To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Floyd M. Stallings entitled "The Changing Male Role? An Empirical Analysis." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, with a major in Sociology.

Suzanne B. Kurth

Suzanne B. Kurth, Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

Thomas C. Head

Stephen Norland

Accepted for the Council:

Hilton A. Smith

Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

U.T. Archives

Thesis
76
.5822

THE CHANGING MALE ROLE?

AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

A Thesis

Presented for the

Master of Arts

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Floyd M. Stallings

December 1976

1306059

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am deeply indebted to Dr. Suzanne Kurth. As my major professor and advisor, she offered invaluable suggestions and untiring hours of her attention; as my friend, she gave unfaltering support. I am also grateful to Dr. Stephen Norland and Dr. Thomas Hood for their interest in and concern with the quality of my work. I wish to thank my parents for their immeasurable love and continued support. Finally, I wish to express my deepest gratitude to Geri for her steadfast confidence in my abilities and for often being the inspiration I needed.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this project was threefold: first, to review and critique a body of literature on the male sex role, and specifically the male liberation literature; second, to present a discussion of social psychological concepts pertinent to the topic of the male sex role which are often absent in the literature; and third, to conduct an exploratory study to determine if the behaviors and attitudes of the men interviewed were consistent with the themes expounded in the literature.

An open-ended interview schedule based on themes in the male sex role literature was developed. Thirty middle class, married males between the ages of 20 and 30 years were chosen through the process of snowball sampling.

The interview data supported some of the themes but failed to support others. In most cases the findings showed that the assertions in the male sex role literature have been overstated and oversimplified. For example, while most men agreed that men generally have trouble expressing emotions, a large percentage indicated that they personally could freely express their emotions. Although most of the subjects stated that they had in the past felt the pressure to prove their masculinity, most indicated that it was not a constant consideration. Other themes received similar qualified support. The various findings in this study suggest that men hold conflicting views about what is masculine and what is appropriate behavior.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
I. CRITIQUE OF THE MALE SEX ROLE LITERATURE	4
Introduction	4
Masculine Stereotypes	5
What is being said	5
What was not said	7
The Femininized Male	8
A problem	8
Is it true?	11
Psychoanalytical Tradition	14
Alternative Familial Roles	16
The androgynous society	16
The basis of change	21
The case of Sweden	24
Several Empirical Studies of the Male Sex Role	27
Major Themes	31
II. DEFINITIONS OF CONCEPTS	34
Introduction	34
Concepts	36
Sex and gender	36
Sex role and gender role	36
Sexual identity and gender identity	38

CHAPTER PAGE

Role/status/position 39

Implicit concepts. 40

Role strain. 41

Institutional sexism 47

Individual versus social change 49

III. STUDY DESIGN 53

Introduction 53

An Exploratory Study 56

Respondent Characteristics 57

Marital status and age 57

Social class 58

Selection of respondents 59

Interview Schedule Construction 60

Themes 61

Analysis 65

IV. FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION. 68

Introduction 68

Masculine Awareness 69

Masculine Stereotypes 70

Expression of Emotion 72

Insecurity of Masculinity 73

Feminization of Males. 75

Male Dominance 76

Male Superiority 78

CHAPTER PAGE

The Importance of Breadwinner Role 81

Male Involvement in Housework. 86

Paternity 92

V. CONCLUSIONS 95

Introduction 95

Recapitulation of Views 96

Suggestions for Future Research 100

LIST OF REFERENCES 106

APPENDIX 113

VITA 119

INTRODUCTION

The sixties and seventies are decades in which there has been considerable discussion about the two sexes. The women's movement has affected numerous areas of life to varying degrees, not always generating significant change but always demanding a hearing. Apparently as a result of the discussion about the roles of women, a small outgrowth of the women's movement was born early in the 1970's: the men's liberation movement. Its advocates urge that men, just as women, need to be liberated from the societal constraints which prevent their expression of emotions, which force them into occupations and activities simply on the basis of their sex, and which deny them the joys of an active role in caring for their children.

Although generally the men's liberation movement has been much less noticed or widespread than the women's movement, it has given rise to a body of popularized social science literature on the male sex role. A substantial sub-set, the male liberation literature, is a collection of various authors' personal experiences, frustrations with masculine stereotypes, and desires for change. The authors basically have backgrounds in journalism, political science, psychology, and sociology. Their primary purpose whether explicitly stated or not seems to be to raise the consciousness of their readers, and in this respect they probably are effective. Regarding the social scientists included in this group, however, their contributions to the obtainment of greater understanding of sex role behavior and to the accumulation of empirical data on this topic are quite limited. They too have written in a loose, popularized style. Although this literature has been widely accepted in

the social sciences, it appears to be more propaganda than scientific research.

Other social scientists have engaged in more conventional discussions of male and female roles. Although they offer more data and conceptual clarity, as a whole the findings about sex roles are contradictory and fragmentary. Traditionally, anthropologists have been concerned with cross-cultural differences in sex roles (e.g., Mead). Physiological and psychoanalytic theories (e.g., Freud, Horney) have been offered to interpret sex role behavior. In addition both psychologists (e.g., Horner) and sociologists (e.g., Komarovsky) have been concerned with the study of sex roles. As will be presented in Chapter II, a social psychological perspective particularly seems to provide conceptual clarification for the difficulties often found in the male liberation literature.

More theoretical and empirical work is needed in the area of sex roles, and particularly on the male role since it has received very limited attention. The common sense view among social scientists seems to be that sex roles are undergoing behavioral and attitudinal change. As of yet, however, not only has the direction and degree of the change not been determined, but also the very existence of significant change has not been convincingly documented.

The paper is divided into four basic sections. First, the author will review and critique the male sex role literature. The purpose of this is to summarize the existent literature on the male sex role and to consider a number of inadequacies in the literature. Second, a section will be devoted to the discussion of a number of concepts often only implicitly considered in the male sex role literature or totally

omitted, clarifying the nature of the conceptual difficulties and inconsistencies in the literature. Third, the author will describe the design of an exploratory study of thirty middle class, young married males. The purpose of the study is to determine the extent to which a number of themes in the male liberation literature are supported by the expressed attitudes and reports of behavior of the respondents. Finally, the findings and interpretations of the data will be presented, and suggestions for future research will be made.

CHAPTER I

CRITIQUE OF THE MALE SEX ROLE LITERATURE

Introduction

In the 1960's and 1970's there has been considerable public and private debate about sex roles in American society. The rising employment of married women including those with children at home, the changing laws, the increasing control over the number and timing of children a couple would have were some of the forces leading to a questioning of sex role stereotypes. In the second half of the 1960's a women's movement emerged which stressed the importance of changing woman's traditional role. This movement continues to the present day.

In the late 1960's and early 1970's another small, scarcely noticed movement began, the men's (male) liberation movement. Many of its members state that their involvement with women in the women's movement provided the impetus for them to begin a questioning of their roles as men in society (Marine, 1972: 7-8; Fasteau, 1974: 3). Loosely organized, the movement, if indeed it can be defined as such, has received minimal media attention and apparently its effects to date are basically limited to the small number of individuals who have joined consciousness-raising groups and those who have read the literature.

One result of these men's concern has been a rash of books on the male sex role that are primarily collections of essays and articles, representing a number of disciplines, as well as, less academic perspectives. Although the writing of this material has perhaps been

cathartic for the authors, it has not led to any systematic analysis of sex roles. Many of these works relate the author's personal experiences and frustrations with the traditional sex roles. While they apparently encourage change in societal roles, their emphasis is upon change in individual behavior. I shall review and critique the themes implicit in the current male sex role literature. In this analysis I shall primarily consider the works of three social scientists: Warren Farrell and Patricia Sexton, both sociologists, and Marc Fasteau, a political scientist.[1] The majority of Farrell's and Fasteau's work involves relating personal experiences rather than social science data. As popularized social scientists, these authors employ the use of social scientific terminology but do so in an oversimplified manner which creates confusion. Since they are widely cited in professional social scientific research on sex roles, a critique of their work is needed.

Masculine Stereotypes

What is Being Said

In most cases presentations begin with a brief discussion of socialization into the male role. The socialization process is an obvious starting point for any analysis, but most of the writers do not provide a theoretical analysis of the process of learning societal expectations but provide only the expectations, stereotypical descriptions.

---

[1]Other authors to whom occasional reference will be made particularly in presenting the themes are as follows: Brenton, David and Brannon, Nichols, and Pleck and Sawyer, all popularized social scientists; Marine, a journalist; and Turner, a more conventional social scientist.

The Liberated Man by Warren Farrell provides a typical presentation. In his chapter on the "development of masculinity," he deals with socialization in a loose, mass appeal style. His listing of the "Ten Commandments of Masculinity" provides an example of the lack of depth analysis and emphasis upon stereotypical views. He argues that men learn the following:

> (1) Thou shalt not cry or expose other feelings of emotion, fear, weakness, sympathy, empathy, or involvement before they neighbor.
>
> (2) Thou shalt not be vulnerable, but honor and respect the "logical," "practical," or "intellectual" - as thou defines them.
>
> (3) Thou shalt not listen, except to find fault.
>
> (4) Thou shalt condescend to women in the smallest and biggest of ways.
>
> (5) Thou shalt control thy wife's body, and all its relations, occasionally permitting it on top.
>
> (6) Thou shalt have no other egos before thee.
>
> (7) Thou shalt have no other breadwinners before thee.
>
> (8) Thou shalt not be responsible for housework - before anybody.
>
> (9) Thou shalt honor and obey the straight and narrow pathway to success: job specialization.
>
> (10) Thou shalt have an answer to all problems at all times (Farrell, 1974: 32).

In an attempt to provide some explanation for the existence of such stereotypical expectations, Farrell refers to the Goldberg and Lewis study which found that mothers have greater contact with female infants than with males and that by the age of thirteen months boys touch and

talk to their mothers less than girls do (1969). For Farrell this represents the earliest stage at which males are unknowingly taught to be "emotionally constipated" (1974: 33).

Farrell moves into a discussion of what he terms the second stage of the development of masculinity in which boys learn to disdain anything that is feminine. He refers to the evidence of sexism in most school readers in which sex roles are often clearly differentiated into traditional male and female roles. In addition to this differentiation, there often is a very basic disrespect for anything that is portrayed as being feminine. According to Farrell, a result of the fear of being considered feminine is that boys frequently develop such grandiose expectations for themselves that anxiety is created (1974: 34-40).

To finish his discussion of socialization, Farrell deals with the physical, student, job, and sex strivers, rounding off his discussion with a sampling of bathroom wall graffiti. He points out such wide-spread ideas that boys strive to prove themselves physically; that they must excel academically, while remaining cool and demonstrating that it (being cool) comes naturally; that they must master, at least relatively well, one sport even if they are high performers academically; and that over time they come to view women as objects to be conquered just as are their jobs, etc. (Farrell, 1974: 40-56).

What Was Not Said

Although the stereotypes which Farrell depicts are probably true to some degree, as are all stereotypes, he does not discuss the extent to

which these expectations are held nor the degree to which people behave in accordance with them. Is every man socialized to believe and abide by the ten rules listed above? Although he provides no data to support his description, one is given the impression that he believes that most men can be characterized in this manner. Without any empirical data his comments are merely subjective statements of his personal observations and experiences, and as such, are of limited utility to social scientists.

Generally his discussion of the socialization process through which male children learn the masculine role is limited theoretically. Farrell does not adequately deal with the numerous conflicts which exist in the minds of children as a result of conflicting role expectations, although he does present some stereotypes that have impact upon individuals which possibly result in role strain. (This concept of role strain will be more thoroughly discussed in the following chapter.) In addition, Farrell does not offer any explanation as to why many mothers touch male infants less than females; nor does he discuss why boys are taught to disdain feminine behavior and attitudes. It appears that he accepts these assertions as given and uses them as a foundation upon which to present his stereotypical descriptions.

The Feminized Male

A Problem

Patricia Sexton presents a view focusing on the negative consequences which result when males are unable to fulfill the stereotypes Farrell describes. In great detail she characterizes the "feminized

male," the male whose "normal male impulses are suppressed or misshapened by overexposure to feminine norms" (Sexton, 1969: 4, 13). Her argument is that the present social structure is preventing men from being "real" men and is producing instead a generation of feminized men. A few factors in the social structure that she considers feminizing agents are schools, the rise of suburbia, increasing life spans, frustrated and idle housewives, and the present occupational structure. Four of these factors will be reviewed in order to present the basic outline of her perspective.

She asserts that schools are essentially feminine institutions which feminize males by insisting upon conformity to the behavior norms of being polite, clean, obedient, etc. To her, the kind of learning the school offers is to be passive and feminine, rather than active and masculine. According to Sexton, boys in school are confronted with two alternatives. One option is to internalize the values of the school. If this occurs, she argues that boys become feminized. A second option is to resist and thereby to fail and rebel, thus maintaining masculine autonomy. Her preference is clearly the latter despite its problems, for a man must be a "man" (Sexton, 1969: 30-33).

A second factor which she considers to be important in the feminization of males is the rise of suburbia. With fathers absent most of the day because of their jobs and the time spent in commuting, the suburban community is almost entirely composed of females. As a result, boys lack masculine models to teach them to become "confident and potent males" (Sexton, 1969: 28).

Sexton asserts that idle housewives and mothers play a significant role in emasculating the male population. She argues that since women

are prevented from obtaining occupational positions of power and prestige outside the home, they frequently release their repressed antagonism and resentment of male perogatives on their sons. She continues that women, and specifically wealthy and idle women, focus their attention on "minor forms of adornment," meaning that they adorn their faces, bodies, houses, children, etc. Also their interests lie in promoting the arts, i.e., opera, ballet, concerts. In response to these women, Sexton holds that men scramble to win their favors, to escort them to cultural events, to adorn them with beautiful gifts. In the process as she sees it, men in effect castrate themselves (Sexton, 1969: 24-25).

A fourth feminizing factor that she presents is the shift from manual labor to automation and white collar occupations. She laments the absence of a need for heavy, manly work. Characterizing the white collar man simply as a desk sitter and memo writer, she asserts that life is softer now and that men are more concerned with conformity to the organizational structure than they are with their individual autonomy. She concludes that the computer and automation have terminated most of the truly masculine jobs (Sexton, 1969: 26-28).

Sexton considers the majority of males to be significantly influenced by these feminizing factors. As a result, she strongly advocates a change in the process of male socialization which would allow males to develop as she believes males should. She states:

> We need real heroes and we need to think more about what we want our males to be, but mainly we need to step aside and let boys develop like boys.

> We should encourage their efforts to become strong and autonomous males. Let them run and play like boys, let them learn the things that boys want to learn, let them dress and act like boys. And let's restrain, if we can, the mothers, school, and society that want to dress them up like women or children (Sexton, 1969: 198).

Is It True?

Sexton's brand of feminism is to say the least a strange one. She appears to advocate equality for women in the occupational sphere, but, at the same time, to insist that men continue to be "men" in the traditional sense of the word. Although she never clarifies what a real man's composition is, she implies that anything less than the rugged, athletic, dashing, courageous hero type is less than desirable. One wonders how women can ever be considered equal in any realm as long as men are led to believe that they are naturally and legitimately more ruggedly autonomous than women.

Her comment that male "honor students" are inevitably "sissies" (1969: 198) is obviously a reflection of her own value judgement and is not empirically supported. Other points that she makes receive limited support within the social psychological literature. One illustration is her unequivocal designation of active or aggressive behavior as masculine and of passive or submissive behavior as feminine (1969: 32). She speaks of these two characteristics not as socially acquired attributes to some extent differentially distributed between the sexes, but as traits inherent in each. In the following discussion

several studies are reviewed to illustrate the inconclusive nature of the findings on sex differences in aggression and passivity. It is apparent that Sexton does not have adequate basis for her assertions.

Some studies have seemed to support her position. For example, Arnold Buss conducted a study in which he used groups of two students each of which was told that he/she would be participating in a teacher and learner situation. Although they arrived simultaneously at the laboratory, one was a cohort of the experimenter. The subject was assigned the role of teacher and was instructed to shock the learner when he/she gave an incorrect response. The learner had previously been instructed to make errors. The problem for the subject then was to decide how strongly to shock the learner for his or her incorrect answers. In this situation male college students gave significantly higher levels of shock to the learner than did female subjects (Buss, 1963: 1-7). In addition, Kilham and Mann found that even when a third party decides on the appropriate shock level, men are more willing to act aggressively toward a passive learner than are women (1974: 696-702). (One could argue on the basis of these results, however, that the males were more conforming to experimental demands than women, rather than more aggressive.)

Taylor and Epstein approached the study of aggression and sex somewhat differently. In their study a student subject could not only shock another student but also could receive shocks from the other person. Initially the men showed more aggression; but as the partner (stooge) became more aggressive, women responded in like fashion. By the end of

the session, the difference between males and females in the amount of shock they were giving their partners was not significant (Taylor and Epstein, 1967: 473-486). Hokanson and Edelman report similar findings to those of Taylor and Epstein in that women will be just as aggressive as men when they are provoked by a shocking partner (1966).

Eleanor Maccoby's compendium also suggests the inconclusive nature of the findings on sex differences in aggression. Of twelve studies on aggression, nine concluded that boys are more aggressive, while the others reported no significant differences. In twenty-six studies of sex differences in dependency, six showed that boys were more dependent, eleven found girls more dependent, and nine reported no significant difference (Maccoby, 1966: 323-351). The lack of concensus indicated by these studies and those mentioned above suggests that Sexton's statements are stronger than the available research justifies.

Sexton appears to believe that certain behavior is naturally and rightfully masculine, while other is feminine. Margaret Mead has shown that such definitions vary from one culture to another. Among the Mundugamor society, both sexes manifest behavior closely paralleling our norm of masculinity. Among the Arapesh, both sexes' behavior is similar to our stereotypical feminine beahvior. Among the Tchambuli, the females act in a manner defined as masculine by American society, and the males are feminine by our current standards (Mead, 1969).

As Duberman posits, when a child is born, he/she begins the process of acquiring a gender role which is compatible with his/her sex status (1975: 37). (In the following chapter a more complete discussion of sex, gender, and role will be presented.) Children of both sexes encounter

a system of socially and culturally prescribed roles. Through a process of reward or acceptance and punishment or rejection, children receive gender role instruction (Chafetz, 1974: 3).

On the basis of the studies reviewed above, Sexton's explanation for sex differences in the levels of activity and passivity among men and women appears unacceptable. When she states that boys should "run and play like boys" and should be allowed to "learn the things that boys want to learn" (1969: 198), perhaps she means that boys should assume traditional sex roles because of her personal belief that these roles are right and best. If this is the case, attempts to refute her opinion are not necessary. If, however, she means that there are activities which boys inherently want to learn and perform simply because they are male, she is ignoring a great deal of research which has shown that little masculine or feminine behavior is determined by biological designation but rather by the interaction of two factors: biological tendencies and the influence of the social environment.

Psychoanalytical Tradition

Although societal processes are not his basic concern, Fasteau in The Male Machine also deals with the socialization process. He not only discussed the inability of men to express emotion, their chokingly competitive drives, their obsession with sports, etc., but also he asserts that it was conformity to a superimposed male ideal type on the part of the leaders in the Vietnam conflict and in Watergate that perpetuated both

occurrences. It is purely speculative; but it provides interesting reading and represents at least an attempt to go beyond what has been said repeatedly in the male literature.

In discussing the process through which a young man learns the male sex role, Fasteau briefly presents one theory. It is based on Freud's original work on the Oedipus complex as recently reinterpreted by feminist writers. Initially children of both sexes identify with their mothers because typically mothers spend a greater amount of time in caring for them. Included in this attachment are a sensual component and the fulfillment of numerous physical and emotional needs. When children reach school or nursery school age, it is rather suddenly demanded that they eschew many forms of behavior that are feminine or "babyish." In essence boys are instructed to renounce their identification with their mothers and to identify with their fathers, whose approval they must achieve by conformity with some male standard. Fasteau argues that boys develop antagonism toward and fear of their fathers. Their choice is either to be warm and loving but subordinate as are their mothers, or to be harsher but more adventurous and exciting as are their fathers. For a number of years, psychoanalysts have observed that boys experience this persistent struggle between their need for continuing identification with their mothers and the pressures to emulate their fathers. For many men the result is a number of painful experiences that persist throughout adulthood (Fasteau, 1974: 200-201).

A critique of Fasteau will be included in the next section.

Alternative Familial Roles

The Androgynous Society

Traditionally it has been conceived that the duty of the husband/father is to provide materially for his wife and children. Likewise, it has been the right of the wife/mother to expect him to do so. On the other hand, the wife/mother has assumed housework and child care as her duties, while the husband/father has considered these activities to be his rights. This division of labor presumes that males and females each have characteristics which particularly suit them to the traditional roles. As an alternative to this traditional view of familiar roles, some writers suggest that a socially androgynous conception of the roles of men and women should be adopted. Employed in this sense, androgyny means that each sex will develop some of the characteristics typically associated with the other in traditional sex role definitions. Rossi states that an androgynous conception of sex roles emphasizes the "enlargement of the common ground on which men and women base their lives together by changing the social definitions of approved characteristics and behavior for both sexes" (1965: 99).[2]

Fasteau asserts that an androgynous division of labor in the home will reduce the conflict boys experience in transferring their identification

[2]Although frequently used synomously, there is a difference between the meanings of androgyny and role reversal. While the former refers to the developing of some characteristics in each sex which are typically associated with the other sex, role reversal involves the complete adoption by one sex of the other's role responsibilities and vice-versa.

from mothers to fathers. Since sex role differentiation will become less marked, each parent will have a degree both of the traditionally feminine unconditional acceptance and of the traditionally masculine performance orientation. Since both traits can be seen in each parent, the boy can freely choose what is more compatible with his temperament and needs. Fasteau utilizes Mead's classic Samoan study as support for his belief that in an androgynous society the Oedipal conflict does not/will not appear (Fasteau, 1974: 201-202).

The above explanation presumes the existence of an androgynous society; however, the fact remains that Fasteau has failed to deal with how this change is to be realized since our current society is not androgynous. Regardless of how much he and others desire the androgynous sex roles, they must be able to show they are emerging. Fasteau's optimism is not shared by Polatnick. She points out that the "allocation of child-rearing responsibility to women is no sacred feat of nature, but a social policy which supports male domination in the society and in the family." She continues to say that regardless of its intrinsic worth, rearing children in our society is not valued; its lack of salary, low status, long hours, and domestic isolation predispose it to be a job for the powerless group - women (Polatnick, 1973: 85-86).

After considering the myth of the "maternal instinct" and the need for fathers to take an active part in child-rearing, Farrell suggests several alternatives to the ordinary arrangements in which the mother is primarily responsible for child care. His first proposal is the establishment of "do-it-yourself child care arrangements." Under this plan parents work with other parents to develop their own child care centers. For example, if ten couples are involved, the plan would

roughly be for each parent to take one day per month off from work to devote to the children. Of course, at least one full time child care worker would be required. He argues that if employers are not sympathetic to parent leaves, they can be made more amenable to the idea when they are confronted with the possibility of losing good employees, having high rates of absenteeism, and the costs of training new employees (Farrell, 1974: 137-140).

One basic problem with this alternative is that it is an option which is available to only one segment of the population, the upper middle class. Even if men and women in the working class desire to share in child care responsibilities, they hardly have the bargaining positions with their employers that professional people have. Farrell is assuming that jobs are abundant and that all workers have effective bargaining power, when in fact there is a scarcity of jobs and workers are frequently forced to take any available jobs. It does not seem likely that a blue collar worker will risk his/her job in today's precarious economy by demanding parent leave or even a minimum amount of time off such as one day per month. This is but one example of the failure of the male sex role literature to realistically address any segment of the population other than the upper middle class. Practically all the authors of the male sex role literature are members of the upper middle class, and the alternatives and arguments that they present are feasible primarily for highly educated, occupationally mobile, and liberal persons.

Another possibility is to develop a new work schedule in either of two ways: by shortening the work week or by staggering work hours. In

the first instance the suggestion is for both parents to work four days a week at ten hours per day, rather than the typical five-day, forty-hour week. One possibility would be for the father to work Monday through Thursday and the mother to work Tuesday through Friday, leaving only three days of the week when both parents are away. In the second case, that of staggering work hours, parents could work slightly different shifts to prevent the child's being away from both parents all day. For example, the mother could work from 7 a.m. until 3 p.m. and the father from 11 a.m. until 7 p.m. This would allow the mother time with the child in the afternoon and the father time in the morning, while still reserving a period of time for the parents (Farrell, 1974: 142-149).

Farrell's assumption that fathers will want to participate on an equal basis in caring for children is not necessarily justifiable. He assumes that the joys of having and caring for children are numerous and that fathers will not wish to be kept from enjoying these privileges. Although she would agree that fathers should be involved in these activities, Polatnick would disagree that they are rights which fathers currently desire. Instead she asserts that the traditional role-counter-role of husband to wife and vice-versa will continue to exist because of an imbalance of power (Polatnick, 1973). Farrell is proposing individual change without considering fully the impact of socialization and existing societal institutions.

Likewise, Fasteau's assumptions are made without adequately taking into account the power of one's previous socialization and existing social arrangements. He predicts a time when

> Our lives will be shaped by a view of personality which will not assign fixed ways of behaving to individuals on the basis of sex. Instead, it would acknowledge that each person has the potential to be - depending on the circumstances - both assertive and yielding, independent and dependent, job- and people-oriented, strong and gentle, in short, both "masculine" and "feminine"; that the most effective and happy individuals are likely to be those who have accepted and developed both these "sides" of themselves; and that to deny either is to mutilate and deform; that human beings, in other words, are naturally androgynous (Fasteau, 1974: 196).

He continues by encouraging the integration of the "masculine" and "feminine" aspects of the self since they actually complement, rather than oppose, each other. For example, a traditionally masculine trait is the ability to pursue large objectives in an organized fashion, while a traditionally feminine characteristic is the ability to discern and value the feelings one has about situations and other people. Fasteau asserts that each of these traits is essential to the useful development of the other. Males are taught to inhibit their emotions; as a result, they are not enough in tune with their feelings to know what they honestly want. Since their feelings are suppressed and, thus, unable to aid in guiding them, they rush frantically in the direction of standardized success. When maintaining this success does not fully satisfy some men, they often lose impetus to achieve altogether. Women, on the other hand, are taught to believe that they are unable to perform well except in certain areas. Fasteau asserts that without the possibility and discipline of action, feelings are often reduced to mere sentimentality and eventually fade entirely (Fasteau, 1974: 197).

He gives a second example of the complementarity of the characteristics of the two sexes which is clearer. Total independence without any dependence leads one ultimately to isolation. On the other hand, complete dependence on another person in all major aspects of life inevitably destroys self-esteem. In addition, neither being tough at all times, i.e., remaining strong in the presence of physical and emotional pressure, nor being tender and caring is sufficient alone. The two traits complement each other (Fasteau, 1974: 197-198).

Fasteau concedes that the development of complementary masculine and feminine qualities will be unevenly and slowly brought about in people (1974: 198). He never, however, addresses the issue of what will precipitate the androgynous society necessary for the existence of such individuals. His point is well made if one assumes, as he obviously does, that such change has already occurred or is rapidly emerging in the United States. In his future society girls will play baseball, just as boys will play with dolls; girls will be expected to call boys for dates, and boys will not pay more than girls; girls will enjoy science and math, just as boys will learn modern dance; etc. He provides similar examples of androgynous adult behavior (Fasteau, 1974: 198).

The Basis of Change

Fasteau considers the increasing number of mothers working outside the home as indicative of the emerging androgynous society. He asserts the widely accepted, but not documented, notion that as women begin to work outside the home, their husbands will assume a larger share of responsibility for homemaking and child care. As a result, he concludes that "both will broaden their repertories of sensibilities and capacities

by adding those previously ruled out by the traditional sex roles, and children will have more androgynous parents as models" (Fasteau, 1974: 199).

At first glance it seems to be a reasonable assumption that as women become involved in professions outside the home, husbands will assume greater responsibility in the home. But is it necessarily that correct an assumption? I argue that most men and women will continue in their basic familial roles. This is not to say that men will not perform some token household duties, but I do not perceive their roles changing significantly. The mere fact that a man prepares TV dinners for the family and clears the table afterward does not really indicate the existence of an androgynous society. One wonders who shopped for the TV dinners, how much praise the man required for his assistance, and how often he does it.

Moore and Sawhill indicate that in general husbands of working wives take a slightly more active role in child care and housework; however, the rapid increase in women in the work force has not been accompanied by a significant increase in husbands' involvement in household chores. Based on a number of interviews, they conclude that between 1955 and 1971 little change occurred in the division of household labor. With regard to three tasks - doing the dishes, getting breakfast, and cleaning up the living room - they found that these tasks are still done primarily by women. Although husbands were more likely to get their own breakfast in 1971, they were <u>less</u> likely to shop for groceries than in 1955 (Moore and Sawhill, 1976: 108-109).

Oakley's findings are very similar to those of Moore and Sawhill. After conducting a number of interviews, she concludes that in only a few families are husbands "notably domesticated" and that caring for the home and children remain the woman's primary responsibility. She indicates that this traditional division of labor is found both in homes in which the woman does not work outside the home and in those in which she is employed outside the home (Oakley, 1974: 140-165).

It seems that instead of having exchanged one type work for another, women have assumed new responsibilities in addition to their traditional tasks. One accommodation they appear to have made is that they have reduced the number of hours spent in housekeeping as a result either of lowering their housework standards or of relying on goods and services in the market, e.g., eating out more often, using commercial laundries, etc.

Beyond this, even if men did become actively involved in homemaking and child care once their wives joined the work forces, would this activity truly imply an androgynous society? Obviously men would be engaged in traditionally feminine tasks, but is this a strong indicator of attitudinal change? If the wife were to stop working, would this alter the amount and type of work the husband engages in? If so, it seems that the change has been one of necessity; i.e., the wife's physical absence from the home necessitated a limited sharing of responsibilities. If traditional roles are resumed when the wife leaves the work force for some reason, it would appear that what had seemed to be the end of behavior ascribed by sex and the emergence of an equalitarian structure in the family was in reality only superficial change.

Traditional role behavior may be altered for economic or other expedient reasons; nevertheless, traditional attitudes may be very present in the minds of the man and woman.

Fasteau, as well as others, has made a mistake common to those who advocate the need for change in traditional sex roles. He has imputed his awareness to others and has interpreted their behavior in a very optimistic way. Although social psychological literature supports the assumption that often behavioral change eventually leads to attitudinal change, he does not deal with the possibility that these changes in behavior are not necessarily indicative of significant changes in attitudes at the present time. The visible changes in behavior may instead be the result of an imperative need for at least a partial and temporary sharing of responsibilities.

The Case of Sweden

The alternatives discussed above, while not totally unlikely in the immediate future, in most cases appear to be projections of the author's personal desire rather than projections based on data. Few of the options described have been or are being implemented in widespread practice. For this reason, a more useful source from which to draw possible alternatives is found in the remarkable efforts made in Sweden to establish equality for women. Early in this century a number of women and men in Sweden began to organize in an attempt to raise the status of women. It was during the 60's, however, that great strides toward this end were made. A brief review of some measures currently under consideration illustrates the progress made.

In the area of education the proposal is that every pupil be instructed in domestic science, child care, needlework, woodwork, and metalwork. Earlier efforts were enacted to eliminate teaching that certain jobs and professions are suitable for men and others for women. Also to assure the opportunity for both men and women to work outside the home, the government has established a basic child allowance (maintenance money) for each child under 16 years of age. Government-operated kindergartens are currently undergoing considerable expansion. In the eyes of the government the costs incurred in maintaining kindergartens and nursery schools pay dividends in several ways. The mother is able to use her occupational training or to receive more training if she desires. The society in turn benefits through the income tax paid by the mother and through the filling of a position which might otherwise have remained vacant (Sandlund, 1968: 231-232, 234-257, 263).

Changes are also being made by the Pensions Insurance Committee to assure widowers the same right to pensions as widows have. Advocates of these changes assert that to provide pensions for widows, and not for widowers, in the event of the death of a spouse, implies the need for taking care of women. They encourage the rejection of any policy or legislation based on this assumption. Likewise a gradual transition to separate taxation of the incomes of husbands and wives is occurring, for allowing married men twice the basic allowance for single persons supports the traditional view of marriage (Sandlund, 1968: 232, 266, 269).

Joint taxation is objectionable on another basis: it is considered to be a direct obstacle to the economic independence of women. When a married women returns to work, she is eligible for her tax-free basic deduction. Her husband's reduction is reduced by the same amount,

resulting in his paying more taxes. The combined incomes of the couple result in a proportionally higher tax on the wife's income than would be the case if she were not married. In this sense the couple is penalized when the wife returns to work, and this penalty may work to deter wives from rejoining the labor force (Sandlund, 1968: 270).

The Swedish government is working to establish equality in the extremely important area of the labor market. Recognizing that women compose a large proportion of low income, unemployed persons, the government has developed an extensive training program for the unemployed. Not only does this training give the individual greater vocational possibilities, but also it increases productivity. In a foresighted measure the government provides all school children of 13-14 years of age with a "prevocational practical orientation" to ensure that children, females in particular, are adquately informed of the available occupational choices (Sandlund, 1968: 276-277).

The government is actively involved in attempts to eradicate sex barriers. Challenges are raised to sex stipulations made by employers when registering vacancies in jobs. In times of economic recession the government is careful to prevent women from losing jobs more rapidly than men. The government considers that differential lay-offs would be indicative of the assumption that in the final analysis men must be the real breadwinners. Also male applicants are given training and employment in areas traditionally regarded as feminine, just as women are entering traditionally masculine areas. Married women seeking to

join the labor force can no longer be subjected to any test to determine their need for employment. In short, the Swedish government is committed to assuring the rights of both sexes to "full, productive and freely chosen employment" (Sandlund, 1968: 272-273).

This overview of conditions in modern Sweden points out a number of limitations in the alternatives presented in the American male sex role literature. Swedish individuals have attacked sex barriers which Americans have apparently overlooked or have not felt were ready to be altered (joint taxation, lack of training for unemployed, etc.) and have made greater advances in areas that we have just touched (child care arrangements and non-sexist education). Their efforts have been to a large extent successful for several reasons, with perhaps the most important being that they have more than tacit support from the government. Before it is likely that widespread change in sex role behavior will occur, the full support of the legislative and judicial bodies of the government is imperative. Writers who urge the initiation of change on the individual level fail to recognize not only the impact of socialization but also the institutional barriers to such change.

Several Empirical Studies of the Male Sex Role

In an attempt at empiricism, Farrell, obviously motivated by the notion that exposure to women's liberation literature would cause men to react more positively, devised an experiment with two groups, each composed of 120 men. The first group was given a questionnaire without any background; the second received the questionnaire only after they had read

seventeen articles or excerpts (approximately two hours of reading time) from women's liberation material. To be sure that the men read the literature, he required that they write and return their reactions before they were given the questionnaire (Farrell, 1974: 192-193).

Since the men were randomly selected, both groups of men were examined to determine the degree of their prior exposure to women's liberation and the degree of similarity in their socioeconomic backgrounds. He found no statistically significant differences between the two groups. Although the men were randomly chosen, they were chosen from three groups which Farrell considers very relevant to the aims of women's liberation: employers because of their power in economic and business areas, state legislators because of their power to ratify or reject the Equal Rights Amendment, and college students because he considered their response to be indicative of the type of change one can expect from the next generation (Farrell, 1974: 193-194).

Briefly, his findings are that the men who were in greatest opposition to women's liberation changed the most. Catholics, originally the least positive group, changed more than Protestants or Jews after reading the material, although the latter groups were in each level of analysis more sympathetic to the women's movement. Although men with very little education were originally strongly opposed, the effect of reading the literature was greatest on this group. Married men were found to be more negative toward women's liberation than single men; but when married men read the literature, they changed more than the single men who also read the material (Farrell, 1974: 194-196). One possible interpretation for

the greater observed changes among men who were originally most opposed to women's liberation (Catholic, uneducated, and married men) is that they had greater room for change than those who were only slightly opposed.

Farrell's conclusion is that whether their "knowledge" came from reading the experimental literature he distributed or from other sources, "once they knew a lot about women's liberation they could no longer remain opposed" (1974: 196). If the findings themselves did not appear particularly elucidating, the conclusion is even more ludicrous. His underlying assumption is questionable. The idea that two hours of reading, or seventeen articles, could qualify one as highly knowledgeable about a multi-faceted movement such as women's liberation is incredible. In addition, this reading could lead experimental subjects to please the experimenter with positive responses. Unfortunately, his study is one of very few attempts to empirically study men's attitudes toward the changing role of women in society.

Komarovsky's (1973) study of 62 male seniors in an eastern Ivy League college is representative of another effort to study the effects of the changing role of women on men. She was particularly concerned with the attitude of men toward women who are intellectually equal or superior to themselves. One-third of the subjects confessed to feelings of anxiety over their perceived failure to live up to the norm of male superiority. The remaining respondents expressed their desire for intellectual companionship between equals. Concerning their future wives working, she found that they were ambivalent and inconsistent in their attitudes. Almost half (48%) of the subjects responded that although

they want their wives to work they expect them to withdraw from work for child-rearing functions and then to eventually return to work. Only 7% of the total were willing to alter their own roles significantly to facilitate the careers of their future wives.

Komarovsky concludes that while the ideological support for distinct sex role differentiation has weakened (evidenced by the desire of the majority for equality in intellect of husband and wife), the belief has not been relinquished. The fact that 80% of the men stated that in the final analysis women are responsible for child-care functions even at the expense of their careers is perhaps more relevant than their professed desire for intellectual equality. The liberal milieu of the Ivy League college may have demanded the superficial acceptance of a set of equalitarian norms which the men had not yet internalized. Komarovsky's findings suggest another weakness of the male sex role literature is its failure to account for inconsistencies between verbal support for various alternatives and actual behavior on the personal level.

In a recent study Clavan and Robak point out that while concentrating on woman's status and role is important, it ignores the interactional dimension of social behavior; i.e., it fails to deal with the network of relationships and men's reactions to the changing norms of femininity. Administering a questionnaire to 89 male undergraduate students and to their fathers, Clavan and Robak sought to obtain some measure of change in the acceptance of new gender roles by analyzing intergenerational and intragenerational differences. They organized the questionnaire to gather information about sex differentiation in three areas: occupation, family, and sexual behavior. They report a statistically significant

difference between generations in all categories and interpret these findings as indicative of the occurrence of some rearrangement of what behavior is considered appropriately masculine or feminine (Clavan and Robak, 1974: 32-42).

They also conclude that there is a trend away from a double standard in sex relations although 57.3% of the young men still prefer that their future wives be virgins. In the occupational area their findings are similar to Komarovsky's. While the majority of the sons state that they approve of their future wives' working, only 31.8% expect their wives to work once they have children. Although their limited sample size and the varied nature of their findings prevent generalization, they conclude that there are some emergent changes and possible trends. More important, however, is their conclusion that while belief in traditional sex role differentiation may be weakening, in terms of actual behavior such differentiation is still very much present (1974: 42-47). In a subsequent study they (Clavan and Robak, 1975) included the variable of religion (Catholic and Jewish) in a similar analysis. They report that in all areas Catholic fathers and sons respond more traditionally than Jewish fathers and sons at a statistically significant level.

Major Themes

The review of these three popularized works on the male sex role implicitly refers to themes important for social scientists to consider in their research on the male role. Various other male sex role and female sex role researcher's works were cited in conjunction with these three works to elaborate these themes.

1. Men do not express emotions as easily as women - especially crying (Farrell, 1974; Pleck and Sawyer, 1974; David and Brannon, 1976).
2. Men constantly guard against appearing vulnerable or illogical; i.e., they constantly have to prove and re-prove their masculinity (Farrell, 1974; Turner, 1970).
3. Men are becoming less masculine as a result of the feminizing effects of forced conformity to school and white collar occupational norms (Sexton, 1969; Brenton, 1966).
4. Men are taught that they should be superior to women in all significant areas (Farrell, 1974; Marine, 1972; Komarovsky, 1973).
5. Men have a basic disrespect for anything feminine which they learned early as children through school readers, etc. (Farrell, 1974; David and Brannon, 1976).
6. Men have an underlying sense of guilt for the male oppression of women (Farrell, 1974).
7. Male egos are so fragile that each man must be the major, if not the only, breadwinner for his family (Farrell, 1974; David and Brannon, 1976).
8. Men consider the responsibility to be the primary breadwinner a burden (Farrell, 1974).
9. Men, and particularly boys, strive to prove themselves physically, excelling in at least one sport even if they are high academic achievers (Farrell, 1974; David and Brannon, 1976).

10. Men disdain housework and refuse to do it (with the exception of a few "masculine" chores) especially in the presence of others (Farrell, 1974).
11. Men miss an important part of life when they do not assume an active role in caring for their children, and they are generally receptive to the introduction of alternative familial roles (Fasteau, 1974; Farrell, 1974).

Many of these themes refer to institutional arrangements within American society. Although the popularized social scientists have concurred with other researchers in their assessment of the institutional bases for various sex role expectations, their presentations have primarily focused upon what the individual can do to change his own life and not what he can do to change institutional arrangements. Their focus upon individual change may be appropriate if consciousness-raising is their goal; but for progress to be made in the social sciences, data related to these themes must be accumulated.

CHAPTER II

DEFINITIONS OF CONCEPTS

Introduction

Given the various perspectives that people have about sex roles and the different purposes they have in writing about them, concepts have not been clearly defined or consistently utilized. In the foregoing discussion of the male role, a number of concepts are implicitly considered but are not adequately developed. In this chapter concepts which are crucial to any discussion of sex roles are clarified in order that future research might be directed by them.

Referring not only to the male role material but also to sex role literature in general, it can be stated that one reason for this lack of clarity and consistency in the terminology is that contributions are made from several distinct disciplines. Each writer is strongly influenced in his/her concern with sex roles by the perspective of his/her particular discipline. Several disciplines which deal with differences in sex roles are as follows: anthropology, physiology, psychoanalytic theory, psychology, and sociology.

Work in the field of anthropology has been centered in a structural-functional context with much emphasis on cross cultural studies (D'andrade, 1966). Although enlightening in some ways, such studies often

deal with societies which are so different from industrial ones that the findings often have little relevance to the more complex societies.

Regarding the contributions of physiology, an initial problem is the relationship of physiology to social behavior. As Mead (1934) points out, human action is social behavior and cannot be reduced to animalistic behavior. It follows that research which is conducted exclusively on infrahuman subjects should not be employed as evidence to support postulations about human behavior (Gundlach and Reiss, 1968; Stoll, 1974; Stoller, 1968; Weisstein, 1971). In addition, there is no conclusive evidence that there is a causal relationship between physiological factors and social phenomena. For example, it has been shown in studies on hermaphrodites that regardless of an individual's biological composition, his/her social identification determines his/her masculine or feminine identity and performance (Hampson, 1965; Money, 1970; Oakley, 1972; Stoller, 1968). These findings suggest that physical differences in the sexes do not cause substantial differences in behavior, particularly when social processes are operative.

Psychoanalytic theory also addresses the phenomenon of sex roles, but there are inconsistent findings with regard to differences in the behavior of the sexes. Chessler (1972) and Weisstein (1971) criticize psychoanalysis for its bias against women in theory and in practice. Also in psychoanalysis the research uses the case study method in which the cases studied represent only a small number of people who are seeking professional help; therefore, generalizability is limited.

Many of the authors of the male sex role material received their training in the fields of psychology and sociology. Neither of these disciplines has offered clear conceptualizations of the terminology in sex role theory. This failure of sociology and psychology, coupled with the influence, acknowledged or not, of anthropology, physiology, and psychoanalysis on current terminology, has created a state of confusion about what exactly is meant by various terms. This chapter addresses the definitional problems in the male sex role literature. The social psychological concepts particularly lean themselves to an analysis of the issues; therefore, a social psychological perspective will be utilized.

Concepts

Sex and Gender

Sex is the first concept to be considered since it is basic to a study of roles based on and determined by one's sex. Most simply stated sex is the biological designation of an individual as male or female (Oakley, 1972; Stoll, 1974; Yorburg, 1974). Gender, on the other hand, is a cultural designation which is ascribed the individual and which labels him/her as male or female (Stoll, 1974). The distinction between sex as a biological characteristic and gender as a cultural and psychological characteristic has frequently been blurred.

Sex Role and Gender Role

Sociologists utilize role to refer to the behavioral expectations for an individual, occupying a specific position in the social system. Sex role, therefore, refers to the expectations in terms of behavior

based on the sex of the individual. Feeling that the concept of sex roles is often misleading, some social scientists argue that sex roles per se do not exist:

> Strictly speaking, there are no such things as "sex roles" though the term is often used in social science . . A role is a pattern of behavior associated with a position . . in society. Statuses provide a basis for social identity. Gender (not sex) is one basis for identity (Stoll, 1974: 41).

Yorburg argues that individuals do not relate to one another simply on the basis of sex but instead on the basis of cultural definitions of what is masculine and feminine (1974). The concept of gender roles, then, is a more nearly correct conceptualization than sex roles, since the latter implies biological ascription. By definition gender roles are the expectations regarding a person's behavior as masculine or feminine. Provided guidelines for behavior, an individual indicates through actual behavior his/her gender (Stoller, 1968). "The culture supports the beliefs and expectations that persons within one gender category will behave in a similar and predictable way" (Stoll, 1974: 42). In much of the literature on male liberation and masculine roles, there is considerable confusion because of the use of the terms male and female instead of masculine or feminine.[1] Since the use of gender role implies the existence of a socialization process in which an individual learns the expectations

---

[1]The author will continue to utilize the term "male sex role literature" in order not to generate further confusion although the preferred term is "masculine gender role."

of masculinity and femininity, it is appropriate to focus on gender roles given the social psychological approach of this work.

Sexual Identity and Gender Identity

In a social psychological framework, role and identity are closely related. Based on the above discussion of gender roles, sexual identity is defined in biological terms rather than in cultural ones. It is one's perception of self as being biologically male or female. Through contact with parents and peers, an individual learns and internalizes such perceptions (Kagan, 1964; Kohlberg, 1966; Lynn, 1966; Yorburg, 1974). Not an automatic occurrence, "sexual identity, the individual's basic sex-typed self image, is built up gradually from early infancy. It is the result of learned conceptions about the self as male or female" (Yorburg, 1974: 1).

Gender identity, on the other hand, is defined as one's perception of self with regard to the ideals of behavior believed to be included in the masculine and feminine gender roles. Hampson (1965) points out that gender identification is a complex process and not an either-or phenomenon but one which differs in strength and completeness. In a brief explanation of this process, Stoll states that it entails a

> . . . complicated process in society whereby children separated by gender at birth become girl-boy, woman-man, feminine-masculine. It concerns the distribution of rewards and opportunities by gender as well as expectations placed upon each (Stoll, 1974: 41).

The relationship between the demands of one's gender role and his/her perception of self is important. Some psychologists argue that gender identity is a crucial factor in adequate personal adjustment (Broverman

and Broverman, 1972). How completely an individual defines himself/herself in terms of gender role depends on the types of rewards received, the availability of an "appropriate" role model, and his/her relationship to family and peers. Thus, the degree to which different persons develop the socially prescribed gender identity varies according to their unique circumstances.

Role/Status/Position

The concept of role has often been used to study the relationship of the individual and the society (Parsons, 1951; Levy, 1952; Nadel, 1957). Confusion and controversy have characterized attempts by numerous sociologists to define the concept. Several works have been devoted to reviewing and organizing the field (Biddle and Thomas, 1966; Rommetviet, 1953; Shaw and Costanza, 1970). The lack of agreement extends to the matter of the concept's importance as a unit of analysis. Parsons (1951) and Dahrendorf (1968) consider it an essential building block of sociology, while Coulson (1972) and Jackson (1972) view it as a redundancy. Through the years the concept of role has centered less on a behavioral dimension and is now most frequently defined as the expectations for behavior of an individual in a given position in society (Coutu, 1959; Dahrendorf, 1968; Shaw and Costanza, 1970; Turner, 1956).

Sherif and Sherif (1969) define status as an individual's position or rank in a power hierarchy within a social unit. The concept of position has been given a number of definitions in the social psychological literature. Gross et al. (1958) and Newcomb (1965) define position as a unit in a social structure, while others view it as a phenomenon similar

to an "office" (Davis, 1949). In this paper it shall be used in the sense employed by the Sherif's - as one's rank within a social unit. As such it is synomous with the meaning of status.

Related to one's role, the expectations for his/her behavior, is the person's role performance, his/her actual behavior. It is the playing out of the expectations inherent in the individual's position (Coutu, 1951; Turner, 1956). Essential to a discussion or role performance is the concept of role taking. It is the process through which one anticipates the behavior of others in interaction. This anticipatory action is made possible by the individual's perceiving expectations which are associated with the position of the other person (Laver and Boardman, 1971; McCall and Simmons, 1966; Stryker, 1957; Turner, 1956). Through role taking an individual is able to take the role of another toward himself/herself. He/she anticipates anothers reaction to his/her role performance. By taking the perspective of another, an actor is able to evaluate himself/herself. Both of these processes (i.e., role taking and taking the role of another with regard to one's self) are crucial elements in an individual's socialization.

Implicit Concepts

To briefly summarize, the following is a list of concepts with which the male liberation literature only implicitly deals:

Sex - biological designation of an individual as male or female.

Gender - cultural designation which is ascribed the individual which labels him/her as male or female.

Sex role - behavioral expectations of an individual on the basis of sex.

Gender role - expectations regarding a person's behavior as masculine

or feminine.

Sexual identity - one's perception of self as being biologically male or female.

Gender identity - one's perception of self with regard to the ideals of behavior believed to be included in the masculine and feminine gender roles.

Role - expectations for behavior of an individual in a given position in society.

Position/status - an individual's rank or position in a power hierarchy within a social unit.

A clear understanding of the above concepts is imperative for the analysis of sex roles. These concepts alone, however, are not sufficient to adequately understand this topic. Several concepts are excluded from discussion in the current literature on masculine gender roles. In the following section these ideas which need to be considered are presented and discussed.

Role Strain

As was stated in the first chapter, a discussion of the concept of role strain is conspicuously absent in this literature. In a concise and clear manner, Ralph Turner deals with this in relation to sex roles. He points out that although there is a considerable range of thought among individuals, the ideas of masculinity and femininity are still rather effectively ingrained in individuals' minds. Men and women measure the worth of their identities as they compare to these ideal conceptions. The degree of role strain present is determined by how well a particular individual thinks he/she has maintained an adequate sexual identity in light of the ideal (Turner, 1970: 292).

Turner identifies three major sources of role strain. First, the most common source of role strain is the actual inability or the fear of inability to perform a role at a high level of adequacy. Since gender roles are arbitrarily ascribed to men and women who have extremely varied potentialities, some degree of role strain can be expected. A second source of role strain is found when a counter role which gives purpose and reason for continuance to the initial role is not evoked. Third, role strain will result when role performance fails to yield a sense of worth and accomplishment. For example, when the expectations of an individual's occupational role and his/her gender role are contradictory, the sense of value in one or both roles may be lessened (Turner, 1970: 292-293).

In dealing explicitly with role strains among men, Turner notes that a male's sex is ascribed but that his gender, i.e., his masculinity, must be achieved. He is continually confronted with the chore of proving his manliness. If a male fails to live up to his ascribed position, he not only relinquishes his claims to male perogatives but also loses a degree of his self-respect. Turner states that the "ways of proving masculinity fall on a continuum from achievement in a distinctly male task to the adoption of a pattern of behavior that embodies masculine traits divorced from significant accomplishment" (1970: 294-295). Success in a man's chosen occupation is often sufficient to convey an adequate level of masculinity. More dramatic, classic ways to ensure one's manliness include attempting a dangerous rescue, conquering a chore that demands extraordinary strength and stamina, and remaining calm in

situations of great stress. If a man possesses neither heroic qualities nor outstanding occupational success, consistently "acting like a man" can validate his masculinity; i.e., by internalizing a "masculine" approach to all aspects of life, he can be a "real" man. For example, he must withstand the temptation to conform or to concede to other's opinions (Turner, 1970: 296). As both Brenton (1966) and Biller (1971) suggest, hunting and other rugged outdoor activities represent a way of validating one's masculinity. Even in the presence of mediocre occupational achievements, a man who engages in overnight hunting trips to stalk his prey has a claim to masculinity. Men may feel masculine when hunting not only because of the austerity of conditions, i.e., rough terrain, heavy guns, poor facilities, although "roughing it" is essential, but also because of the successful defeat of an opponent (another creature).

Although the necessity of proving one's masculinity is generally believed, several factors exist which frequently make it difficult to obtain the level of masculinity which appears to be crucial for many men's self-respect. In most instances boys are separated from their fathers for the larger portion of their early lives due to daily routines; thus, as mentioned before, they lack an adequate role model whose masculinity they can easily emulate. Their surrogate models are found in the mass media and among their peers, both of which tend to stereotype and hyperbolize masculinity. The second problem exists even if there is an adequate model present. Achieving masculinity through socially

recognized accomplishment is not possible until a man has reached a certain age and level of maturity, if then. Heroic demonstrations are possible for a limited number of people and then only when an unusual situation creates the need for such feats.

Athletic ability provides a boy a degree of masculinity; but moving from stardom in high school, he is confronted with mediocrity on the college level; and the same occurs for many college stars when they move into the professional realm. In spite of this, athletics do represent an institutionalized way of proving one's prowess (Turner, 1970: 296-297). It appears, however, to this author that even after the age of active participation in athletics has passed, some men continue to utilize an avid interest in sports to maintain their masculinity. This perhaps explains to some degree why millions of American men devote an incredibly large number of hours each year to watching football games which are televised. It may be that vicariously they are experiencing the thrill of contact sports and that by demonstrating their attraction to such activities by watching them on television, they proclaim their masculinity. Closely viewing and analyzing Sunday afternoon and Monday evening football games provides some men the feeling of being a sports expert. Although they are not in the field, they can call the correct plays from their living rooms, pointing out the errors that should have been avoided. The result is a rewarding, at least superficially, sense of involvement in a masculine activity.

A third obstacle to the attaining of masculine self-respect is located in the confusing nature of the male-female relationship. Typically one's masculinity rests on his supposed superiority and dominance over women. The values of today's egalitarian movements receive verbal approval if masculinity is already securely developed and established through some accomplishment that is socially recognized; but if masculinity is even remotely questionable, these values pose a serious threat. Early in school boys learn that academic achievement alone will not secure masculinity since school is dominated by women anyway. Mothers, female babysitters, and women teachers, who generally control day-to-day childhood, present confusing notions of masculinity (Turner, 1970: 297-298). At least one study has shown that when presented an adjective check list of traits, the women chose an approximately equal number of masculine and feminine words to characterize the ideal male. They wanted men to possess not only traditionally masculine qualities but also the abilities to be gentle and sympathetic. The obvious result is a state of confusion in the minds of young males (McKee and Sheriffs, 1959: 356-363).

Finally, widely accepted myths of sex-specialized abilities also block masculine validation. It has been held that only men have the natural aptitude to excell in prestigious positions in society. Women supposedly have aptitudes for jobs which men cannot perform, but these are far less important chores. On a societal level, as well as on a personal, such beliefs become self-fulfilling; women have systematically been refused the opportunity to learn traditionally masculine tasks.

Even social science theories have supported this line of thought. In the area of small group research there are very few definitive findings, but some of the ideas gained from this research have been applied to the family. For example, Bales and Slater (1955) conclude that certain people in groups engage primarily in performance tasks, while others devote their energy to maintaining interpersonal relationships within groups. Basing his arguments on these findings, Parsons (1955) asserts that this distinction is also applicable to the family. Accordingly, the husband/father performs the instrumental role as a task-performance specialist, and the wife/mother plays out the expressive role by maintaining the social and emotional relationships of the family. Although various studies have not found this analytical distinction to be true (Levinger, 1964), Parsons assertions have persisted and have undoubtedly influenced sociology through the functionalist perspective.

In addition school curricula based on sex (e.g., industrial arts for boys and home economics for girls) have kept these myths alive. The result is that masculine security is kept at a minimum level. Institutional arrangements have generally not allowed males direct tests of their masculinity and have prevented women from competing in certain masculine areas either directly or indirectly. As long as their self-respect depends upon their superiority over women, however, their masculinity will be constantly threatened by the <u>possibility</u> of encountering capable women (Turner, 1970: 298-299).

Institutional Sexism

Turner's assertion that various "institutional arrangements" systematically work to perpetuate traditional gender roles is akin to the concept of institutional racism. Jones defines this type of racism as those "established laws, customs, and practices which systematically reflect and produce racial inequities in American society" (Jones, 1972: 131). Similarly others have developed the concept of institutional sexism to refer to systematic arrangements which generate and maintain sexual inequality (e.g., Chafetz, 1975; Stoll, 1974).

Each major institution in America contributes to institutional sexism. In the familial structure traditional gender roles flourish. As mentioned before, the number of those who seriously seek significant changes in these roles is apparently relatively small. Epstein asserts that women typically do not feel that society has "dealt with them unfairly nor are they regarded by society as a particularly disadvantaged group" (1970: 3). Until a significant number of both women and men become sensitized to the need for change in traditional gender roles, little change can be expected to occur. Male children continue to be taught directly and indirectly in the home and elsewhere that their primary role is to be a successful breadwinner for their future wives and children. The incredible surge of interest in Marabel Morgan's The Total Woman (1974) (three million copies printed to the present day) is illustrative of the permeation of traditional values. Morgan's approach is blatantly sexist as is evidenced in her admonitions to wives to be good housekeepers, "sizzling lovers," and "squeaky clean and attractive." On the other

hand, she gives a view of men as virile, successful creatures whose egos must be and should be nurtured by their wives.

Although overt barriers to women in the area of education are being removed, the educational institution stereotypes and channels men and women in a much more basic and permanent way. Many texts are still being used which contain sexist illustrations that picture men in the business world and women in domestic settings (Chafetz, 1974). These are subtle but powerful mechanisms of socialization which promote traditional gender roles.

A third societal institution, the religious institution, has been seen by some as limiting the role of women (Duberman, 1975: 78). Particularly people have referred to some aspects of the Judaeo-Christian tradition as idealizing a subservient role for women.

Each facet of institutional sexism mentioned above contributes to the continuance of women's relatively small (numerically) contributions to the economic world. The business realm is still the domain of men which women can enter only after overcoming many obstacles. Of equal significance is the pressure many men experience to devote their energies to succeeding in business. Women are kept from obtaining autonomous positions that require independent decision-making, and men are <u>expected</u> to successfully fill such positions. In a sense the institution keeps both men and women in their "places."

Characteristically the military has discriminated against women also. The most recent example is the account of the female U.S. Merchant Marine Academy cadet who was found in her dormitory bed with

her fiance, another cadet. Subsequently, she was forced by the authorities to resign, while the behavior of her partner was overlooked (Blake, 1976: 34). Examples such as this speak loudly to support the claim that institutional sexism locks both men and women in traditionally conceived roles.

In conclusion, the failure of Farrell, Fasteau, and others to more than tangentially deal with the implications of institutional sexism for change in the masculine gender role is a serious omission. The following section considers the resultant problem.

Individual versus Social Change

A recurrent theme among the male writers of the male sex role literature is that the author had been socialized into the traditional male role quite thoroughly; that he had obtained success in the "eyes of the world;" and that while still young because he had recieved great insight and a new perspective, he had emancipated himself from the shackles of his socialization. From an individual perspective there is no problem with this type of thinking and acting (except that it often leaves the reader with the impression that the writers are highly pleased with themselves).

If writers such as Farrell and Fasteau are treated as social scientists, they have failed in that role because they do not present systematic analyses of existing institutional arrangements and how these arrangements would need to change in order to eliminate institutional sexism.

The individual changes they promote may benefit men who are involved in consciousness-raising groups and other facets of the movement; however, the movement may not develop further until an effort is made to deal with the question of the male role on a societal level, systematically presenting problems and realistic ways that change can be enacted. Certainly the social scientific analysis of the male role requires more focus upon social units other than the individual as well as social practices.

Some writers clearly argue that change must be individually generated and that "theories" will not solve the dilemmas of today's male. One says that

> . . . the liberation of each man from power complexes begins as a personal liberation. It originates with individuals rather than in the structure around them. It is unlikely that the system will readily crumble before the onslaughts of the disenfranchised and disgruntled. It will not respond to the harangues of political organizers. A saner society will flower when men liberate themselves from contrived, socially fabricated prohibitions, cultural straightjackets, and mental stereotypes that control and inhibit behavior through arbitrary definitions of what it means to be a man (Nichols, 1975: 316-318).

The emphasis on consciousness-raising groups in Farrell's book is another example of the emphasis upon individual change. He states that consciousness-raising groups create "a subculture which encourages questioning and experimenting in ways that are applicable to one's personal life" (Farrell, 1974: 217). As of yet, there have been a limited number of these small groups, and their effects on the remainder of society have been limited.

Many of the authors create the impression that they believe that if a man tries hard and long enough, he can overcome any obstacle in his way to becoming a liberated man. They seem to underestimate the power of existent social arrangements. Turner (1970) appears to understand institutional forces more than the others. In expressing his belief that masculinity is not inherently necessary for a man's self-respect, he states that he recognizes that in spite of this truth, our culture has made masculinity a requisite for self-respect. He refers to the set of institutional arrangements and obstacles that prevent some who wish to change from doing so. Many men who desire to change may be bound into traditional roles by their wives and friends, not to mention the rest of society. In many cases if they are to maintain the relationships which are most meaningful to them, they continue to behave in accord with the male role into which they were socialized. The male liberation literature does not seem to recognize the existence of this role strain.

If the goal of the male liberation authors is to promote a social movement, they still need to consider institutional arrangements. Carden points to the advantages and disadvantages of consiousness-raising groups among women, but her comments are applicable to men's groups as well. She states that the first stage of the group involves a reconceptualization of the individual's personal situation. Often it is an emancipating and cathartic time of sharing which results in individually generated and inwardly directed change. Extremely important though this stage may be, a point is soon reached after which the group itself has nothing more to offer. Although many women at this stage cease active

participation altogether, others continue as activists but turn their attention away from consciousness-raising groups to social action projects which promote change on the societal level (Carden, 1974: 71-73).

It is at this point that male consiousness-raising groups have failed. Generally speaking, they have remained in the first stage and have not made concerted efforts to change beyond the individual level. Perhaps one reason for this unwillingness to move beyond personal liberation is the existence of confining institutional arrangements as discussed above. Until men who desire changes face the fact that the changes they endorse will be institutionally attacked and barred at personal expense to themselves, social change cannot occur. On an individual level, it is sufficient for one man or several to be liberated within the boundaries of their homes and work. The choice is theirs; but before they can speak in lofty and optimistic terminology of the widespread change that is "sweeping across America," they must empirically show that a large number of men desire the changes they advocate and are willing to openly confront the elements in this society that perpetuate traditional gender role behavior.

Since much of the male sex role literature appears to promote a men's liberation movement more than it attempts to generate social scientific understanding of the male role, there is need to empirically consider men's perceptions of their social roles. In the next chapter a study design will be presented to investigate the male gender role. Studies such as the one proposed hopefully will provide greater understanding of the male gender role and behavior.

CHAPTER III

STUDY DESIGN

Introduction

Although the topic of sex roles has enjoyed considerable popularized discussion in the last decade, empirical research on the male sex role has been very limited. The literature discussion in the first chapter reviews some of the few studies which have been conducted. In most cases the design has been to administer a structured questionnaire with few, if any, open-ended questions. This type of instrument is limited in that it cannot surmount two problems: first, that one's attitudes, as expressed in close-ended responses, are not necessarily reflected in actual behavior; and second, that one's behavior may not be in accord with expressed attitude.[1]

In the initial stages of this research project, the current male sex role literature was searched to locate existent questionnaires. Although articles and books generally do not include study questionnaires (Komarovsky, 1973; David and Brannon, 1976), those which are presented

[1]The author has pointed out that the liberal milieus in which many questionnaires are administered and the corresponding factor of social desirability may have caused some persons to appear more liberal in their attitudes than their actual attitudes and behaviors are. In addition, it has been suggested that temporary circumstances (e.g., economic need of married students) may cause one to behave in a way which in reality is contrary to his/her attitude.

(Farrell, 1974; Tavris and Pope, 1976), are of limited use for several reasons.[2] In each case the questionnaires are composed of structured questions. As with all forced choice questions, the answer categories are obviously not always sufficient. Often the respondent is unable to decide on an answer which seems applicable; yet, he/she is forced to make a choice. The following question is representative of the type of questions in the existent questionnaires: "Think of the name of the car you own (e.g., Ford Mustang, Dodge Charger). If your car were called Ford Pansy or Dodge Daisy, how would you feel about owning it?" The answer categories are "(a) the same as I feel now, (b) a bit more embarrassed than now, (c) I probably would have chosen another car, (d) I definitely would have chosen another car" (Farrell, 1974).

Without the possibility of probing to learn why the respondent answered as he did, it seems that very little knowledge can be gained. The wording of this question and the construction of the answer categories may in themselves predispose the respondents to answer in certain ways. The questions contain words which have sex-linked connotations. For example, the author contrasts Ford Mustang and Dodge Charger with Ford Pansy and Dodge Daisy, all of which have a number of implications. In this society an enjoyment of delicate flowers is commonly attributed to females, while aggressive, forceful animals are

---

[2] In the sex roles literature there are questionnaires which attempt to measure levels of femininity and masculinity. These are not appropriate for this research project because they tend to be unidimensional and have forced choice responses.

considered to be of much greater interest to males. Moreover, in colloquial language the word "pansy" refers to an effeminate youth or male homosexual. Given these connotations, it seems that a more neutral wording of questions such as this would be less likely to direct the respondents' answers.

Another problem illustrated in the construction of the above question is one that pervades much of the research which is conducted on sex roles. In discussing a value laden subject such as the topic of sex roles, the phenomenon of social desirability frequently results in the respondents' attempting to appear more liberal or open-minded than they actually are. In this particular question any response other than the first ("the same as I feel now") could be construed as a sexist response; even the admission of embarrassment could be thusly viewed. The possibility of such interpretations is not unknown to most respondents. Granted some persons do not object to being labeled as such; yet, many persons whose attitudes are basically traditional would avoid appearing as much by selecting the first answer category. In an era of at least superficial support for a number of equalitarian movements, many individuals guard against seeming out-moded or close-minded. Regarding this question, it seems that an open-ended question allowing the respondent to qualify his answer in whatever way he desires would result in greater knowledge of his beliefs. The presentation of the polarized opinions to the respondent in the form of categories may cause him to fail to express his beliefs because the poles may connote right and wrong, favorable and unfavorable.

Generally speaking, it appears that the writers of the male sex role literature have based their conclusions and generalizations on their personal feelings, impressions, and desires, and sometimes those of their friends, rather than on empirical data.[3] In constructing their questions it does not seem that these researchers exercised an adequate degree of caution in controlling factors that could influence the respondents' answers. In fact, the researchers utilize traditional stereotypical impressions of sex roles and sex-linked concepts. In their efforts to illustrate that changes have already occurred, they allowed their own biases to limit their research design.

An Exploratory Study

If a greater understanding of the male sex role is to be obtained, a more complete exploration is needed of some of the ideas which have been loosely studied in recent years. In an attempt to account for possible discrepancies in attitudes and behavior and to allow respondents the opportunity for qualifying and expanding their answers, I propose conducting a number of in-depth interviews to ascertain not only men's attitudes but also how and why they act in various ways. Since it is impractical for this researcher to engage in actual observation of

---

[3] One notable exception to this is the work of Mirra Komarovsky (1973).

behavior over a long period of time, it will be necessary to rely upon self reports. Although reliance upon self reports limits the proposed study, this procedure should result in greater understanding of the male sex role than close-ended questionnaires.

Due to the time consuming nature of in-depth interviews and the limitations of one investigator, I choose to interview thirty men. This is an adequate number since this research is an exploratory study designed to provide a basis for indicating more specific areas in which sex role research needs to be done. The purpose of the study is to more fully consider general issues raised in the existent literature; so no relationships are hypothesized. Given this purpose, generalization to all males will not be attempted.

Respondent Characteristics

In selecting respondents three basic criteria will be used. The thirty male subjects will be chosen according to their age, marital status, and social class. Since generalization to other males is not the purpose of this study, access to individuals who fall in these general categories is the important element in selection.

Marital Status and Age

Only males who are married and currently living with their wives will be chosen as part of the sample. In the study of sex roles it is important to look at one's role in relation to a counter-role. Specifically, to understand more fully the interactional dimension of one's behavior on the basis of his being male, it is necessary to

explore his interaction with females. The choice then to study married men is based upon the fact that they daily interact with their wives. This interaction undoubtedly affects their roles as men, their behavior and attitudes.

The thirty subjects chosen will be between the ages of 20 and 30 years of age. The rationale for choosing this age group is based upon two ideas. Turner suggests these men are in part of the life cycle in which their masculinity is more precarious than it is later. If they are still students, they have yet to test themselves in their chosen occupations. Men in the early years of occupational careers have yet to determine the level of their success. In this society both of these circumstances often lead to a questioning of masculinity (Turner, 1970: 303).

Another reason for choosing this age group is that if sex roles are changing as some are arguing, this age group is more likely to exhibit the changes than an older group would be. In addition, this generation has been confronted for a large part of their lives in varying degrees with the issues raised by the women's liberation movement. Both their youthfulness and their exposure to women's liberation can be viewed as factors that cause them to be more receptive to the idea of changing sex roles.

Social Class

A further criterion is that each male utilized in the study must be considered a member of the middle class. There are three reasons for

the use of middle class males. First, the social-psychological literature indicates that gender role behavior varies according to social class (Rabban, 1950; Burgess et al., 1971). To control for class differences, then, respondents of one class, the middle class, will be used. Another reason for this choice is that the male sex literature is written by and for middle class men; therefore, to more accurately compare their work with this research, it is important to be consistent in choosing only middle class respondents.

Finally, it seems that men who are less affluent do not have the time to be concerned with their roles as men in this society. Although their behavior is also frequently determined by sex role expectations, economically sustaining themselves and their families requires so much of their energy and resources that a discussion of their perception of their roles would not necessarily reflect changes occurring in other segments of society.

For the above reasons only middle class persons will be chosen as respondents. Their membership in the middle class will be determined on the basis of their educational levels and occupational statuses. It will be required that each person is a college graduate and that presently he is either in graduate school or in a traditionally middle class occupation, i.e., white collar positions.

Selection of Respondents

Through the process of snowball sampling, males who meet the qualifications according to age, marital status, and social class will

be interviewed. The researcher will utilize his acquaintances to obtain names of additional males. Although no randomization will be attempted, efforts will be made to choose respondents from various settings to prevent the inclusion of too great a number of men in the sample who represent the university community, the church setting, or any particular group of men. Since this is an exploratory study with no hypothesized relationships to be statistically tested, this method of selection poses no analysis problems.

Interview Schedule Construction

After considering the strengths and weaknesses of previous questionnaires, it was decided that rather than using any of these, an interview schedule of open-ended questions would be developed. An interview schedule, based upon the themes summarized at the end of the first chapter, was developed to attempt to verify whether or not the attitudes and behaviors described by previous researchers are present in the sample. The investigator felt it important not only to develop questions which are attitudinal in the sex role research tradition of Komarovsky (1973) but also to construct those which deal with behavior. Although some research (Farrell, 1974) has attempted to determine actual behavior, the results are not convincing. In this study it will be necessary to rely upon self reports to ascertain behaviors. Recognizing the shortcomings of this technique, respondents will be asked in some questions to specify the frequency of particular actions to aid the researcher in determining the extent of their involvement in these activities. In constructing the interview schedule the researcher composed questions which have face validity.

Questions were developed which focus upon important themes found in the literature which was considered in the first chapter. To reiterate briefly, the themes are listed below.

Themes

1. Men do not express emotions as easily as women - especially crying (Farrell, 1974; Pleck and Sawyer, 1974; David and Brannon, 1976).
2. Men constantly guard against appearing vulnerable or illogical; i.e., they constantly have to prove and re-prove their masculinity (Farrell, 1974; Turner, 1970).
3. Men are becoming less masculine as a result of the feminizing effects of forced conformity to school and white collar occupational norms (Sexton, 1969; Brenton, 1966).
4. Men are taught that they should be superior to women in all significant areas (Farrel, 1974; Marine, 1972; Komarovsky, 1973).
5. Men have a disrespect for anything feminine which they learned early as children through school readers, etc. (Farrell, 1974; David and Brannon, 1976).
6. Men have an underlying sense of guilt for the male oppression of women (Farrell, 1974).
7. Male egos are so fragile that each man must be the major, if not the only, breadwinner for his family (Farrell, 1974; David and Brannon, 1976).

8. Men consider the responsibility to be the primary breadwinner a burden (Farrell, 1974).
9. Men, and particularly boys, strive to prove themselves physically, excelling in at least one sport even if they are high academic achievers (Farrell, 1974; David and Brannon, 1976).
10. Men disdain housework and refuse to do it (with the exception of a few "masculine" chores) especially in the presence of others.
11. Men miss an important part of life when they do not assume an active role in caring for their children, and they are generally receptive to the introduction of alternative familial roles (Fasteau, 1974; Farrell, 1975).

The schedule is designed to obtain several types of information (see Appendix A). The first section is structured to gather background information such as age, educational status, occupation, religion, number of children, and whether the wife works outside the home (Questions 1-6). Another set of questions focuses on the respondents' knowledge of the men's liberation movement and their attitudes toward it. They will be instructed to read a brief article describing the movement and then asked if they desire to know more about it on the basis of this description (Questions 7-8).

Another group of questions will probe the respondents' feelings about their own masculinity. For example, they will be asked if they feel the pressure to constantly prove their masculinity to other people and the extent to which this pressure affects their behavior. Another question will query them as to how masculine they consider themselves to be in comparison to other men they know. Other questions are structured to learn what effects such occurrences as their wives' receiving higher

paying jobs than their own or appearing more intelligent at particular times would have upon their feelings as a man (Questions 9-16, 20, 26, 28, 35, 38).

Other questions are designed to learn how receptive the respondents are to the introduction of less traditional role behavior (Questions 21-25, 27). They will be asked whether or not they would expect their wives to move with them if they were offered better jobs in a different location and whether or not they would be willing to move with their wives if the latter were offered better jobs elsewhere (Questions 29-30). Also the respondents will be asked to describe their reactions to Mr. S, who requested paternity leave to help care for his young daughter and to Mr. X, who, along with his wife, works only part-time in order to be home with their children. Finally, they will be asked how willing they would be to try these alternative arrangements (Questions 33-34). Although the last two questions seem similar in that both attempt to learn the extent to which these men desire to be involved in child care, they are different in an important dimension. The first involves requesting a temporary leave of absence without any real setback or obstacle to long-term occupational goals. The second, however, requires a reassessment and possible reorganization of one's life goals.

Two questions require presenting the respondents with a 3 x 5 card which contains a list of a number of items (Questions 20 and 31). In one question the respondents will be given a list of occupations and asked to designate those which they do not consider very masculine jobs. In compiling the list an effort was made to include jobs which are traditionally masculine, and those which are relatively neutral with regard to sex. In another question the subjects will be presented a list

of household chores and instructed to indicate those which they regularly perform and those which their wives regularly perform. Once again the list includes the gamut of chores from traditionally female to traditionally male tasks.

These questions require the utilization of a panel of expert judges, composed of two graduate students (one male and one female) in the social sciences. Prior to the administration of the questionnaire, the judges were given the same lists described above and will be instructed to base their answers upon their conceptualizations of traditional masculinity and feminity. In analyzing the data comparisons will be made between the respondents' answers and those of the judges. Should there be any disagreement between the answers of the judges, the particular item which is disagreed upon will not be used in the analysis.

As mentioned earlier some questions require the respondents to specify the frequency of their behavior. In one question described above they will be given a list of household tasks. In designating those which they regularly do, they will be instructed that to state that they regularly perform a chore means that they do it more than half the time (Question 31). Another question involves a list of sports and activities. The resondents will be asked to report how often they engage in these actions, using the following categories: once or more often a week, two or three times a month, once a month, or less often (Questions 36-37).

The question which asks the respondent whether or not he feels that American males have become less masculine in recent years is based

upon theme number eight (Question 17). Two questions which are designed to learn whether or not the respondent believes that men are naturally more aggressive and naturally better at certain things than women are based upon theme number three (Question 18-19). Theme number nine is the impetus for the question which asks whether or not the respondent feels that men are the powerful group in this society and whether or not he has ever experienced a sense of guilt because of the male domination of women (Question 32).

The remaining questions (39-42) deal with the individuals' perception of sex roles. These questions ask the respondents to indicate which sex they believe is better off in this society and why, to describe their attitude toward women's liberation, to state the most important things in their lives, and to state the extent to which they have thought about their roles as men in this society before the interview. The literature has suggested that people hold certain views relating to these final questions. They are designed to test the assertions of previous researchers.

After designing the interview schedule, it was pre-tested on two individuals. It was found that most of the questions could be understood in their original form but that two questions required minor re-wording for greater clarity. Subsequently they were altered and are included in the final schedule.

Analysis

In analyzing the data the researcher will separate the questions according to the themes from which they were drawn and will if possible

categorize the responses given. Some questions will require simple yes/no or agree/disagree answers. Frequently, however, the respondents will be asked to explain their answers, and other questions are simply open-ended. In these cases the researcher created in advance possible response categories in which the answers could conceivably fall. After pretesting two individuals, some categories were revised. After the data are collected, the researcher will read the answers and revise the response categories if necessary. Then the researcher will code the responses.

After the responses are roughly grouped in various categories, the percentages of respondents falling in each category will be computed. When different groups of men within the study group are compared, percentage differences will be used. Since the categories are nominal and in most cases contain more than two possible responses, it will be impossible to utilize measures of association such as gamma or phi.

The investigator will attempt to present for the reader the range of comments the respondents give on various questions. In addition typical responses will be reported to better communicate the respondents' actual feelings. If the subjects convey information about their feelings or attitudes which is not directly in response to the question asked, these comments will also be recorded.

This chapter has described the study design. Initially it pointed to weaknesses in earlier studies and subsequently explained the reasons

for conducting an exploratory study which will utilize in-depth interviews. The themes from which the interview schedule was designed were reviewed. In the following chapter the findings and interpretations are presented.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION

Introduction

This research utilized thirty young white married males whose names were obtained from the investigator's acquaintances. Their ages ranged from 22 to 30 years, with the mean age being 26 years of age. As specified in the study design, only respondents with at least a bachelor's degree were chosen. The educational range is from bachelor's degree to Ph.D. and J.D., with the mean level of education being slightly more than one year's work beyond a bachelor's degree. Eleven respondents are full-time students; five are teachers; four are engineers; one is a lawyer; one is a social worker; one is an architect; and the seven others hold various positions in business organizations as personnel and credit managers. All occupations held are typically considered middle class positions in the sociological literature.

Since some researchers (Clavan and Robak, 1975) have indicated that religious preference may affect one's perception of appropriate sex role behavior, the researcher was careful not to limit respondents to only one religious group.[1] Ten respondents reported that they have no religious preference; twelve represent more traditional religious denominations (Baptist, Catholic); and eight belong to less traditional denominations (Episcopalian, Methodist, etc.).

---

[1]Although some research suggests a relationship between religion and sex role perceptions, the researcher did not select respondents on the basis of their religious preference. It is difficult to ascertain what is important about religion (e.g., denomination, religiosity, and social class may confound relationships).

On the other hand, there seems to be a general awareness of sexism. Several of the men indicated a concern that they would appear sexist. At the end of the interview three asked, "well, am I a chauvinist pig?" When designating the division of labor on household chores, four others stated that they were afraid that they appeared sexist. Although such feelings may have influenced their answers, each person making such a comment indicated that he would "go on and tell the truth."

Masculine Stereotypes

The male sex role literature is based on the presumption that there are widely shared views of what traditional masculinity involves. Before considering the subject's own attitudes and behavior, responses are reported to several questions which focus on stereotypical views of masculinity as presented in the male liberation literature. One question required a panel of judges to consider a list of sixteen occupations and to designate those which they felt were stereotypically not masculine. The judges agreed that eleven occupations could be labelled non-masculine. The percentage of respondents labelling an occupation not masculine ranged from 10% who indicated that they did not consider working as an air line attendant masculine to 57% who similarly labeled working as a hairdresser. Other occupations respondents categorized as not traditionally masculine are 43%, secretary; 40%, prostitute; 37%, house-husband; 30%, nurse; 27%, model; 23%, fashion designer and interior decorator; 17%, telephone operator; and 13%, elementary school teacher. It appears

that a number of men feel that occupations which involve activities generally perceived as feminine, involving tasks usually assigned to women, are not appropriate if a person is to be viewed as masculine.

Another question asked the respondents to describe the kind of behavior which comes to mind when someone says that a person acted in a masculine way. Only one man stated that no particular type of behavior came to his mind. Among the respondents there seems to be some agreement about the type of behavior which came to their minds. They were allowed to state more than one adjective describing the behavior. Over half (53%) stated that they thought of behavior involving physical strength or athletic ability, while another large group (50%) indicated that they thought of dominant, aggressive activity. Thirty-three per cent expressed a similar impression of masculine behavior as powerful and forceful. Other descriptions less often given include the following: stoic, chivalrous, boastful, and objective. These findings suggest that men are aware of stereotypical views of masculinity.

They were also asked to give the name of the person whom they consider to represent the American ideal of masculinity. Although the answers ranged from Abraham Lincoln to Joe Namath, the one name clearly chosen most often was John Wayne. In most cases the men whose names were chosen are famous political figures, movie stars, or athletes. Interestingly, five respondents named their fathers who were presumably their own male models. Several respondents had difficulty in answering the question, and five stated either that they could not think of anyone or that they did not have a conception of the American ideal of masculinity.

The respondents were given a list of nine situations and asked to indicate the instance in which they felt the most masculine and the one in which they felt the least masculine. They did not exhibit much consensus about which situation made them feel most masculine. Eight respondents chose "wooing a potential sex partner or making love," and five chose "socializing with other men" and "playing a sport." The remaining subjects were dispersed among the other responses.

When asked to indicate in which situations they felt least masculine, a number of respondents indicated that they found it very difficult, and six were unable to answer. Of the twenty-four respondents, eight said they felt least masculine "while at work." Thus, it appears that the respondents did not share a great deal of consensus about what situations connote masculinity or the lack of it. Perhaps situations vary too much or other factors are more important in rousing masculine feelings or insecurity.

Expression of Emotion

One aspect of the masculine stereotype is that men are unemotional. Pleck and Sawyer (1974) argue that men do not express emotions as easily as women - especially crying. When the respondents were asked if they agreed with this statement, a large majority (87%) answered affirmatively, with only four answering no. Many answered as the following respondent did: "it's generally true because men were brought up to believe that crying is feminine - you know, big boys don't cry, etc." When further questioned as to whether or not they <u>personally</u> had trouble expressing emotions and particularly crying, fewer respondents said yes. While

seventeen (57%) responded affirmatively, 43% of the subjects indicated that they could easily express emotions. Some of these men specified that they could freely express emotions in private settings but still felt constrained in public situations. One responded that he had "come to grips with the concept" and that he had "broken out of old and supid mores that forced men not to cry." Another stated that he is "more open to being in touch with my feelings," indicating to the researcher that he had experienced change in his life.

These findings suggest that while a large majority of men agreed with the assertion of Pleck and Sawyer that men generally do not express emotions as easily as women, a sizeable minority no longer allow the stereotype to restrict their behavior, at least privately. While these findings offer support for previous findings, they suggest that some men are aware of the limitations imposed by the stereotypes.

Insecurity of Masculinity

Some social scientists (Farrell, 1974; Turner, 1970) assert that men feel that they must constantly prove and reprove their masculinity to other people. The respondents were asked: "Many writers suggest that men must constantly prove and reprove their masculinity to other people. Do you feel this pressure?" Only six respondents (20%) indicated that it is a relatively constant consideration. Another group of ten respondents answered that they "occasionally feel this pressure" but that it is "definitely not a constant thing." Of the sixteen men who indicated that

they often or occasionally felt that they must prove their masculinity, fifteen reported that the pressure affected their behavior; i.e., it caused them to try to be more masculine.

Slightly less than half of the respondents (47%) answered that they never felt this pressure now, although eleven indicated that they had felt it "as an adolescent when sports were so important." One respondent replied that he "never thinks of proving my masculinity - it's just there." Another indicated that he "may be subconsciously thinking about masculinity, but it's never conscious." Others in the category indicated that they never think about their masculinity and certainly not in terms of proving it.

While the majority (53%) stated that concern over their masculinity is a constant or an occasional experience, the fact that 47% responded that they never feel this pressure leads to a questioning of the arguments of earlier researchers. Certainly with only 20% affirming that the pressure is constant, these findings do not support previous assertions, that men feel a constant pressure to prove their masculinity. Another explanation, however, is that perhaps some men have so internalized standards of masculinity that they experience them as general standards, not as masculine standards. As indicated above by one respondent and the responses on the question concerning masculine awareness, some men do not think about masculinity. In addition as Turner indicates, many men are unwilling to admit their problems, and they might be hesitant to state that they feel pressured to be more masculine.

Feminization of Males

While the majority of literature on the male sex role suggests that men have been limited by the traditional male role, a few writers have suggested that the problem is in fact that men are not allowed to be really masculine. Sexton (1969) and Brenton (1966) suggest that men are becoming less masculine as a result of the feminizing effect of forced conformity to school and white collar occupational norms, and they clearly imply that this is undesirable.

When asked whether or not they agree that American males have become less masculine, the answers ranged from "no, men are still men - there have always been some weirdo's" to "yes, men are less concerned with appearing masculine." When grouped into agree/disagree categories, seventeen (57%) agreed that men are becoming less masculine, but they did not give the same reasons as Sexton and Brenton. Nine attributed the change to physical appearance (clothes, hair, jewelry), and the others gave a variety of reasons (e.g., open homosexuality, more involvement in housework). Only four respondents stated that changes in the type of occupations men hold have resulted in a feminization of males, and none indicated a belief that the school system has played a role in this change. Further questioning revealed that twelve of the seventeen men who agreed with the statement believed that the changes are good.

---

[2]The role of physical appearance needs to be further explored in the study of masculinity.

Male Dominance

The male role in our society cannot be adequately considered without looking at its relationship to the female role. Farrell (1974) suggests that most men regard their sex as the more powerful group and that they experience a sense of guilt because they perceive that males collectively dominate women. In this study respondents were queried as to which group is more powerful. Most indicated that men are at the present time, but several expressed the feeling that "things are changing and women are getting more power." Others stated that women may be somewhat less powerful than men but not "to the extent that they are oppressed." Another respondent replied that men "probably have better jobs and higher positions, but I don't feel that it's dominance; everyone gets too excited about this." Despite these qualified responses, when grouped in rough agree/disagree categories, twenty-six of the men (87%) replied that men are in most areas the most powerful group.

On the other hand, when asked if they had ever felt guilt because of the male domination of women, the overwhelming majority stated that they had not. A few expressed that they had "often felt guilty"; a few reported that they had felt "somewhat guilty;" and the remaining affirmative respondents simply said yes. The comment by one respondent that "I've certainly never felt any guilt because I don't think women are oppressed" is a very typical negative response. When roughly grouped into yes/no categories, twenty-three (77%) reported that they have never felt guilt. In this study Farrell's assertion that perception of greater power arouses guilt is not supported.

The researcher noted among a number of respondents an apparent look of incredulity and in some cases was confronted with laughter when this question about guilt was asked. All respondents who engaged in these behaviors indicated that they had not felt guilt. To the researcher these behaviors indicated that they not only had not experienced such feelings but also felt that the suggestion that they had was absurd.

After examining the answers to these two questions, individual respondents' answers to both were compared. As might be suspected, all four males who indicated that they did not perceive that men are the most powerful group answered that they did not feel guilty about the oppression of women. Of the twenty-six men who answered that men are the more powerful group, nine responded that they had felt guilt because of the male domination of women.

The respondents were asked a related question about the position of each sex: "which sex is better off in this society?" Some replied that "men have less restraints socially and occupationally and are thus better off." One respondent stated that men are better off because "their roles are established even though challenged, whereas women are unsure about their roles." In contrast, one respondent answered that women are better because "men take care of them." Another commented that "women have the option to work or not to work - to choose a traditionally feminine role or not - but men are forced to be the breadwinner." When categorized, however, sixteen (53%) indicated that men are better off, while 30% stated that women are, and 17% that neither sex is better off than the other. Of the sixteen respondents who

replied that men are better off, only five reported that they had felt guilty because of male domination of women. Of the ten men who reported that they consider women to be in a better position in this society, nine indicated that they had never experienced a sense of guilt about male domination.

Their findings support Farrell's assertion that the majority of men perceive their sex as the powerful group which is in most areas better off than their counter-group. They do not support, however, his notion that men experience feelings of guilt because they perceive themselves as more powerful than women. Even among those who support women's liberation (N = 7) only approximately 40% reported that they have felt guilty because men dominate women.

Male Superiority

Marine (1972) and Farrell (1974) state that men are taught directly and indirectly as children that they should be superior to women. Komarovsky (1973) qualifies this notion somewhat. Several questions in the study were designed to learn how the men in this group feel about ability and performance differences between male and female. One hypothetical question asked how they would feel if in a social setting their wives easily answered a question that they had been unable to answer. Several men responded that they "wouldn't be bothered at all; she knows some things, and I know other things." These replies suggested separate domains for both spouses in which superiority is expected. Others expressed that they would be "proud of her intelligence." Of those subjects who expressed concern, one replied that he would feel a "little bit stupid" and another that he would be "slightly embarrassed." When

roughly grouped into would bother/would not bother categories, 87% responded that they would either be pleased with her intelligence or unaffected at all. When asked, however, how they would feel if this occurred frequently, 60% commented that they "would feel put down." This finding suggests that while the men would feel threatened if they frequently appeared less intelligent than their wives, they are unaffected if their wives occasionally know more about a subject than they, particularly if it is in their wives' domains.

Another question queried the respondents as to whether or not they believe that males are naturally more aggressive than females. Several drew on their education and stated that they have had "enough psychology to know that aggression is an individual trait." Similarly, others responded that men are not naturally more aggressive than women becuase "Margaret Mead's studies found societies in which men are less aggressive than women." Still others in an academic vein attribute the development of aggression among men to the "way men are brought up in America." A few utilized academic sources to support another position. They commented that "men are biologically more aggressive" and supported this by stating that "studies of animals show that males are more aggressive." When categorized into yes/no answers, 37% responded affirmatively and 63% negatively.

A related question which did not elicit academic replies asked if men are naturally better at certain things than women. A large majority (80%) indicated that they believe men are better in some areas. Most of these (77%) specified tasks requiring extreme physical strength. Twenty-

three per cent responded that men are naturally better in areas that require analytical thinking and high-level decision making. These answers indicate that the subjects gave more traditional replies to questions which did not evoke academic responses.

A comparison was made to determine if the same men responded that they would be troubled if their wives answered a question which they could not, that they believe men are naturally more aggressive, and that they believe that men are naturally better at certain jobs than women. The results indicate no pattern; i.e., the men who gave what could be termed traditionally masculine responses to one question did not to other questions. The researcher then performed a similar comparison using the respondents who stated that they would be bothered if their wives frequently answered a question which they could not. Still no pattern was indicated. The respondents were just as likely to say no to one question as they were to say yes; i.e., there was a roughly equal probability that they would or would not give a certain response.

The responses to these questions draw a somewhat confusing picture. In summary, most men (87%) responded that they would not be bothered if their wives answered a question which they could not answer, although 69% stated they would be threatened if this occurred frequently in areas that they "should know more about." These findings are consistent with those of Komarovsky. Her research indicated that men are not uncomfortable when women exhibit superior intelligence in feminine domains.

The majority (63%) stated that men are not naturally more aggressive than women, but 80% indicated that they believe men are naturally better

in certain things than women. Several of the subjects (13) based their responses to the first question on their education; consequently, these responses may not be as indicative of their attitudes as the answers to the second question are.

Although the assertions of Marine and Farrell seem to hold true for some men, this research indicates that there is a higher degree of ambivalence and inconsistency about the superiority of males than earlier researchers have indicated. This may be due to their reliance on common-sense perceptions of traditional masculinity and lack of empirical data, since Komarovsky's findings are similar to the findings of this research.

The Importance of Breadwinner Role

One argument for the superiority of males and their greater power has been that they perform important functions for the society in their familial role as breadwinner. Most American men have been socialized to expect and to want to be the major breadwinner in their families (David and Brannon, 1976). When asked if they would personally prefer that their wives did not work, an overwhelming 83% responded no for various reasons. [Of the five respondents (17%) who indicated that they would prefer that their wives not work, three have working wives. They stated that as soon as they no longer need her salary, she would quit.] Of those indicating that they do not object to their wives working, ten commented that in today's economy both spouses have to work.

Fifteen others mentioned economic need, and also stated that working is important to their wives. (The female sex role literature indicates that women cite economic need as the primary factor in their employment.)

Another question designed to obtain information in this area asked subjects how they would react if their wives accepted a higher paying job than their own. Most (67%) commented that they would "love to have the additional money," but a third of the respondents stated that they "would not object verbally but would not like it much." One man expressed his concern by stating that he would "pump gas on the side to catch up to her salary."

In response to a related theme, the subjects were asked if they consider the responsibility to be the primary breadwinner a burden. Fifty per cent replied affirmatively, with several stating that "it's hardly possible nowadays for one person to support a family." The remaining 50% of the men stated that supporting their families is a role they consciously chose and is thus not considered a burden. Of the fifteen men who expressed the feeling that the breadwinner role is a burden, only one stated that he really would prefer that his wife did not work.

There are other ways to establish the importance men attach to their breadwinner functions. The respondents were asked whether or not they would expect their wives to move to another city if they were offered a better job there. Displaying an apparent look of dismay at the question, one man commented that his wife would certainly move "because she's my wife." Several stated that they were "sure she'd want to go."

Several indicated that they would "certainly discuss" it with their wives, but that in the final analysis they would expect them to go. Others stated that "there'll come a time when we'll have children, and it will be solely my resonsibility to support the family - so we'll follow my career opportunities." When grouped into yes/no categories, 80% indicated that in the end they would expect their wives to move.

The respondents were then asked whether or not they would move if their wives were offered better paying positions in other cities. The answers ranged from "no, I'd fear being thought of as following my wife" to "yes, for economic reasons." A large number stated that their decisions would depend on "how easily I could find a comparable job." Roughly categorized, 37% stated that they would not move for various reasons. A larger percentage (40%) commented that they <u>might</u> move if they could find a good job in the new city. Only three men stated that they would definitely move.

These findings question the breadwinner theme but represent attitudes congruent with the currently high level of labor force participation by married women. Further analysis reveals varying attitudes toward the importance of the breadwinner role.

Two other questions provide interesting results in this area. The respondents were told of a man who requested paternity leave from his job to spend more time with his young daughter. When asked if this would cause them to doubt the man's masculinity, only two replied that it would. When asked if they would be willing to do this, 37% stated

that they would because they feel a strong responsibility to be a good parent. Another 30% stated that they would not request paternity leave since they feel that child care is the primary responsibility of the wife. Thirty-three per cent responded positively to the idea but indicated that they would not take this action if it hindered their occupational goals in any way.

A second situation was presented to the men in which a husband and wife work only part-time to share in the responsibility for caring for their child. When asked if this behavior would cause them to doubt the man's masculinity, only three said that it would. The others replied that they do not consider caring for one's child a reflection on one's masculinity. When asked, however, whether or not they would be willing to work part-time, the answers differ sharply from those given in response to the previous situation, requesting paternity leave. Almost all of the men (90%) stated that they would not engage in this behavior. Several stated that their "work is too important" and that "working part-time in my field would simply not be feasible." A few stated that they did not "want to become that involved in child care." One man stated that he would not do this "because I feel that the man should assume the economic burden and that the wife should stay home with the child."

In summary, responses to their questions reveal several attitudes. Most men (83%) stated that they do not object if their wives work, and a majority (63%) reported that they would not be bothered if their wives made more money than they. In spite of this, 80% indicated that they would

expect their wives to move if they were offered better positions in another city, while only 10% stated that they would positively move if their wives were offered a similar position in another city.

These findings suggest that while many men desire their wives to work, most regard their own occupations as the more important in the final analysis. The questions regarding a family move clearly illustrate this. It seems that while thewife's job may be important to her self-identity and to her family economically, it is not important enough to cause her husband to refuse a promotional transfer or to motivate him to move should she be given a similar offer. In other words, in many cases her job is viewed as an auxiliary.

Most of the respondents expressed a desire to share in caring for their children; however, it became evident that they are not willing to seriously alter their occupational goals in order to do so. Although 37% stated that they would be willing to request paternity leave and another 33% expressed a willingness if they could be assured that it would not seriously hinder success in their jobs, only 10% stated that they would work part-time. In the former instance the costs of involvement in child care in terms of occupational setbacks are less, and the subjects are clearly more responsive to this idea than to the latter. Even among the nineteen respondents who reported that they consider their families to be the most important thing in their lives, only two said that they would consider working only part-time to share in child care. These findings

rephrased to read as follows: while many men do not object to their wives' aid in providing for the family economically, ultimately they perceive their role as breadwinner to be more important and more uniquely theirs than is the role of caring for their children.

Male Involvement in Housework

The functional argument has been that men perform the important instrumental role in the outside world and that women should as a consequence perform the less important maintenance functions in the home. The male liberation literature suggests that American men have learned to devalue housework and refuse to do any with the exception of a few traditionally masculine chores. It chastises men for not sharing in housework responsibilities. The author noted earlier that there is some question whether or not husbands whose wives work share more equally in housework.

In this study respondents were given a list of household tasks and asked to indicate those they regularly do (more than half the time), those their wives regularly do, and those which are shared equally by both spouses (Question 31 in Appendix A). In this analysis six tasks, three designated by a panel of expert judges as traditionally masculine chores and three as traditionally feminine chores, will be considered. The six are as follows: masculine - car maintenance, taking out the garbage, and making minor house repairs; feminine - shopping for groceries, cleaning the bathroom, and preparing meals.

In performing the traditionally masculine tasks the division of labor is more distinct than in the feminine chores. Each man interviewed (100%) reported that he is primarily responsible for car maintenance. Almost as overwhelmingly, 93% of the men in this sample indicated that they assume full responsibility for minor household repairs. In addition, 84% stated that they take out the garbage regularly.

Among the traditionally feminine tasks, there is a greater degree of sharing of responsibilities. Fifty per cent of the men reported that their wives shop for groceries, with 47% indicating that the chore is equally shared and 3% that it is exclusively their responsibility. With regard to cleaning the bathroom, only 10% reported that they regularly do this task; 23% indicated that they share it equally with their wives; and the large majority (67%) stated that their wives are solely responsible for cleaning the bathroom. Although none of the men reported that they regularly prepare meals, 33% indicated that it is a chore equally shared. The remaining 70% answered that their wives almost always prepare the meals.

While these findings do not refute the arguments made in the male liberation literature, they create a basis for questioning the degree to which these assertions are true. Clearly the respondents assume as their responsibilities the traditionally masculine tasks, supporting the assumption of Farrell (1974) and others that men learn the define certain chores as theirs. Regarding the other chores, however, the findings are less supportive. Almost one-half of the men reported that they share

equally in shopping for groceries, and one-third indicated that they prepare meals as often as their wives. These findings suggest that the point made by the literature is somewhat overstated. Although the results are hardly indicative of widespread erosion of traditional sex role behavior, they do indicate that these men assume a larger role in household work than stereotypical descriptions lead one to believe.

Whether or not the respondents' wives are full time workers or students seems to have some effect upon the division of labor. The percentages of involvement in traditionally masculine chores are basically the same for men whose wives do not work full time and for those whose wives are full time workers or students. For each of the three traditionally feminine tasks the men whose wives are at home (full or part time) are less involved than the other men. For example, 57% of the men whose wives are full-time outside the home reported that their wives clean the bathroom; among those whose wives are not full-time, 100% indicated that their wives perform this task. Among husbands of full-time outside the home wives, 33% reported that their wives shop for groceries, compared to 89% for those whose wives are not involved full-time outside the home. Finally among husbands of full-time outside the home wives, 67% indicated that their wives prepare the meals, compared to 87% for those whose wives are not full-time. These findings suggest the possibility of a relationship between wife's outside the home involvement and husband involvement in household work.

Eleven of the respondents are full-time graduate students. Since they are not presently involved in the breadwinner role, the researcher felt it reasonable to expect that they were more likely to be involved in household jobs. Once again regarding the masculine tasks, the percentages of involvement for students and non-students are roughly the same. Only in shopping for groceries is there a large difference in percentage for the feminine tasks. Among graduate students 73% share this responsibility equally, while only 32% of the non-students reported similarly. For cleaning the bathroom and preparing the meals the percentage of graduate students who perform these tasks as often as their wives is in each case 36%. In comparison among non-students the percentages are respectively 16 and 21. This analysis offers some support for the researcher's tentative assumption that full-time students assume greater responsibilities for household chores.

An analysis was made to ascertain differences that may exist between expressed attitude toward women's liberation and individual behavior in performing household tasks, the rationale being that those who support women's liberation are more likely to be involved in household work. The respondents' descriptions of their attitudes toward women's liberation were roughly grouped in to for (N = 7), mixed (N = 14), or against (N = 9) categories.[1] The six tasks previously utilized were also

---

[1]Those who were categorized as for women's liberation indicated that they reacted positively to most of the issues raised by the women's movement. Those included in the mixed category stated that they were supportive of legal rights for women but very opposed to the "radical end of women's liberation." The remaining respondents indicated that they were categorically opposed to the movement or felt that "it's silly."

used in this analysis. Men who support women's liberation indicated a higher degree of involvement (43%) in only one task, cleaning the bathroom, while 22% of the men opposed to women's liberation indicated that they share this chore. Basically the same percentage (57%) of supportive men shop for groceries as among those who are not supportive (56%). Interestingly, only 14% of the former group indicated that they share in preparing meals. This percentage is lower than that of those men who are opposed to the movement (44%).

These findings are somewhat contradictory and confusing. They suggest that one's expressed attitudes toward women's liberation has little effect on his involvement in traditionally feminine tasks. Although it might be supposed that men who are in agreement with the aims of the women's liberation movement would be more involved in household work which is traditionally performed by women, this research does not support such an assumption. The findings indicate that these men engage only slightly more in two of these tasks than men who profess to oppose women's liberation and actually less in one chore (preparing meals).

The men favoring women's liberation do seem, however, to be less concerned with performing traditionally masculine chores. Although all men in this group indicated that they are responsible for car maintenance, only 57% stated that they do minor household repairs, with 43% reporting that they share this responsibility with their wives. Seventy-one per cent answered that they regularly take out the garbage. Among men opposed to women's liberation, 100% stated that they are solely responsible for each of these tasks.

In conclusion, these findings indicate that the male liberation authors may have exaggerated the number of men who refuse to perform household tasks. While a number of chores remain divided according to sex, clearly a sizeable number of men in this sample reported that they are actively involved in housework - even in some traditionally feminine tasks. In each group large percentages of the men stated that they assume role responsibility for performing the traditionally masculine tasks. On the list which they were given (see Question 31, Appendix A), there are only eight tasks designated by the judges as masculine chores, while there are thirteen feminine tasks indicated. Consequently, men are expected to do fewer jobs, and many of these are not daily chores. Stating that they are largely responsible for the masculine chores and in varying degrees share the three feminine tasks chosen for analysis does not indicate that they are more involved in household chores than their wives are.

In this group of men, husbands of non-working wives reported less involvement in housework as might be expected. Generally, these findings suggest that many men are ambivalent in their behavior and in their attitudes. For example, expressed support for the aims of the women's liberation movement has little, if any, apparent effect on men's involvement in housework. Perhaps the existence of such inconsistency and ambivalence is the most important result of this research in that it indicates that men may be somewhat unsure of what they perceive as proper sex role behavior in this time of widespread media attention to women's liberation.

Paternity

In addition to housework the child bearing and rearing functions have been seen as rather exclusively feminine tasks in American society. The male liberation literature argues that this should change, that men are missing something important by this division of responsibilities. Several questions were designed to ascertain the men's feelings about child care abilities and responsibilities. When asked if women are better able to take care of small children, the responses were rather equally divided. Fifty-three per cent stated that potentially men are just as capable as women to care for small children although females generally receive more training in this area. Forty-seven responded definitely that women are more adept in this area than men.

Another question asked if the child-bearing function of women gives them a natural role in caring for children. Several stated that there is a "special bond between a woman and her child that a man cannot have becuase she carries and gives birth to the child." Others stated that women are both "biologically and tempermentally better suited for child care." One man stated that "although I was glad that my son was alright when he was born, I had to grow to love him; but my wife loved him long before he was born." Others stated that "with the exception of breast-feeding, mothers have no more natural role than fathers." When grouped into yes/no categories, 77% indicated a belief that women have a natural role in child care. All but one of the men who

stated previously that men are just as capable of caring for small children as women responded in this subsequent question that women have a more natural role in child care.

The respondents were then asked whether or not they believe that every woman is born with a material instinct. Several men relied upon textbook knowledge in indicating that "psychologists have stated that there is no such thing." Another commented that he and his wife "got a new dog, and my wife loves and mothers that dog whereas I don't really care; and I think she's just naturally more maternal than I am." When grouped, however, eighteen (60%) responded negatively, frequently stating that science has shown that humans have few instincts.

These findings suggest that the respondents' attitudes are often conflicting. The majority of the men (53%) stated that potentially men are as capable of caring for small children as women, but 77% responded that women have a more natural role in child care. Responding, however, to another question, 60% stated that every woman is not born with a naternal instinct. Various cross tabulations were made to learn if the same men responded that women are better able to care for small children, that they have a natural role in child care, and that they are born with a maternal instinct. The results indicated no pattern since the men responding traditionally to any one question gave non-traditional responses to other questions.

When asked if their wives should work outside the home after having a child if they desire, almost unanimously (93%) they replied yes. When asked when their wives should return to work after having

the child, 50% indicated specific times, with most stating that she should not work until the child enters grade school. Three men commented that their wives should never work while the children are at home.

While responding that the decision of when to work should be left to the wife appears to be a more equalitarian response, it actually implies the traditional assumption that women have the sole responsibility for deciding when their children should be left in the care of others; i.e., in other words, that they are responsible for child care arrangements.

As previously reported, numerous attempts were made to determine if patterns existed in that men giving traditional responses to one question gave similar responses to other questions. In addition to the relationships discussed, other tables were constructed using student status, wives' work status, presence of children, and masculine salience as independent variables to ascertain their effects upon each of the following dependent variables: need to prove masculinity, belief that men are becoming less masculine, belief that men are better off in this society, belief that men are the more powerful group, and belief that women are better able to care for small children. None of these indicated the existence of any relationships not previously discussed.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

In the first chapter considerable attention was given to literature on the male sex role, and more specifically the male liberation literature. The major ideas and arguments presented in this literature were reviewed and critiqued. Although there is an increasingly large body of social science literature on the male sex role, it is frequently ideological (propounding male liberation), popularized (omitting relevant theoretical concepts), and often not based on empirical research. The second chapter presented a discussion of a number of social psychological concepts pertinent to any consideration of sex roles but which are often only implicitly considered in the male sex role literature (e.g., sex, gender, sex role, gender role). Another group of concepts (e..g, role strain, institutional sexism) necessary to any systematic analysis of sex roles in American society were also expounded in the second chapter. In the third chapter the design of an exploratory study of thirty white middle class, young married men was described. Given the limited empirical research on the male sex, an exploratory study was necessary to determine more specific areas in which research is needed.

The findings and interpretations of the project were reported in Chapter IV. Questions were asked concerning each of nine themes implicit

in the male sex role literature. The data interpretations focused on the extent to which the themes were applicable to the men interviewed.

Recapitulation of Views

While some of the themes were supported, others were not. Several were supported to a limited, qualified extent. Many subjects held apparently inconsistent views of masculinity; i.e., they supported some ideas in response to one question and did not support similar ideas in their responses to other questions. This perhaps led to the qualified support of a number of them.

Contrary to the implication in the literature, only 27% of the men interviewed stated that they had frequently thought of their roles as men in this society. If the male role is undergoing the stress that some have argued or the liberation that others have argued, these results suggest that either men are unaware of such forces or they are occurring only for a limited number of men.

A number of questions focused upon stereotypical views of masculinity and their impact upon males. Giving support to stereotypical perceptions of men as unemotional, 87% agreed that men agenerally do not express emotions (crying) as easily as women. When asked if they personally felt that they could not do this, a sizeable minority indicated that they could freely express emotions (crying). It should be recognized that this group still experienced the impact of the stereotype for they indicated that they could do so only in private or that it was a stereotype that they had overcome.

Six men stated that they felt pressure to prove their masculinity constantly, and another ten reported that they occasionally felt this pressure. Their responses offer qualified support to the theme in the male sex role literature that men must continually prove their manliness, their masculinity, and suggest that these men perhaps experience role strain. The interviews suggest that those young men who were not experiencing this pressure may have in an earlier time period. So, men may experience this at certain ages or in certain situations.

One theme found in some literature and in the mass media suggests that men are becoming less masculine, and that this is undesirable for them and for the society. Fifty-seven per cent agreed that American men are becoming less masculine. Most respondents gave physical appearance as the reason and indicated they did not see any negative consequences resulting from this change with the exception of two men who saw the possibility of increased open homosexuality.

The theme that men perceive their sex group as more powerful in this society was supported, since 87% agreed with a statement to that effect. The findings do not support the existence of the hypothesized result of this power, that men experience a sense of guilt because of the male domination of women. Seventy-seven per cent reported that they had never felt guilt in this regard. Many of the subjects were personalistic in their responses to this question; e.g., several stated that they did not oppress their wives, friends, or secretaries. In the male liberation literature the implication is clearly that liberated men should experience a sense of guilt for male domination. Realistically,

it is perhaps unreasonable to expect men to feel a collective sense of guilt, since, as many indicated, they were not involved in personally oppressing women. Several of the authors who suggest the existence of this guilt implicitly state that they have experienced such feelings as a result of their involvement with the women's movement (Farrell, 1974; Fasteau, 1974). Perhaps men who have not been involved with this movement will not develop these feelings.

The findings suggest that the men interviewed are ambivalent in their feelings about male superiority in several ways. Apparently their ambivalence is partially the result of their education, which provided them an academic perspective on certain questions that influenced their answers. Another factor pointing to their ambivalence is that it appears that men conceded that women have superior intelligence in certain domains. When female superiority exceeded these bounds, however, the men indicated that they were troubled and uncomfortable. In addition, the frequency with which women appeared more intelligent also seems to affect the men. The respondents indicated that an occasional manifestation of their wives' greater knowledge was not conceived as threatening. They responded, however, that should this occur frequently, that they would be bothered. Specifically, although 87% indicated that they would be unaffected if their wives answered a question in the presence of others which they could not, 60% stated that they would be if this happened frequently. As earlier indicated, many (63%) based their answers on their formal education and stated that men are not naturally more aggressive than women. Responding to a question which did not elicit academic replies, 80% stated that men are naturally better at certain things than women

(physical activities requiring strength, decision making, analytical thinking).

Although the findings about the men's feelings about their masculine role as breadwinners are somewhat contradictory, this research suggests that men still regard their role as breadwinner as extremely important. Eighty-three per cent responded that they do not object to their wives working, and 67% stated they would be unaffected if their wives made more money than they. Despite these responses which support current labor force participation patterns for women, 80% indicated that ultimately they would expect their wives to move if they were offered better positions in other cities. Only 10%, however, indicated that they definitely would move if their wives were offered similar positions.

In response to questions about alternative familial roles, new institutional arrangements, 37% stated that they would be willing to request paternity leave. An overwhelming 90%, however, stated that they would <u>not</u> consider working part-time to share in child care. These findings and those above indicate that most men, primarily for economic reasons, do not object to their wives working. Ultimately, however, they perceive their roles as breadwinners as more important than their wives' occupations and more important than their roles in child care.

Existent stereotypes lead one to believe that men involve themselves only in traditionally masculine household chores. This research indicates that there are clearly masculine typed jobs that males perform whether students or non-students and whether their wives are full-time workers

or students. It also indicates, however, that many men are involved to varying degrees in traditionally feminine chores. It was found that in each of the feminine tasks men whose wives are full-time workers or students outside the home assumed greater responsibility than men whose wives are not full-time. In addition, the findings indicate that in each case full-time male graduate students are slightly more involved than non-students. It is difficult to know whether or not these patterns are temporary arrangements which are often necessarily made among students. Interestingly, men who expressed support for women's liberation were not found to be more involved than were men who expressed opposition to the movement.

The men also seem to be ambivalent with regard to their attitudes toward child care abilities. While 53% stated that as a group men are potentially as able to care for small children as women, 70% indicated a belief that women, because of their child-bearing function, have a natural role in caring for the child. Again supporting their answers on the basis of their education, 60% responded that women are not born with a maternal instinct, questioning nurturance as a part of the female sex role.

Suggestions for Future Research

Some theoretical considerations are necessary. In the second chapter a number of concepts were introduced to guide future research. Upon completing the research reported herein, several questions about the concepts emerged. One, the distinction between sexual identity and gender identity is perhaps an analytical tool of limited utility. The subjects did not seem to clearly differentiate between being a male

(sexual identity) and being masculine (gender identity). They seemed to combine biological and cultural factors when discussing being a male as well as when discussing being masculine. The distinction between these two concepts is perhaps difficult to maintain in practice, if the respondents are not aware of, or unable to articulate the meaning of each for themselves.

Another conceptual problem involves the all encompassing nature of many of the concepts. Although men throughout the society may generally give the same stereotypical description of what masculinity is, masculinity probably does not mean the same thing or affect men in similar ways personally. The author suggested that there are age, social class, and marital status differences in gender expectations, and the social science literature further suggests many other variables may affect gender expectations (e.g., race, religion, residence, ethnic background). In addition, a social psychological perspective suggests situational variables (e.g., sex of other, formality of the situation) may also affect gender expectations. Given the number and variety of variables which may affect expectations and behavior, it is perhaps inappropriate to discuss the masculine role and the feminine role in American society, if we are to understand the individual's actual behavior. One means to cope with this problem is to further delimit the concepts and studies of the male sex role. For example, in this study men of a particular marital status, stage in the life cycle, and social class were interviewed. Other studies should also focus upon particular sets of males.

In this study it was necessary to rely upon self-reports made by the respondents. A problem with self reports is that individuals, even

educated individuals such as those in this study, may not be aware of and/or be able to articulate their feelings about a topic such as masculinity. Observations of actual behavior in a variety of settings would aid in understanding masculinity. Obviously the researcher engaging in observation would obtain more accurate knowledge for several reasons.

Several men indicated that they experienced difficulty in making a decision in the short time allowed by the schedule as to the degree to which they were involved in household activities. Forced as they were to decide, the men, given individual personalities, may have responded either more traditionally than they actually were to be honest with the researcher or less traditionally to guard against appearing sexist. Some of the results may be limited because of the difficulty subjects experienced in responding to some questions (e.g., when they felt the least masculine). The researcher limited the weight given to responses to questions the subjects found difficult to answer for whatever reason.

A general problem occurs when conducting research on a popular controversial topic. All the men exhibited an awareness of current discussion and trends of thought; and several expressed that they feared appearing sexist, particularly when indicating the degree of their involvement in household chores and when labeling various occupations as not masculine. In several cases they indicated this concern but stated that they would "go ahead and be honest." A few men expressed the feeling that the research might be aimed at exposing sexist attitudes. These fears may have influenced some responses, although the researcher feels that it perhaps less likely to have affected those who verbalized their feelings than those who did not.

In addition to actual observation, or in lieu of this technique when observation is impossible, having subjects record in daily logs accounts of the activities in which they engage over a period of time would be very helpful. This also would aid the respondent in actually knowing the extent of his involvement in various activites.

Another suggestion for further research is for future investigators to interview the respondents' wives for two reasons. First, obtaining the wives' estimation of their husband's involvement in various tasks would provide an interesting comparison with the respondents' estimation. In addition, the wives have perspectives of their husbands which are possibly very different from their husbands' self-perceptions. For example, the wives would be queried as to how they perceive their husbands' masculinity. It would be enlightening to determine if women generally perceive their husbands as more or less masculine, or approximately the same, as their husbands perceive themselves.

One problem indicated earlier with which future investigators must contend, particularly in questions such as those just mentioned, is that many men, and perhaps women, do not have clear conceptualizations of masculinity and that many do not often think about their masculinity. At the close of almost all of the interviews, the respondents commented that they had actually enjoyed the interview, for it had caused them to think about some issues about which they had never before consciously thought.

Future researchers might also develop several projective questions. For example, responses to questions such as "what do you think your

wife would want you to do in various situations" could interestingly be compared with responses wives would give to a similar question: "what would you want your husband to do in various situations?" At least one subject commented when responding to another question that he often felt that his wife wanted him to act in masculine ways, particularly around others.

This investigator's research was limited to middle class, young married males for reasons previously discussed. Future research directed toward men in other groups would provide information which could be compared to the findings of this research to determine if men with different characteristics respond similarly. It would be worthwhile to determine, if possible, the effects that marriage seems to have on sex role attitudes and behavior. In addition, it would be interesting to test the common sense assumption that older men are less receptive to changing patterns of behavior. Finally, since, as some have suggested, sex roles may be related to social class, a project designed to include men from different classes would shed further light on these assumptions.

The finding of this research that men who expressed support for women's liberation were not more involved in housework than those who expressed opposition should be further pursued to determine if this finding were a matter of chance or if it truly indicates a pattern, since the number of those supporting the women's movement was limited. One also could engage in a study to determine if men who as students assume more traditionally female responsibilities in housework maintain these trends once out of school.

In conclusion, the most serious short-coming of the work done in the field of the male sex role is the absence of base line data. The arguments and points made by the male liberation literature are based upon stereotypes of behavior which supposedly exists or did at some time in the past among most men. Many assertions, for example, that men do not express emotions as easily as women, that men experience guilt because of the male domination of women, etc., are based not on empirical data but on the impressions gained from existent stereotypes. Before broad generalizations can be made, the accumulation of base line data and replication are essential.

Although much research is obviously needed in this area, this initial body of literature should not be overlooked, for it has played perhaps an important role in the future study of sex roles. It has raised issues to which most men and many social scientists do not seem to have devoted much thought. Hopefully it has provided the impetus for more scientific research.

LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

Bales, R. and P. Slater
1955 "Role Differentiation in Small Decision-Making Groups," in Family, Socialization, and Interaction Process, T. Parsons and R. Bales, editors. New York: Free Press.

Bednarik, K.
1970 The Male in Crisis. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.

Biddle, B. and E. Thomas
1966 Role Theory. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Biller, H.
1971 Father, Child, and Sex Role. Lexington: D. C. Heath and Company.

Blake, P.
1976 "Sex and the Single Sailor." Time, 108, 1, July 5: 34.

Brenton, M.
1966 The American Male. Greenwich, Connecticut: Fawcett Publication, Inc.

Broverman, I., D., Broverman, S. Vogel, F. Clarkson, P. Rosenkrantz
1972 "Sex Role Stereotypes: A Current Appraisal," Journal of Social Issues, 28: 59-78.

Burgess, E., H. Locke, and M. Thomes
1971 The Family. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company.

Buss, A.
1963 "Physical Aggression in Relation to Different Frustrations." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67: 1-7.

Carden, M.
1974 The New Feminist Movement. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Chafetz, J.
1974 Masculine/Feminine or Human? Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc.

Chessler, P.
1972 Women and Madness. New York: Avon Books.

Clavan, S. and N. Robak
1974 "Masculinity: Father and Sons." Youth and Society, 6, 1: 32-47.

Coulson, M.
1972 "Role: A Redundant Concept in Sociology?" in Role, J. Jackson, editor. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coutu, W.
1951 "Role-Playing Versus Role-Taking: An Appeal for Clarification." American Sociological Review, 16: 180-185.

Dahrendorf, R.
1968 Essays in the Theory of Society. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

D'amdrade, R.
1966 "Sex Differences and Cultural Institutions," in The Development of Sex Differences, E. Maccoby, editor. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

David, D. and R. Brannon
1976 The Forty-Nine Percent Majority: The Male Sex Role. Reading: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Davis, K.
1949 Human Society. New York: Macmillan and Company.

Deaux, K.
1976 The Behavior of Men and Women. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc.

Duberman, L.
1975 Gender and Sex in Society. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Epstein, C.
1970 Woman's Place. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Farrell, W.
1974 The Liberated Man. New York: Random House.

Fasteau, M.
1974 The Male Machine. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Goldberg, S. and M. Lewis
1969 "Play Behavior in the Year-Old Infant: Early Sex Differences." Child Development, 40, 1: 20-31.

Gross, N., M. Ward and A. McEarchen
1958 Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of School Superintendency Role. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Gunlack, R. and B. Reiss
1968 "Self and Sexual Identity in the Female: A Study of Female Homosexuals," in New Directions in Mental Health, B. Reiss, editor. New York: Gruen and Stratte, Inc.

Hampson, J.
1965 "Determinants of Psychosexual Orientation," in Sex and Behavior, F. Beach, editor, New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Hokanson, J. and R. Edelman
1966 "Effects of Three Social Responses on Vascular Processes," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3: 442-447.

Jones, J.
1972 Prejudice and Racism. Reading: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Kagan, J.
1964 "The Acquisition and Significance of Sex-Typing and Sex-Role Identity," in Review of Child Development Research (Vol. 1), M. Hoffman and L. Hoffman, editors. New York: Russell Sage.

Kilham, W. and L. Mann
1974 "Level of Destructive Obedience as a Function of Transmitter and Executant Roles in the Milgram Obedience Paradigm." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 29: 696-702.

Kohlberg, L.
1966 "A Cognitive Developmental Analysis of Children's Sex Role Concepts and Attitudes," in The Development of Sex Differences, E. Maccoby, editor. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Komarovski, M.
1973 "Cultural Contradictions and Sex Roles: The Masculine Case." American Journal of Sociology, 78, 4: 873-884.

Laver, R. and L. Boardman
1971 "Role Taking: Theory, Typology and Propositions." Sociology and Social Research, 55: 137-148.

Levinger, G.
1964 "Task and Social Behavior in Marriage." Sociometry, 27: 433-448.

Levy, M.
1952 The Structure of Society. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Lynn, D.
1966 "The Process of Learning Parental Sex Role Identification." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 28: 466-470.

McCall, G. and J. Simmons
1966 Identities and Interaction. New York: Free Press.

McKee, J. and A. Sherriffs
1959 "Men's and Women's Beliefs, Ideals, and Self-concepts." American Journal of Sociology, 64: 356-363.

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

Marine, G.
1972 A Male Guide to Women's Liberation. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Mead, G.
1934 Mind, Self and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Mead, M.
1949 Male and Female. New York: William Morrow.

1969 Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies. New York: Dell Publishing Company.

Money, J.
1970 "Sexual Dimorphism and Homosexual Identity." Psychological Bulletin, 74: 425-440.

Moore, K. and I. Sawhill
1976 "Implications of Women's Employment for Home and Family Life," in Women and the American Economy, J. Kreps, editor. Englewood Cliffs: Spectrum.

Morgan, M.
1974 The Total Woman. New York: Flemming H. Revell Company.

Nadel, S.
1957 The Theory of Social Structure. New York: Free Press.

Neimann, L. and J. Hughes
1951 "The Problem of the Concept of Role: A Resurvey of the Literature." Social Forces, 30: 141-149.

Newcomb, T., R. Turner, and P. Converse
1965 Social Psychology. New York: Holt Rhinehart and Winston.

Nichols, J.
1975 Men's Liberation: A New Definition of Masculinity. New York: Penquin Books.

Oakley, A.
1972 Sex, Gender and Society. New York: Harper and Row.

1974 The Sociology of Housework. New York: Pantheon Books.

Parsons, T.
1951 The Social System. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.

1955 "The American Family," in Family, Socilization, and Interaction Process, T. Parsons and R. Bales, editors. New York: Free Press.

Petras, J.
1975 Sex: Male/Gender: Masculine. Port Washington, New York: Alfred Publishing Company, Inc.

Pleck, J. and J. Sawyer
1974 Men and Masculinity. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Polatnick, M.
1973 "Why Men Don't Rear Children: A Power Analysis." Berkeley Journal of Sociology, 18: 45-86.

Preiss, J. and H. Ehrlich
1966 An Examination of Role Theory: The Case of the State Police. Lincoln, Nebraska.

Rabban, M.
1950 "Sex-Role Identification in Young Children in Two Diverse Social Groups." Genetic Psychology Monographs, 42: 81-158.

Rommetviet, R.
1953 Social Norms and Roles. Minneapolis: Minneapolis University Press.

Rossi, A.
1965 "Equality Between the Sexes: An Immodest Proposal," in The Women in America, R. Lifton, editor. Boston: Beacon Press.

Sandlunch, M.
1968 "The Status of Women in Sweden: Report to the United Nations," The Changing Roles of Men and Women, E. Dahlstrom, editor.

Sexton, P.
1969 The Feminized Male. New York: Random House.

Shaw, M. and P. Costanzo
1970 Theories of Social Psychology. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.

Sherif, M. and C. Sherif
1969 Social Psychology. New York: Harper and Row.

Stoll, C.
1974 Female and Male: Socialization, Social Roles and Social Structure. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Company.

Stoller, R.
1968 Sex and Gender. New York: Science House.

Stryker, S.
1957 "Role Taking Accuracy and Adjustment." Sociometry, 20: 286-296.

Tavris, H. and D. Pope
1976 "A Comprehensive Survey of Masculinity. Psychology Today, 9, 1, March: 78-86.

Taylor, P. and S. Epstein
1967 "Aggression as a Function of the Interaction of the Sex of the Aggressor and the Sex of the Victim." Journal of Personality, 35: 473-486.

Terman, L. and C. Miles
1936 Sex and Personality: Studies in Masculinity and Femininity. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Tiger, L.
1969 Men in Groups. New York: Random House.

Turner, R.
1956 "Role Taking, Role Standpoint and Reference Group Behavior." American Journal of Sociology, 61: 316-328.

1970 Family Interaction. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Weisstein, N.
1971 Psychology Constructs the Female or the Fantasy Life of the Male Psychologist. Boston: New England Free Press.

Yorburg, B.
1974 Sexual Identity: Sex Roles and Social Change. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. Age

2. Educational status

3. Occupation

4. Religious preference, if any

5. Number of children

6. Is your wife employed outside the home?

7. As you know, there is a women's liberation movement. Do you also know that there is a men's liberation movement? To familiarize you with this movement, read this excerpt from an article in the New York Times which describes the men's liberation movement.

   It almost had to happen. Women's liberation has given birth to a small but healthy ancilliary movement: Men's liberation. What do these men want to be liberated from? Why abdicate a position of power and superiority? These points are made:

   Men, no less than women, are victims of a fixed set of rules based generally on mores, not biology. A relationship with women as equals would be more rewarding, more honest, and more durable. Men would be freed from the total responsibility for the family's economic wellbeing. The burden of breadwinning and decision-making would be shared. Men could show emotion - fear, anxiety, and pain. They could cry on occasion and show tenderness publicly. Outmoded concepts would disappear. Some men would rather operate a vacuum cleaner than fix a faucet; some women have greater mechanical skills than their husbands.

8. On the basis of this short description, would you want to know more about the men's liberation movement? Why?

9. The quotation suggests that men don't express emotions as easily as women. Do you agree? Do you personally have trouble expressing emotions - especially crying? Why?

10. When you hear someone say that another person acted in a masculine way, what type of behavior comes to your mind?

11. Is there someone, living or dead, whom you think of as representing the American ideal of masculinity?

12. Many writers suggest that men must constantly prove their masculinity to other people. Do you ever feel this pressure? If yes, does this pressure to be masculine affect your behavior? (i.e., does it cause you to try to be more masculine?)

13. Compared to other males you know, how masculine would you say you are?

14. When do you have the strongest feeling of being masculine? Let me give you some examples:

    (a) Helping a women in need
    (b) Involved in your work
    (c) Competing with a peer
    (d) Playing a sport
    (e) At home with family
    (f) Wooing a potential sex partner or making love
    (g) Defeating an opponent
    (h) Socializing with other men
    (i) Achieving a major goal

15. When do you feel the least masculine?

16. Suppose you and your wife are having dinner with another couple, and the conversation turns to an intellectual topic. You are directly asked a question which you cannot answer. Your wife readily offers the answer. How would you feel? How would you feel if this happened frequently?

17. Some have suggested that American males in recent years have become less masculine and more feminine. Do you agree? If yes, what changes in work or leisure activities, physical appearance, and modes of expression indicate to you that men are becoming more feminine? If you think men are becoming less masculine, do you think that this is good or bad?

18. Do you believe that there are innate differences in the way men and women act? For example, do you believe that men are naturally more aggressive than women?

19. Are men naturally better at certain things than women?

20. Would you think a man was not very masculine if he held one of the following occupations? Check those you think are not masculine. Why?

(a) Secretary
(b) Mechanic
(c) Nurse
(d) Prostitute
(e) Model
(f) Physician
(g) Elementary school teacher
(h) Telephone operator
(j) Construction worker
(k) Air line attendant
(l) Hairdresser
(m) Engineer
(n) Fashion designer
(o) House-husband
(p) Interior decorator
(q) Plumber

21. Is either sex more concerned with getting along with people - men or women?

22. Do you think women are better able to take care of small children than men?

23. Do you think that the childbearing function of women gives them a natural role in caring for children? Why?

24. Do you believe that every women is born with a maternal instinct?

25. If (when) you have a child, do you feel that your wife should work outside the home if she wants to? If yes, when should she reasonably begin to work after having the child?

26. Have you ever felt that the responsibility to be the main supporter for your family was a burden?

27. If your wife works outside the home, would you really prefer that she did not? Why?

28. Mr. M's wife recently accepted a higher paying job than his own. If you were he, how would you feel?

29. If you were offered a job in another city which pays much more than you receive now, would you expect your wife to move? Why?

30. If your wife were offered a better job in another community, would you move with her? Why?

31. Which of the following do you regularly do and which does your wife regularly do? For a daily chore, regularly is intended to mean approximately half the time.

___Car maintenance
___Clean bathroom
___Iron
___Mow lawn
___Walk the dog
___Change storm windows
___Do laundry
___Shop for groceries
___Prepare meals
___Wash dishes
___Write thank you notes
___Take out the garbage
___Correspond with relatives
___Manage family finances
___Call maintenance men
___Decorate home
___Prepare meals for guests
___Take the children places
___Drive the car when you go places
___Lock the doors at night
___Minor household repairs (electrical plumbing, carpentry repairs)

32. Many feminists assert that men dominate our society and oppress women. Do you agree that men are the powerful group in our society? If so, are societies naturally this way? Some writers suggest that many men feel guilty because of the male oppression of women. Have you ever experienced such feelings?

33. Mr. S has requested paternity leave from his job to spend more time with his young daughter. Would this make you doubt his masculinity? Why? Would you be willing to try this arrangement? Why?

34. Mr. and Mrs. X wish to share the responsibility of child care. Both have arranged only part-time work, leaving ample time to care for their child. Would you think Mr. X less masculine? Why? Would you be willing to try this arrangement? Why?

35. Have you ever acted more confident, brave, or strong than you really felt because women were present? Why?

36. Which of the following sports and activities do you enjoy doing?

___Football
___Softball
___Golf
___Jogging
___Fishing
___Tennis
___Basketball
___Painting
___Woodworking
___Gambling
___Bowling
___Skiing
___Hunting
___Playing a musical instrument

37. How often do you participate in these activities?

38. Are there any activities or sports you have not engaged in because you felt that they were inappropriate for a male?

39. Which sex is better off in this society? Why?

40. How would you describe your attitude toward women's liberation?

41. Rated from highest to lowest, what are the most important things in your life?

___Job	___Sports
___Family	___Power
___Social recognition	___Religion
___Money	___Community involvement

42. To what extent have you thought about your role as a man before this interview?

VITA

Floyd M. Stallings was born in Houston, Mississippi, in May of 1953. He was reared and attended high school in Houston, graduating as salutatorian of his class in 1971. Later that year he entered Mississippi College, where he was a member of Pi Gamma Mu and Alpha Chi and was named to Who's Who Among Students in American Colleges and Universities. He graduated with special distinction in 1975 with a major in sociology. The following fall, he began work in sociology at the University of Tennessee, from which he received his Master of Arts degree in December of 1976.