table may not reproduce well because of small type.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Development; Childhood Attitudes; Childhood Interests; Children; *Cognitive Development; *Concept Formation; Literature Reviews; Peer Influence; Play; Research Needs; *Sex Role; Sex Stereotypes; *Socialization
IDENTIFIERS Gender Identity; Multidimensional Approach

ABSTRACT

The literature on children's acquisition of sex-typed knowledge, preference, and behavior is reviewed, and a matrix of sex-typing constructs and sex-typed content areas is offered. Two major themes are discussed. The first theme concerns the importance of activities, interests, and peer associations in the early acquisition of sex-typing constructs. It is argued that children learn sex-typed play activities, occupational stereotypes, family roles, and interests earlier than they learn about sex-typed personality traits and social behaviors. It is further suggested that while the latter have been emphasized as the core of sex typing, more attention should be paid to activities and interests and to sex segregation of peer groups. The second theme concerns the importance of cognitions and concepts about sex typing in the process of learning about gender. It is argued that, contrary to a premise of cognitive developmental theory, identifying cognitions and concepts about sex typing is not in itself sufficient for understanding the process of sex typing or for generating interventions. The suggestion is made that many people have been too quick to assume that changes in cognitions produce changes in identity, preferences, and behavior. In conclusion, researchers are urged to take the multidimensionality of sex typing seriously and to include multiple measures of multiple constructs and/or content areas in their studies. (Author/RH)

Sex Typing and Socialization

Aletha C. Huston

University of Kansas

Invited Address to Divisions 35 and 7 at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, August, 1982.

Sex typing is a topic in which the social values and biases of scholars are particularly likely to affect their approach to questions and their interpretations of the literature. It was a central issue for developmental psychologists for many years before the Women's Movement because most people believed that acquisition of "appropriate" sex typing was essential for normal, healthy development. Theories and research were directed to learning how young boys could become masculine and young girls could become feminine. The Women's Movement and the resulting rejection of traditional sex roles by many people led to a conceptual about-face in the early 1970's. Many of the scholars who became interested in the subject were committed to the values of feminism. Their research was designed to learn about the negative consequences of traditional sex typing and about means for socializing children toward "androgyny" or away from socially prescribed sex roles. Because of the radical shift in social values, the effects of such social values on theory and research are particularly apparent in the domain of sex typing. I consider that a healthy trend. Values and assumptions guide all social science; we delude ourselves if we thing scholars can be entirely objective or conceptually neutral. Our science can best proceed and grow if we recognize and identify those assumptions. Having made that assertion, let me tell you mine, so you can place my remarks in the context of my personal committments in this field.

I approach this topic with a combination of strong feminism and a belief that most aspects of traditional sex typing are harmful to the development of both males and females. I would like to see a world in which children are socialized as individuals with a whole range of diverse options available to them. At the same time, I have considerable faith in the conceptual and methodological tools of modern social science. I think theories and research should be held to the most stringent standards of logical consistency and methodological adequacy. I am also enough of a behaviorist that I am more persuaded by what people do than by what they say. I think we can best learn about how to change traditional patterns of sex typing by gaining a sophisticated theoretical understanding of the processes involved, whether they contribute to stereotypical or counter-stereotypical outcomes. Hence, much of the literature I will discuss concerns how children learn socially expected patterns of gender-based behavior. From that, I think we can move on to learning how children can acquire new patterns.

The scholarship of the 1970's led to a considerable number of conceptual advances. One of the most important was the recognition that sex typing is multidimensional. Although others had proposed dimensional structures for understanding sex typing, Constantinople's (1973) review of measures for adults marked a point after which no reasonable scholar could again speak of "masculinity" or "femininity" as unitary constructs. Furthermore, the work of Bem (1974), Spence & Helmreich (1978) and others made it clear that bipolar conceptions were inadequate for understanding personality traits that are socially stereotyped as feminine and masculine.

The full impact of multidimensionality did not hit me, however, until I began trying to integrate the results of a wide range of literature for a comprehensive review of sex typing in children. Very diverse characteristics of people are subsumed under the rubrics sex role, sex typing, gender identity, and so on. As I struggled to make sense of the literature and to delimit the scope of my task, I found it helpful to organize the domain in a matrix based on two continua: content and construct. That matrix appears in Table 1. It is presented as a useful heuristic device,

---

Table 1 about here

---

not with any claim that its divisions and groupings represent factorially pure or unitary attributes.

The rows in the matrix are categories of content that have been included by various investigators in conceptions or measures of sex typing. The middle three are most pertinent to this discussion. Number 2, Activities and interests includes toysand play activities, occupations, household tasks, family roles, and areas of achievement. Much of what sociologists define as sex roles (in the technically precise use of that term) falls in this content category. Number 3, personal-social attributes, includes personality traits and social behavior such as aggression, dominance, dependence, and gentleness. Most of the measures of androgyny and most psychological research fall in this content domain. The fourth area is gender-based social relationships. It includes the gender of one's friends, one's sexual partners, the person one chooses to imitate, and the persons one selects as attachment figures, all of which have been used as indexes of sex typing. The common theme among all of these is that one's relation to another person is based on that person's gender. For young children, friendship patterns serve as a good example. Children are expected to form most of their friendships with members of their own gender. A child who plays consistently with the other gender is often thought deviant. In fact, one criterion for diagnosing "gender deviant" boys is that they prefer girls as playmates (Rekers, 1979).

The columns in the matrix represent constructs describing an individual's relation to the content categories. They include concepts or beliefs about what is sex typed in each domain, identity or self perception of one's own attributes, preference or attitudes about your own or other people's sex-typed characteristics, and behavioral enactment demonstrating sex typed behavior. This matrix will serve as a reference point for the main points of my talk today. I have chosen two major themes from the recent literature on the socialization of children's sex typing to discuss. Each of them was selected not only because there is interesting research available about it, but also because I think there are some important new research directions suggested.

The first theme concerns content categories. Throughout development, play activities, interests, occupations, and family roles are sex typed earlier and more definitely than are personality and social behaviors. Yet, psychologists have emphasized personal-social attributes as the core of sex-typing while often dismissing activities and interests as either obvious or trivial. Before explaining what I think we can learn from recognizing the importance of activities and interests, let me document the statement that they are primary in development.

A large body of literature on children's sex typed concepts have accumulated in the last 10 years, and the results are quite consistent. Sometime between ages 2 and 3, children learn to label themselves and others correctly as male or female. Almost as soon as they can produce these labels, they know the sex stereotypes for toys, clothing, tools, household objects, games, and work. Children who are just 2 years old respond at chance levels on questions about stereotypes, but by age 2 ½, several investigations have found better-than-chance responding when children were asked to classify objects and symbols of sex-typed activities and interests. By age 3 and beyond, children are clearly aware of the feminine and masculine connotations of many activities, interests, and adult occupations (Huston, in press).

Parallel patterns occur in children's spontaneous play behavior or when they are asked to choose toys and games for themselves. By age 2, girls and boys play with sex-stereotyped toys more often than with toys stereotyped for the other gender. For example, Marion O'Brien at the University of Kansas has conducted a series of studies in a day care center attended by about 24 toddlers from ages 1 to 3 (O'Brien, Risley & Huston, 1981). She provided

carefully selected sets of toys that were socially defined as masculine, feminine, and neutral during free play sessions. Girls played more often with the feminine toys and boys with the masculine toys. Some of these children are too young to produce meaningful verbal labels about male and female, yet they show sex-typed toy choices.

By age 4 or 5, children also state highly stereotyped occupational preferences. If you ask them what they want to be when they grow up, the majority of preschool girls say teacher, nurse, secretary, or mother. Boys name a wider range of occupations, most of which fit a masculine stereotype (e.g. fireman, pilot) (Huston, in press).

These patterns become ingrained early, even when parents and teachers make an effort to counteract them. I have heard numerous anecdotes from professional women that are similar to my own experience. When my daughter was 3 1/2, she announced with certainty that women could not be doctors. I pointed out that I was a doctor and, if a Ph.D. was not enough, her aunt was a physician. She looked at me with suspicious disbelief.

Along with sex-typed play activities in preschool come gender-based social relationships. Children are more responsive to peers of their own gender than to peers of the other gender as early as age 3. Jacklin and Maccoby (1978) found that unacquainted pairs of 33-month-old children interacted more when they were the same gender than when they differed. In preschool, and probably in other settings, sex segregation of the peer group is inextricably intertwined with sex-typed play activities. When boys and girls gravitate to different activities, then they play primarily with children of their own gender. Conversely, if children select same-sex playmates, they often find themselves in sex-stereotyped activities. If you like playing dolls, you'll end up playing mostly with girls. Or, if you choose to play with girls, you'll often find them in the doll corner. Thus, it seems to me that sex segregation of peers, which increases from preschool through middle childhood, is an integral part of the early pattern of sex-typed activities and interests.

Now let us turn to personal-social attributes. It is probably significant that investigators have rarely tried to ascertain children's knowledge about sex stereotypes in this domain before about age 5. When they have questioned preschool children, most investigators have found little awareness of socially prescribed feminine and masculine social behavior. Between 5 and 11, children gradually acquire knowledge of sex stereotypes about traits such as aggression, crying easily, kindness, and dominance. Such stereotypes not only emerge much later developmentally than those for activities and interests, but they are less definite (Williams, Bennett, & Best, 1975). People are less certain about the sex-typing of kindness and independence, than they are about doll play and love of trucks.

Children's personal-social behavior is also less clearly gender-typed than play patterns and peer choices. Aggression is the only behavior in this domain for which sex differences consistently appear in early childhood. In 1974, Maccoby and Jacklin concluded that there was not definite evidence of mean sex differences for any other personality attribute. Although that conclusion has been challenged, it is clear that sex differences in altruism, nurturance, independence, dependence, dominance, and the like, where they exist at all, are neither as pronounced nor as early developmentally as the play patterns and peer choices we have already discussed.

In short, my first major theme is that, of all the content areas subsumed under the rubric of sex-typing, psychologists have paid too little attention to activities and interests and to peer choices while overemphasizing personality attributes and social behavior. I do not mean to imply that the latter are unimportant, but that we have not paid enough attention to the most

obvious, earliest, and most well-documented differences in expectations and experiences of young girls and boys.

If we followed my advice, and turned our attention to activities, interests, and peer groupings, what might we learn? I will suggest two directions for new research. There are undoubtedly many others. First, play activities themselves may cultivate certain patterns of behavior and teach certain cognitive or social skills. For example, Julia Sherman (1967) and others have suggested that male sex-typed activities such as block play provide more opportunities to learn about spatial relationships than female-stereotyped play activities. A small body of empirical literature provides some support for this contention, but the evidence is far from conclusive (Huston, in press). In an era when the sociobiologists are making strong claims that sex differences in visual-spatial skills have a genetic basis, it is incumbent on advocates of environmental antecedents to gather good data on the issue.

In our work at the University of Kansas, Jan Carpenter and I have pursued the hypothesis that male sex-typed activities may help children to acquire skills in leadership, taking initiative, and acting independently. Our data show that preschool boys spend more time than girls in activities that are not structured by adults. "Structure" in this work refers to the rules, guidelines, and parameters of an activity--what you do and how you do it. If an activity is structured by an adult, children look to the adult for guidance about what to do. They learn to be compliant and to seek recognition from adults. When they are in unstructured activities, they must create a structure for themselves. In so doing, they practice leadership, innovation, and initiative (Carpenter & Huston-Stein, 1980).

The second research direction that might arise from an emphasis on activities and interests is more intensive study of sex segregation and its consequences. Segregation of peer groups is such a prevalent pattern during the preschool and elementary years that we sometimes treat it as an ontogenetic "given." Yet the literature on school settings shows that the amount of sex segregated play varies greatly from one environment to another. For example, children in open school programs spend much less time playing exclusively with same-sex peers than those in traditional schools (Branchi & Bakeman, 1978). Varying the room arrangement or varying where adults spend their time in the preschool can also alter the ratios of boys and girls in an activity. It seems to me that we could profit from careful investigations of the environmental structures and contingencies that increase or decrease sex segregated play.

I should add that, while sex segregation contributes to sex differentiated play patterns, it may also, under some circumstances, permit more flexibility in sex-typed behavior. For example, girls perform better in all-female math classes and boys perform better in all-male reading classes than in mixed sex classes. Similarly, students in single-sex colleges more often take non-traditional majors than those in coeducational institutions (Block, 1981).

The second major theme that I believe emerges from the literature is the importance of cognitive variables in children's acquisition of sex-typing. The first of the construct headings in the matrix in your handout is concepts or beliefs about sex appropriateness--that is, cognitions about sex typing. Social psychology and the psychology of personality have been swept by the "cognitive revolution" in the past 15 or 20 years. Instead of explaining behavior primarily by motives and needs, many theorists have elaborated the ways in which people conceptualize and interpret their social worlds. In developmental psychology, this trend has often included an emphasis on cognitive-developmental changes as a basis for social cognition.

The major theoretical work applying Piagetian theory to sex typing was Kohlberg's chapter in Maccoby's (1966) book on sex differences. Kohlberg rejected the psychoanalytic notion that motivational variables, such as a desire to identify with the parent, were the primary determinants of sex-typing. Instead, he proposed that cognitions about gender preceded motivation to adopt same-sex attributes. Cognitions or concepts about social expectations for males and females were proposed as the major antecedents of sex-typed attitudes and behavior.

Not only were cognitions primary, according to Kohlberg, but they did not need to be taught in any deliberate fashion. Children spontaneously classify and categorize their worlds. Most developmental psychologists now agree with the view that children actively organize the stimuli and information they encounter. They are cognitive constructivists, not passive recipients of adult tuition. It is also agreed that gender is one of the earliest social categories learned although there is some disagreement about why gender is so fundamental. Are the physical differences between females and males so obvious that children in all cultures will learn to classify people as male and female (as Kohlberg argues), or do children learn that gender is important because their culture emphasizes it (as Bem (1981) contends)? Whatever the reasons, in most known cultures, children do spontaneously categorize the world according to gender, and, as Kohlberg originally proposed, they proceed to fill in those categories with information about the work, play activities, clothing, hair styles, and behavior which are associated with females and males in their own societies. They acquire the information from many sources -- what they observe directly, what is portrayed in fiction and media, and what they are told. No one needs to teach concepts about gender directly; children construct them on their own.

The cognitive emphasis has generated a great deal of research on children's concepts about gender, most of which provides empirical support for the basic propositions of the theory. Recent formulations, based on schema theories (Bem, 1981; Martin & Halverson, 1981) have elaborated the constructive nature of concepts about sex-typing even further. Children not only categorize their social environment by gender and learn the stereotypes associated with females and males in their culture; they use the schemas created by this cognitive activity to select and interpret new information as they receive it. In Piagetian terms, they assimilate new information to existing concepts. As a result, gender schemas can lead them to ignore information that does not fit the schema or to distort perceptions to make them more consistent with the schema.

This process is illustrated dramatically in several studies in which children were shown pictures or films of people performing stereotypic or counter-stereotypic behavior actions. When children see counter-stereotypic behavior, they often fail to recall it or they distort their recollection to make the behavior more consistent with sex stereotypes. For example, in two studies by different investigators, children saw toy commercials in which child actors played with stereotyped or counter-stereotyped toys. When asked afterward whether the children in the commercial were boys or girls, about half of the children who had seen the counter-stereotyped advertisements recalled the sex of at least one child actor incorrectly. Almost all children who saw the stereotyped versions recalled the actors' genders accurately (Atkin, 1975; Frey & Ruble, 1981). Similar distortions occurred when children saw one of four films depicting a doctor and nurse. The four versions contained all possible combinations of males and females playing the two roles. When children were shown photographs of the actors and asked whether each was a doctor or nurse, all who had seen the male doctor and female nurse answered correctly. Only 22% of those who saw the female doctor and the male nurse identified both roles accurately (Cordua, McGraw & Drabman, 1979).

This line of research is a little discouraging if one would like to see new concepts about gender transmitted to the coming generation, but we had better understand the processes involved if we are to produce change meaningfully and intelligently.

The cognitive-developmental focus has also led to an expansion of the age range during which we are aware that important learning about sex typing occurs. Virtually all theorists in recent years have moved away from the psychoanalytic emphasis on the first five years as the formative period for sexual identity. Particularly as theorists like Jeanne Block (1973) have tried to specify how people move beyond traditional bifurcated sex roles to androgynous patterns, continuing change and development during the entire life span have been increasingly emphasized in our thinking.

Not only does change continue beyond the preschool years, but the direction of that change is not linear. In his initial formulation, Kohlberg proposed that children's sex role concepts would become more flexible in middle childhood because they could apply concrete operational thinking to such concepts. That hypothesis receives some support when questions about sex stereotypes are posed in a way that permits children to say a behavior is equally appropriate for girls and boys. In some studies, children are simply asked whether behaviors are more typical of females or males. When they are forced to choose, older children generally give more stereotyped responses than younger ones. But, if they have a third choice--Is it more appropriate for males, females, or equally appropriate for both?--there is an increasing tendency from about 5 or 6 on for children to say that activities or behaviors are equally appropriate for both genders. As children move into middle childhood, they are increasingly able to break away from the either-or absolutism of preschool children's thought (Huston, in press).

The increase in flexibility about sex typing parallels more general increases in children's understanding that social conventions are culturally relative and changeable. This pattern was nicely demonstrated in a study of children from kindergarten to eighth grade. They were asked about sex stereotypes and about social conventions involving table manners. For sex-typed activities, they were asked who usually engaged in an activity (stereotype knowledge), whether girls or boys <u>can</u> engage in that activity, and whether there might be a country somewhere where this activity would be appropriate only for the gender opposite the stereotype (flexibility). Older children knew sex stereotypes better, but they were also more aware of exceptions and of cultural relativity. The same developmental pattern occurred for social conventions about table manners--older children knew the conventions, but were also aware that they could be changed (Carter & Patterson, in press).

These findings suggest that changes in children's sex stereotypes may be easier to communicate when children are in middle childhood than in the preschool years. It may imply that children are more cognitively ready for interventions designed to teach non-traditional concepts about gender after they have achieved some flexibility in social cognitive processing than before.

Cognitive developmental theory also contains the premise that concepts and cognitions are the major <u>determinants</u> of sex-typed preferences and behavior. That is, they play an important causal role. In the matrix in your handout, the theory implies that concepts and beliefs should have an impact on the other constructs--self-perception, preference, and behavior. In my judgment the evidence for the causal role of cognitions is not strong. This issue is important because a lot of efforts to change sex typing have been focused on changing children's sex role concepts. Let me elaborate. If cognitions are major determinants of other constructs then (1) cognitions ought to <u>precede</u> behavioral sex-typing, (2) at least after the first few years of

life, cognitions ought to be correlated with preferences, identity, and behavior, and (3) changes in concepts or stereotypes ought to produce changes in self-perception, preference or behavior. To use a favorite phrase of Eleanor Maccoby's , what does the evidence tell us about these three propositions?

First, do cognitions precede sex-typed behavior and preferences developmentally? The answer is no. I have already mentioned that children demonstrate sex-typed toy choices by age 2 before they demonstrate even a clear differentiation of males and females. Of course, it is possible that we are simply unable to measure cognitions when children are basically preverbal, but I think it unlikely that such young children are guided by concepts of gender-appropriateness. It seems more reasonable to conclude that concepts and behavior develop in parallel or simultaneous fashion. Beverly Fagot (1982) suggested in a recent paper that the two may develop rather independently until middle childhood. Sex-typed behaviors are learned, according to her hypothesis, through direct reinforcement, punishment, and modeling in the preschool years at the same time concepts about sex stereotypes are acquired. Only later do children use cognitions about sex typing and parental values as guides for behavior. In any case, the available data indicate that sex-typed behavior and preferences emerge at least as early, if not earlier, than cognitions about sex appropriateness.

Second, are cognitions correlated with identity, preference, and behavior? The evidence on this issue is mixed. On the whole, people with very pronounced sex stereotypes have somewhat more pronounced sex-typed preferences or behavior than individuals with more flexible cognitions, but the correlations are often modest. For example, children who stereotype reading as feminine and math as masculine have more sex-typed achievement goals than those who do not accept such stereotypes (Huston, in press). Of course, even where correlations exist, one cannot be sure of causal direction. Stereotypes could arise from one's preferences or one's behavior as well as being causal agents.

Another source of evidence bearing on the correlations between cognition and behavior comes from the different developmental paths followed by girls and boys. Both males and females learn more and more about social definitions of masculinity and femininity as they get older. At any age, however, boys usually have more pronounced stereotypes than girls. Girls usually show more flexibility in their sex typed concepts--that is, they view more activities and behaviors as equally appropriate for both sexes than boys do. So there are some sex differences in sex-typed cognitions, but both genders follow the same developmental curves.

Sex-typed <u>preferences</u>, by contrast, follow very different developmental curves. Males generally show a monotonic increase with age in masculine preferences and identity. The older they are, the more they express male sex-typed preferences and the more they perceive themselves as masculine (at least until adolescence). Girls <u>move away</u> from feminine preferences and identity during the age period from about 5 or 6 until adolescence. In this age range, girls often show declining preferences for feminine activities and interests, and they become increasingly interested in masculine activities. The few developmental studies of self-perception using the children's PAQ or similar measures show the same trend. Older girls perceive themselves as more masculine than younger ones. This pattern appears in studies carried out in the 1920's, the 1950's, and 1960's. It is not merely an artifact of recent consciousness about the evils of sex stereotyping (see Huston, in press).

Third, do changes in cognitions produce changes in identity, preference or behavior? We need more evidence on this topic, but I would suggest now that many people have been too quick to assume that this proposition is true. A lot of intervention efforts in the past few years have been aimed at changing children's sex stereotypes. People have assumed without evidence that changing stereotypes will change behavior. One of the most widely cited examples is Guttentag and Bray's (1976) study described in their book, Undoing Sex Stereotypes.

Another large-scale intervention effort was the television series, Freestyle, which was designed to present nontraditional career interests and behavior patterns to children in the age range from 9 to 12. After seeing 13 half-hour programs in their classrooms, children responded to measures of stereotypes, attitudes, and behavioral intentions (e.g. Would you join a basketball team?). The program was reasonably successful in changing children's concepts about what was appropriate for females and males, but produced fewer changes in attitudes and behavioral intentions (Johnston, Ettema, & Davidson, 1980). I do not mean to suggest that we should stop trying to teach nontraditional concepts about gender, but we should not expect such concepts to carry the full weight of bringing about changes in attitudes and behavior.

Let me conclude by summarizing the two major themes I have discussed and by making one major plea for the direction to be taken in future research. The first theme emerging from the developmental literature is the importance of activities and interests and of peer associations in the early acquisition of sex typing. I have argued that children learn sex-typed play activities, occupations, family roles, and interests earlier and more definitely than they learn personality traits or social behaviors. Along with play activities goes sex segregation of the peer group. We need to focus more attention on these content areas whether we are interested simply in describing the process or we want to bring about change. It seems to me that some of the most effective ways of teaching nontraditional behavior to preschool children involve making changes in home and school settings that bring about less sex-stereotyped divisions of play activity and more mixed-sex peer activity. The work of Serbin and Connor (see Serbin, 1980) employing careful experimental manipulations and observations of behavior is an example of how productive such research can be.

My second theme was that cognitions and concepts about sex-typing are important elements in the process of learning about gender, but they are not sufficient by themselves for understanding the process of sex typing or producing change. We now know with some certainty that children form concepts spontaneously and that they actively construct concepts and schemas about their social worlds. There is some hope for change in the fact that cognitive developmental changes permit (but do not guarantee) increasing flexibility with age in children's thinking about gender. At the same time, we should exercise considerable caution in assuming that concepts and cognitions are the major causal variables influencing other aspects of sex typing. Self-perceptions, preferences, and behavior are often relatively independent of concepts and are affected by many other variables in addition to the individual's belief about what is appropriate for each gender.

Finally, my plea to researchers in this area. Take multidimensionality seriously. One of the major weaknesses in the literature in this field is that people use one measure of sex typing, often without being explicit about why they chose it or what aspect of sex typing it measures. The cumulative impact of the research in the area is seriously weakened because different studies include diverse measures that are noncomparable. The 20 cells in my matrix all have logically possible entries, and there are empirical studies that fall in most of them. How does one compare a study using the PAQ with one using a Toy Preference index? Individual studies should include multiple

measures of multiple constructs and/or content areas to permit a comprehensive understanding of the processes involved. Mavis Hetherington's studies of father absence (Hetherington, 1966; 1972) and divorced families (Hetherington, Cox & Cox, 1978) are examples of what should be done; they included behavioral observations, preference tests, peer choices, and self-perception measures--a variety of methods and content areas. We have made enormous conceptual and empirical strides in understanding one of the most basic components of human development. There are many capable and creative researchers with strong committments to this area. I hope that such talent can be deployed to produce significant gains that will increase theoretical understanding and permit effective social change in the next 10 years.

References

Atkin, C. Effects of television advertising on children. Second year experimental evidence. Michigan State University, Dept. of Communication, 1975.

Bem, S. L. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 155-162.

Bianchi, B. D. & Bakeman, R. Sex-typed affiliation preferences observed in preschoolers: Traditional and open school differences. Child Development, 1978, 49, 910-912.

Block, J., Von der Lippe, A., & Block, J. H. Sex-role and socialization patterns: Some personality concomitants and environmental antecedents. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1973, 41, 321-341.

Block, J. H. Gender differences and implications for educational policy. Unpublished manuscript, University of California at Berkeley, 1981.

Carpenter, C. J. & Huston-Stein, A. Activity structure and sex-typed behavior in preschool children. Child Development, 1980, 51, 862-872.

Carter, D. B. & Patterson, C. J. Sex roles as social conventions: The development of children's conceptions of sex-role stereotypes. Unpublished manuscript, University of Michigan, 1979.

Constantinople, A. Masculinity-femininity: An exception to a famous dictum? Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 80, 389-407.

Cordua, G. D., McGraw, K. O. & Drabman, R. S. Doctor or nurse: Children's perceptions of sex typed occupations. Child Development, 1979, 50, 590-593.

Fagot, B. Adults as socializing agents. In T. Field, A. Huston, H. Quay, L. Troll, & G. Finley (Eds.), Review of human development. New York: Wiley, 1982.

Frey, K. S. & Ruble, D. N. Concepts of gender constancy as mediators of behavior. Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Boston, April, 1981.

Guttentag, M. & Bray, H. Undoing sex stereotypes: Research and resources for educators. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

Hetherington, E. M. Effects of paternal absence on sex-typed behaviors in Negro and white preadolescent males. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 87-91.

Hetherington, E. M. Effects of father absence on personality development in adolescent daughters. Developmental Psychology, 1972, 7, 313-326.

Hetherington, E. M., Cox, M., & Cox, R. Family interaction and social, emotional and cognitive development of children following divorce. Paper presented at the Symposium on the Family: Setting Priorities. Sponsored by the Institute for Pediatric Service of the Johnson & Johnson Baby Company. Washington, D.C.: May 1978.

Huston, A. C. Sex typing. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), Handbook of child psychology. 4th Ed. Vol. 4. New York, Wiley, in press.

Jacklin, C. N. & Maccoby, E. E. Social behavior at 33 months in same-sex and mixed-sex dyads. Child Development, 1978, 49, 557-569.

Johnston, J., Ettema, J., & Davidson, T. An evaluation of Freestyle: A television series to reduce sex-role stereotypes. Report from Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1980.

Kohlberg, L. A cognitive-developmental analysis of children's sex-role concepts and attitudes. In E. E. Maccoby (Ed.), The development of sex differences. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1966, Pp. 82-172.

Maccoby, E. E. & Jacklin, C. N. The psychology of sex differences. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1974.

Martin, C. L. & Halverson, C. F., Jr. A schematic processing model of sex typing and stereotyping in children. Child Development, 1981.

O'Brien, M., Huston, A. C., & Risley, T. Emergence and stability of sex-typed toy preferences in toddlers. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Behavior Analysis, Milwaukee, May, 1981.

Rekers, G. A. Psychosexual and gender problems. In E. J. Mash & L. G. Terdal (Eds.), Behavioral assessment of childhood disorders. New York: Guilford Press, 1979.

Serbin, L. A. Sex role socialization: A field in transition. In B. Lahey & A. Kazkin (Eds.), Advances in clinical child psychology, Vol. 3. New York: Plenum, 1980.

Shermin, J. A. Problems of sex differences in space perception and aspects of intellectual functioning. Psychological Review, 1967, 74, 290-299.

Spence, J. T. & Helmreich, R. L. Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates, and antecedents. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1978.

Williams, J. E., Bennett, S. M., & Best, D. L. Awareness and expression of sex stereotypes in young children. Developmental Psychology, 1975, 11, 635-642.

Table 1. A Matrix of Sex-Typing Constructs by Sex-Typed Content (all entries are examples)

Content Area	Construct: A. Concepts or beliefs	B. Identity or self-perception	C. Preferences, attitudes, values (for self or for others)	D. Behavioral enactment, adoption
1. *Biological gender*	A1. Gender constancy.	B1. Gender identity as inner sense of maleness or femaleness. Sex role identity as perception of own masculinity or femininity	C1. Wish to be male or female *or* gender bias defined as greater value attached to one gender than the other.	D1. Displaying bodily attributes of one gender (including clothing, body type, hair, etc.).
2. *Activities and interests:* Toys, Play activities Occupations Household roles Tasks Achievement areas	A2. Knowledge of sex stereotypes *or* sex role concepts *or* attributions about others' success and failure.	B2. Self-perception of interests, abilities; *or* sex-typed attributions about own success and failure.	C2. Preference for toys, games, activities; attainment value for achievement areas; attitudes about sex-typed activities by others (e.g., about traditional or nontraditional roles for women).	D2. Engaging in games, toy play, activities, occupations, or achievement tasks that are sex-typed.
3. *Personal-social attributes:* Personality characteristics Social behavior	A3. Concepts about sex stereotypes *or* sex-appropriate social behavior.	B3. Perception of own personality (e.g., on self-rating questionnaires).	C3. Preference or wish to have personal-social attributes *or* attitudes about others' personality and behavior patterns.	D3. Displaying sex-typed personal-social behavior (e.g., aggression, dependence).
4. *Gender-based social relationships:* Gender of peers, friends, lovers, preferred parent, models, attachment figures	A4. Concepts about sex-typed norms for gender-based social relations.	B4. Self-perception of own patterns of friendship, relationship, or sexual orientation.	C4. Preference for male or female friends, lovers, attachment figures, or wish to be like male or female, or attitudes about others' patterns.	D4. Engaging in social or sexual activity with others on the basis of gender (e.g., same-sex peer choice).
5. *Stylistic and symbolic content:* Gestures, Nonverbal behavior Speech and language patterns Styles of play Fantasy Drawing Tempo Loudness Size Pitch	A5. Awareness of sex-typed symbols or styles.	B5. Self-perception of nonverbal, stylistic characteristics.	C5. Preference for stylistic or symbolic objects or personal characteristics *or* attitudes about others' nonverbal and language patterns.	D5. Manifesting sex-typed verbal and nonverbal behavior, fantasy, drawing patterns.