

A STANDARDIZED MEASURE OF SEX ROLE PRESCRIPTIONS

Robert B. Settle, San Diego State University
Pamela L. Alreck, San Diego State University
Michael A. Belch, San Diego State University

Abstract

An instrument to measure sex role specificity (SRS) was composed and standardized on 1,200 adults from the general West Coast population. The SRS scales proved to be reliable and internally consistent, and two dominant factors underlie prescriptions for each sex. Role specificity differed systematically by demographic status.

Introduction

Sex Roles and Marketing

The use of sex as a segmentation variable has spawned a great deal of marketing research designed to determine the appropriate roles to be assigned to women through advertising appeals, to measure women's perceptions of the ways they are now being portrayed, and to gauge the changing sex roles this segment may be adopting. The psychology literature on sex roles is so extensive it might warrant a journal devoted entirely to research on this topic. A review of the literature in both psychology and marketing indicates a lack of consistency in both the methods used to determine perceptions or effects of sex role portrayals and in the results and conclusions of the research.

For the most part, research on sex roles in the marketing literature has focused on the portrayal of women in commercial advertising. The most common method has been to do post hoc content analysis of advertisements to determine how women have been portrayed, and then to offer criticism of the limited range of roles presented. Studies by Courtney and Lockeretz (1971), Wagner and Banos (1973), Sexton and Haberman (1974), Venkatesan and Losco (1975) and Belkaoui and Belkaoui (1976) all followed this basic paradigm. The consensus of these researchers was that women were portrayed as (a) homemakers, (b) sex objects, (c) dependent on men, (d) holding jobs of little importance, and (e) with little or no decision making responsibility.

In respect to the determination of people's attitudes toward the roles depicted, research by Wortzel and Frisbie (1974), Green and Cunningham (1975) and by Lundstrum and Sciglimpaglia (1977) focused on the effects of role portrayal on product evaluations or purchase decisions. None of the studies reported to date has attempted to determine the normative roles that people feel the sexes should enact. Lacking information on these prescribed roles for men and women, the advertiser and marketer must rely on his or her own observation and judgment or on the "conventional wisdom" of the industry as a whole. The purpose of this research is to develop a standardized instrument for the measurement of both male and female sex role prescriptions. The results should provide indications of how the public feels men and women ought to be portrayed; i.e., what roles are acceptable and unacceptable for men and for women. No such standardized instrument has been developed, as yet, within the discipline of psychology. Thus, the instrument developed here might have relevance well beyond the portrayals of women in advertising.

Role Prescriptions

Socially defined roles might be classified into three different types: (1) prescribed roles, (2) perceived roles, and (3) enacted roles. The prescribed roles are those that are actually expected of the actor; the behavior that others in the social environment feel befits a particular individual by virtue of that person's sex, age, occupation, or some other characteristic. Perceived roles are from the view of the individual. They are what the person believes is expected or regarded as appropriate by others. Within a social situation, these two types of roles might be discrepant from one another, either because the prescriptions are ambiguous or because the actor is relatively insensitive, or both. The enacted role is the behavior pattern that is actually acted out by the individual. It, too, might differ from the prescribed and the perceived. In social circumstances, the actor may be unable to play the role, even though it is correctly perceived, or the person may not care to conform to the role prescription, out of choice.

An instrument might be developed to measure any or all of these types of roles. Enacted roles could be measured by the systematic observation of each sex in various social situations. Perceived roles could be ascertained by asking people what they believe others expect of them, based on their sex. Prescribed roles can be measured by asking the individual what their generalized expectations and norms for others are; what things in the behavior of men and women in general would gain their approval or disapproval. It is this latter tack, the measurement of prescribed roles, that this project pursues.

Methodology

Item Selection

The selection of an item pool began with an examination of the ways that "manhood" and "womanhood" have been described in both the academic literature and the popular press. Topics tended to fall into two basic categories: (1) What people are by virtue of their particular sex, and (2) what they should be, given their sex. For example, one might believe that women are innately more capable of caring for small children than are men. Similarly, one might believe that men ought to be the major decision-maker in the family. An item pool of several hundred such statements were gleaned from the literature. Those which were redundant with others on the list were culled, as were those that referred to unusual actions or extraordinary situations. This process provided a list of less than two hundred potential item topics. Of those remaining on the list, forty-eight items applying to masculine behavior and an equal number of items applying to feminine behavior were eventually selected by the researchers. The criteria for selection were: (1) The degree to which the action or condition might be seen as discriminating between the sexes. (2) The judgment of the degree of common acceptance that might be expected, based on the literature. (3) The representation of a wide variety of behavior domains or categories.

Behavior Domains

Within the item pool, the topics could be congregated into six general behavior domains: (1) Recreation and leisure behavior, (2) food, beverage consumption and smoking, (3) parenting and family behavior, (4) social appearance and etiquette, (5) employment and occupational factors, and (6) dating, mating and sexual behavior. These domains were regarded as relatively comprehensive and inclusive of typical actions and roles important to the daily life of individuals in all walks of adult life. The items were written in a relatively simple vocabulary and were expressed in conversational or vernacular grammar. The list was shown to several lay people of various backgrounds to obtain their comments concerning their comprehension and general reaction. A few were rewritten, but none replaced.

Scaling and Formatting

The items were expressed as statements to which respondents could indicate their agreement or disagreement. The scale used for the instrument was a five-point Likert scale: (1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Neutral, (4) Disagree, and (5) Strongly disagree. The scale appeared at the top of each page, with twenty-four items listed below it. Respondents recorded the number of the scale category corresponding to their opinion in a space to the right of the item.

Half of the items applied to women's behavior and half to men's behavior. Half of those in each category were worded so that agreement would indicate sex role specificity or constraint and the others were inclined in the opposite direction to control for "yea-saying" and "nay-saying." The items were listed in quadruplets in the sequences: (1) masculine positive, (2) feminine positive, (3) masculine negative, and (4) feminine negative. The groups were randomly ordered on the four-page instrument.

Sampling and Data Collection

The data for the standardization of the sex role scale were collected in two field projects sampling the general adult population from two major metropolitan areas of Southern California during the spring of 1980. The same sampling method and quotas and the same data collection techniques and validation methods were used for each project.

The field workers who collected the data were undergraduate students of marketing or marketing research classes. Each received several hours of instruction on the project and data collection techniques. They were instructed to contact potential respondents in their homes, to explain the nature of the project and permit the respondent to read the letter of transmittal, and after winning their cooperation, to leave the questionnaire with the respondent to be self-administered at their own convenience. The field worker made an appointment to return a few days later to retrieve the completed questionnaire. "Nonresponse" with this procedure might be considered either a refusal to accept the questionnaire or failure to complete it properly. The two sources, combined, were less than five percent of the responding sample.

Each field worker was given a quota based on the sex, age and occupational status of the respondents. This procedure was used to insure an adequate representation of the various demographic segments of the society. Field workers received credit for their work according to how closely they were able to fulfill the quota.

The name, address and the telephone number of each respondent were obtained on the questionnaire. The data were submitted to a special computer program to provide a two-page report to the respondent. This report expressed sex role specificity only in terms of preference for so-called "gendered" products or services, so that no conceivable threat would be conveyed to respondents. Their opinions were shown in relationship to those of the others in the sample, and this permitted them to make comparisons of their degree of preference for "typically masculine or feminine" brands or products on the market. The reports served as a small inducement to potential respondents, and this form of feedback was very well received by the respondents. Because every respondent was mailed a report at his or her home address, this constituted virtually one hundred percent verification of actual response. The only nondeliverable reports proved to be clerical errors or relocation by the respondent during the interim between receipt and mailing.

Data Processing

The data were keyed to computer file and submitted to a series of programs to machine edit the data. Anomalies were sight edited from the source documents, and corrections made as necessary. About twenty cases were eliminated from the file because they were not sufficiently complete to be included. Six hundred cases were obtained in each of the data collection projects.

The data were submitted to statistical analysis to first obtain descriptive statistics. Given the insignificant departures of the major score distributions from normal, the data were judged adequate for parametric statistical techniques. Item analysis and analysis of score distributions were obtained principally with the use of product-moment correlations and multiple regressions. Internal consistency analysis included the computation of coefficients alpha and other relevant measures of internal consistency reliability. Lastly, the relationships among scores and demographic categories were measured with the use of factorial analyses of variance.

Test-Retest Reliability

To obtain a measure of the "trait stability" and the reliability of the instrument over time, the scales were administered to sixty-five undergraduate business students on two occasions with a one-month interim period between the administrations. The sequence of the items was changed for the second administration, to reduce the effect of actual item response recall. While these respondents were not from the general public, there is little reason to believe that these results would differ systematically from what might be obtained from the public at large.

Results

Degree of Specificity

The percentage of the sample that were either neutral or answered in a direction indicating sex role specificity (agreement with "positive" items or disagreement with "negative" ones) for each item were computed and examined. The majority of items yielded distributions of less than fifty percent in the six behavior categories, but several items did receive majority support for specificity in each category.

Comparison of the proportions for male and female respondents suggested that men tended to be more sex

role specific than women. This observation was supported by subsequent analysis of variance. While there are a few "turn-arounds" such that one sex was more "liberal" for an item of that gender than the opposite sex was, these were only a small minority. In general, both sexes appeared to be about as specific for their own sex as for the other. Nor did one behavior domain appear to be more subject to sex role constraint than the others. Each domain contained several items that received very low and very high sex role adherence.

Scale Reliability

Table 1 contains a complete description of the masculine, feminine and combined scale distributions. Before this analysis was performed, the "negative" items were reflected so that all items and scale

scores ascend toward sex role specificity. A constant of one was subtracted from each item value, so that with forty-eight items on each sub-scale, the minimum obtainable score was zero and the maximums were 192 for the sub-scales and 284 for the combined scale. The scores, then, tended to be rather "low" on sex role specificity on this absolute basis. The average item mean over, the 1,200 respondents, proved to be well below the "midpoint."

Item analyses were conducted for each sub-scale and for the combined scale. The mean, minimum and maximum inter-item correlations are shown in Table 1. None of the individual items in any of the three analyses proved to have either a negative correlation with the total of the remaining items in the analysis or to have an exceptionally low multiple regression coefficient when regressed on the other items. In other words, there were no negative discriminators and item redundancy was well within acceptable limits. All coefficients alpha were over .9, indicating scales that are very internally consistent. The test-retest reliability coefficients were all over .85, indicating that there is fairly high trait stability and little error variance associated with the scales. The other coefficients of consistency were similarly high for the standardization sample.

The masculine and feminine sub-scales were compared using the "split-half" analysis technique for equal length scales. While they were highly associated with one another on all comparison coefficients, their mean values were significantly different, as indicated by the F-ratio and probability listed in Table 1. This indicates nothing more than the fact that the feminine sub-scale tends to elicit more sex role specific responses than does the masculine scale. Actually, there is no way, within this design, to determine if that relationship is a function of the greater application of sex role specification to women than to men, or merely a function of the arbitrary choice and wording of items.

Demographic Categories

The distribution of the responding sample across nine demographic dimensions are shown in Table 2. Each sub-scale and combined scale mean for the various categories are also shown. Factorial analysis of variance revealed that all demographic categories except income provided significant main effects with a probability of less than .001. Neither sub-scales nor combined scale differed significantly by income category, and the masculine sub-scale did not provide a significant main effect by marital status. Aside from those exceptions, sex role prescriptions differ markedly according to demographic status. Most notably:

- A. The young tend to be less prescriptive.
- B. Men are more prescriptive than women.
- C. Married people are more prescriptive for women.
- D. Prescription is greater for non-working, late family life cycle.
- C. The more the education, the less the prescription.
- E. Retired, homemakers and self-employed are more prescriptive.
- F. Semi-skilled labor are high and professionals low on prescription.
- G. Orientals and Native Americans are high on prescription.

To measure the interaction of demographic factors on sub-scale and scale scores, the two-way interactions were analyzed while the higher-order interactions were thrust into the error term in a factorial analysis.

TABLE 1

SCALE AND SUB-SCALE SCORE DISTRIBUTIONS AND RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS

Statistic	Masc.	Fem.	Comb.
Standardization Sample			
Mean.....	57.62	60.93	118.55
Standard Deviation.....	20.35	22.93	41.68
Standard Error.....	0.59	0.66	1.20
Skewness.....	-0.16	0.11	-0.10
Kurtosis.....	0.22	0.52	0.30
Maximum.....	127.	178.	284.
Maximum Obtainable.....	192.	192.	384.
Minimum.....	0.	0.	0.
Minimum Obtainable.....	0.	0.	0.
Sample Size.....	1200.	1200.	1200.
Number of Items.....	48.	48.	96.
Mean Item Mean.....	1.20	1.27	1.24
Minimum Item Mean.....	0.55	0.56	0.55
Maximum Item Mean.....	2.91	2.34	2.91
Mean Inter-Item Corr....	1.20	1.27	1.24
Minimum Inter-Item Corr..	-0.11	-0.05	-0.11
Maximum Inter-Item Corr..	0.44	0.50	0.60
Coefficient Alpha.....	0.91	0.93	0.96
Std. Item Coef. Alpha....	0.92	0.93	0.96
Corr. Betw. Sub-Scales...			0.86
Spearman-Brown Coef.....			0.93
Split-Half Betw. Sub-Sca.			0.91
F-Ratio Betw. Measures...			353.29
Probability.....			0.00
Test-Retest Sample			
Mean, 1st Admin.....	52.06	55.72	107.79
Mean, 2nd Admin.....	51.75	53.91	105.66
S.D., 1st Admin.....	22.59	22.92	44.76
S.D., 2nd Admin.....	22.86	23.91	45.63
Coef. Alpha 1st Admin....	0.94	0.94	0.97
Coef. Alpha 2nd Admin....	0.95	0.95	0.97
Sample Size.....	65.	65.	65.
Test-Retest Reliability..	0.87	0.86	0.88
Spearman-Brown Coefficient.	0.93	0.93	0.94
Split-Half Betw. Admin....	0.93	0.93	0.94

TABLE 2

SCALE SCORE MEANS BY DEMOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTIONS

Category	Freq.	Pct.	Masc.	Fem.	Comb.
Total Sample					
All	1200	100.0	57.6	60.9	118.6
Respondent Age					
Teens	43	3.6	59.9	58.0	117.9
Twenties	385	32.1	54.4	54.1	108.6
Thirties	248	20.7	53.3	59.2	109.5
Forties	162	13.5	60.6	60.8	117.8
Fifties	165	13.7	59.1	66.3	125.4
Sixties	135	11.2	65.9	74.2	140.1
Seventies & Over	65	5.1	74.7	81.3	154.0
Respondent Sex					
Male	566	47.2	63.1	64.8	129.9
Female	634	52.8	52.8	57.5	110.2
Respondent Marital Status*					
Married	673	65.1	58.6	63.6	122.2
Not married	527	43.9	56.3	57.5	113.9
Family Life Cycle					
Young Single	349	29.1	53.4	54.3	109.7
Young Couple	159	13.2	50.7	52.7	103.4
Full Nest I	123	10.2	57.3	61.2	118.5
Full Nest II	124	10.3	55.3	59.2	114.5
Full Nest III	141	11.7	65.9	67.2	129.1
Empty Nest I	94	7.8	60.8	67.2	128.1
Empty Nest II	110	9.2	65.8	74.9	140.7
Sole Elder I	37	3.1	52.0	57.2	109.1
Sole Elder II	63	5.3	67.4	75.8	143.2
Respondent Education					
Elementary	29	2.4	80.4	87.6	168.0
Some High School	80	6.7	69.6	72.9	142.5
High School Graduate	404	33.7	60.3	65.2	125.5
Some College	326	27.2	56.0	59.2	115.2
College Graduate	211	17.6	55.2	56.0	111.2
Post-Graduate	150	12.5	46.5	48.5	95.0
Respondent Employment					
Company Employed	554	46.2	56.4	57.9	114.3
Self Employed	103	8.6	59.2	62.8	122.0
Government Emp.	194	16.2	51.3	53.2	104.6
Homemaker	118	9.8	57.8	68.3	126.1
Seeking Emp.	37	3.1	60.7	59.7	120.4
Retired	143	11.9	69.4	77.1	146.5
Student	51	4.3	55.7	58.0	113.7

TABLE 2 (cont.)

SCALE SCORE MEANS BY DEMOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTIONS

Category	Freq.	Pct.	Masc.	Fem.	Comb.
Respondent Occupation					
Semi-Skilled	136	11.3	65.5	67.5	130.0
Craft or Trade	164	13.7	63.2	66.3	129.5
Clerical Work	241	17.8	56.4	61.6	118.0
Technical & Sales	222	18.5	68.6	60.7	119.3
Managerial	207	17.2	57.9	59.8	117.6
Professions	225	18.8	49.8	52.6	102.4
None Listed	32	2.7			
Respondent Ethnicity					
No Minority	1033	88.1	59.6	60.0	116.6
Black	40	3.3	58.6	62.6	121.2
Oriental	22	1.8	78.0	76.4	154.3
Chicano	20	1.7	59.7	59.8	119.5
Native American	10	0.8	76.7	74.1	144.8
Other Ethnicity	75	6.3	63.0	66.8	129.8
Respondent Family Income**					
Under \$5,000	37	3.1	54.5	61.0	115.6
\$5,000 to \$9,000	110	9.2	60.3	61.3	121.6
\$10,000 to \$14,000	164	13.7	56.8	58.6	115.4
\$15,000 to \$19,000	132	11.0	55.0	58.5	113.5
\$20,000 to \$24,000	62	5.2	56.3	58.4	118.7
\$25,000 to \$29,000	74	6.2	52.2	54.9	107.2
\$30,000 to \$34,000	27	2.3	50.4	53.3	103.7
\$35,000 to \$39,000	36	3.0	53.6	57.0	110.6
\$40,000 and Over	61	5.1	60.0	63.5	123.6

*No significant difference in Masculine subscale.

**No significant differences in any scale means.

sis of variance. The only significant interactions with factors that also provided significant main effects were between family life cycle and education and between family life cycle and occupation. In the main, it appears that the other demographic factors act independently and additively. That is, an individual is likely to be more sex role specific if his or her education level is low and even more so if the person is an elderly male, etc. Of course, this does not apply equally to the composite family life cycle variable.

Factor Composition

Each of the sub-scales were submitted to factor analyses for examination of their principle components and revelation of their rotated factor structure. (See Settle, Alreck and Belch, 1981.) Five, four, three and two factors were submitted to varimax rotation and the factor loadings and individual item content analyzed. The rotation of two factors for each sub-scale proved to be the most interpretable and meaningful. The inspection of individual item content for those items loading most heavily on each factor yielded rather different interpretations for the masculine and feminine sub-scale. In general all factors cut across behavior domains. That is, the

items on any given factor were not predominantly from one domain, and any one domain was apt to have items on two (or more) factors. The first factor on the masculine sub-scale could best be characterized as a "potency-responsibility" factor. The items loading most heavily on this factor had to do with being the breadwinner, "wearing the pants" in the family and being strong enough to make the major decisions. The other factor for the masculine sub-scale largely reflected freedom or restraint on male emotionality. Items loading heavily on this factor related to sentimentality, interest in children, succorance, fidelity and involvement in more "tender" pursuits and interests.

The two factors for the feminine sub-scale were also fairly distinct. The first might be termed "opportunity" because items loading on this factor dealt with women's rights to pursue active sports, get equal pay for equal work, hold supervisory positions and choose careers in business or industry. By contrast, the second factor contained the items that might be classified as "feminine etiquette and demeanor." These items related to "acting like a lady," accepting responsibility for household chores, putting family "first," and never acting "butchy." While the two factors were fairly distinct and interpretable for both sub-scale, it should be noted (and might be expected from the high internal consistency) that the factors are certainly not independent of one another. From subjective judgment, one might conclude that the scale measures a single underlying propensity, manifest in a variety of behavior domains, but reflecting slightly different fundamental criteria for each sex.

Conclusions

Scale Performance

A major objective of this project was to create and to standardize an instrument that might be used for the measurement of sex role prescriptions. The item analysis, internal consistency analysis and test-retest reliability analysis all indicate that the instrument is well balanced and very effective, relative to the statistical performance that has been obtained by psychometric instruments of this ilk. One aspect remains untested here. The external validity of the instrument remains to be tested and reported. It might be suggested, for example, that "socially desirable" response patterns tend to portray respondents as being less sex role prescriptive than they actually are. This aspect of the measurement instrument can and will be tested by comparison of its resultant scores with external indicators of sex role specificity and role related behavior. Given that refinement, the sex role scales may contribute substantially to the measurement and understanding of sex role prescriptions. Such assessment might have considerable application in the behavioral sciences in general, and for marketing, consumer behavior and promotion in particular. Sex role prescriptions could be of special interest in the marketing of "gendered" brands and products, in the understanding and clarification of the degree of normative social influence on the consumer decision process and on the selection of role models for promotion.

Demographic Patterns

This project reveals very clearly that there are marked differences in the prescription of sex roles according to the sex, age, education and occupation of the respondent, among other demographic categories. It appears that men are more sex role prescrip-

tive than are women, that the vigor of sex role dependence increases with the age of the individual, and that those in upper education levels and higher occupational status tend to be less prescriptive on the basis of sex. These relationships have several marketing and promotional implications. For example, the relative influence of husband and wife within the family decision making process might vary systematically by demographic status. It appears likely that elderly males who have less education and lower status occupations would be most insistent on the traditional sex role specification and adherence. On the other hand, target markets composed primarily of well educated young women with high status occupations could be expected to exhibit little dependence on sex roles in the selection of products and the pursuit of life styles.

The differences in sex role specificity by age of the respondents is particularly interesting. Such differences may result from two different causes that might be called "history" and "maturation." On the one hand, it may be that social change and external demands for less dependence on distinctions by sex have caused the "younger generations" to be less sex role prescriptive. Thus, the differences could be attributable to "history" and little change in the tendency to prescribe sex roles would be expected as these generations mature and take up residence in the elderly age categories of the society. The alternative view is that the tendency to prescribe sex roles is a function of human life experience and "maturation." In that case, the youth of any epoch would be less likely to prescribe distinct sex roles than would their seniors. These confounding factors cannot be separated within this research design, confined to a static picture of the present condition. The size and nature of the standardization sample do provide a source of "baseline" data for subsequent measurement and comparison in a longitudinal format. Consequently, replication of the survey over a substantial time period will eventually reveal the relative effect of each of these two conceivable underlying causes for differences in sex roles by age and for the formation of sex role specificity in general.

Representation

Given the differences in sex role specificity by demographic category, it seems likely that other demographic factors would also influence this prescription of roles. This project was confined to metropolitan residents of Southern California. The conventional wisdom concerning social and cultural differences among different areas of the country suggest that this geographic area might be more "liberal" in the acceptance of innovative perspectives and more willing to relinquish traditional cultural norms, values and attitudes. To the degree that these casual observations are true, one might expect rural residents of the mid-west and south to be more sex role specific. Testing of such hypotheses must await the use of the sex role scales in various parts of the country with both general and special populations.

Promotional Models

The majority of consumer products are advertised and depicted in promotional materials within a social setting. These settings and the models portrayed by men and women in relationship to the product or service have been the subject of considerable research, as noted earlier. The results of that research indicated that the role models portrayed are confined rather rigidly to the most traditional constraints and sex role specifications, particularly for women.

References

Probably such restriction on the range of role portrayal can be attributed in large measure to the tendency to "play it safe" with the often huge expenditures of resources on promotion. Other sources of influence and constraint can also be identified, particularly in light of the results of this study. In large measure, those making the choices and decisions concerning role portrayal in advertisements are men who are probably well into their career and middle-aged or older. On the other hand, their audience is, in many cases, feminine and somewhat younger. It might be suggested, without accusation or indictment, that a "self-reference cycle" operates in the role model decision process. Because the decision maker tends to be somewhat prescriptive of sex roles, there is an automatic assumption, in the absence of counter indications, that the audience shares the role prescriptions in kind and degree. Perhaps this and subsequent work with the sex role scales will encourage use of a wider range of role portrayals in advertisements and promotional campaigns, particularly for feminine products and audiences and for those in the upper socio-economic strata.

Stereotypes

There appears to be a particular stereotype, common to both academic and commercial institutions and vocations, that the "typical" American family consists of a husband and wife and a couple of children, that the husband is the breadwinner while the wife is principally concerned with homemaking, child care, etc. Like most stereotypes, this one (a) will ordinarily be denied vigorously and universally by everyone, (b) will elicit recognition by everyone that "others" do entertain such a stereotype, (c) that it provides tremendous economy of thought and cleanliness of expectations, (d) was historically rooted, at least in part, in demographic fact, and (e) becomes less accurate, useful and representative as sociocultural conditions and circumstances change. Today, demographers variously estimate that only a small minority of American families actually have a husband-father in the work force and a wife-mother at home looking after the family. Certainly no responsible marketer would assume that the most typical American family lives on a farm or in a rural community, though once it was so. Ironically, there is willingness to relinquish that demographic stereotype in favor of a new image of the metro-consumer, but reluctance to abandon the sociographic or psychographic stereotypes of sex roles.

This research and the future use of the sex role scales may make it more clear that constrained prescription and rigid specification of sex roles does not accurately reflect the consumers' own attitudes and actions. Acceptance of wider ranges of role behavior patterns may sacrifice economy and simplicity in favor of a better representation of the consumer and more effective marketing and promotional efforts.

- Ahmed Belkaoui and Janice Belkaoui, "A Comparative Analysis of the Roles Portrayed by Women in Print Advertisements: 1958, 1970, 1972," Journal of Marketing Research. 13 (May, 1976), 168-172.
- Alice Courtney and Sarah Lockeretz, "A Woman's Place: An Analysis of Roles Portrayed by Women in Magazine Advertisements," Journal of Marketing Research. 8 (February, 1971), 91-95.
- Robert Green and Isabella Cunningham, "Feminine Role Perceptions and Family Purchasing Decisions," Journal of Marketing Research. 12 (August, 1975), 325-332.
- William Lundstrum and Donald Sciglimpaglia, "Sex Role Portrayals in Advertising," Journal of Marketing. 41 (July, 1977) 72-79
- Robert Settle, Pamela Alreck and Michael Belch, "The Dimensions of Sex Role Prescriptions," Proceedings of the Southwest Marketing Association Annual Conference, 1981. (in press)
- Donald Sexton and Phylis Haberman, "Women in Magazine Advertisements," Journal of Advertising Research. 14 (August, 1974) 41-46.
- M. Venkatesan and Jean Lasco, "Women in Magazine Ads: 1959-1971," Journal of Advertising Research. 15 (October, 1975) 49-54.
- Louis Wagner and Janis Banos. "A Woman's Place: A Follow-up Analysis of the Roles Portrayed by Women in Magazine Advertisements," Journal of Advertising Research. 13 (May, 1973) 213-214.
- L. H. Wortzel and John Frisbie, "Women's Role Portrayal Preferences in Advertisements: An Empirical Study," Journal of Marketing. 38 (October, 1974) 41-46.