The Male Role and Avoiding Femininity[1]

Donald R. McCreary[2]

Brock University

When confronted with males and females deviating from society's sex-based gender role prescriptions, people tend to respond more negatively to the males' transgressions. In order to develop an understanding of the reasoning behind this phenomenon, two theories were tested. The social status model predicts that males are punished because feminine behavior is lower in status than masculine behavior. The sexual orientation hypothesis predicts that, for males, there is a stronger perceived link between gender roles and sexuality and that a male acting in a feminine way is more likely to be considered a homosexual than a female acting in a masculine way. A group of mostly Caucasian participants were asked to rate a male or female target, performing in either a male- or female-valued manner, on variables assessing social status and perceived homosexuality. The results suggested that the basic assumption of the social status model (i.e., higher male role status) could not be upheld; hence this hypothesis could not adequately be tested. However, strong support emerged for the sexual orientation hypothesis. The functions of homophobic attitudes and the idea that these two models may not be mutually exclusive, especially from within a developmental framework, are discussed.

An asymmetry exists in the way males and females are treated when they display cross-gender behaviors or personality traits. Research examining the perceptions of males and females acting in gender-congruent and cross-gender ways show that males of all ages are viewed more negatively than females for their gender role transgressions (Carter & McCloskey, 1984; Costrich, Feinstein, Kidder, Marecek, & Pascale, 1975; Feinman, 1984; Jackson & Sullivan, 1990; Martin, 1990; Moller, Hymel, & Rubin, 1992) and that parents, peers and teachers show more concern when males (either child or adult), rather than females, deviate from traditional gender role prescriptions (Antill, 1987; Archer, 1993; Langlois & Downs, 1980; Lytton & Romney, 1991). These attitudes appear to be related to data showing that males are more likely to be punished for acting like a "sissy," while females acting like a "tomboy" tend to be tolerated and, at times, even rewarded by others (Archer, 1984; 1993; Hemmer & Kleiber, 1981; Maccoby, 1986).

The actions of both parents and peers have been shown to affect significantly children's display of gender-typed behaviors. Parents, especially fathers, reward boys more than girls for displaying gender-congruent forms of play. They also tend to punish boys more harshly than girls for deviations from prescribed gender role norms (Langlois & Downs, 1980; Lytton & Romney, 1991). In a similar way, males influence same-sex[3] peers through social reward and punishment; those who act in a stereotypically feminine manner are likely to be teased and ultimately rejected from their male peer groups (Fagot, 1977; Moller, et al., 1992). For example, Fagot (1977) reports that boys displaying cross-gender behaviors tend to play alone almost three times more frequently than boys who act in a gender-congruent manner. Furthermore, research using a person perception paradigm shows that males described as having traditionally feminine attitudes or acting in stereotypically feminine ways were perceived to be less attractive and less popular than males described as holding traditionally masculine attitudes (Costrich et al., 1975; Dunkle & Francis, 1990; Jackson & Sullivan, 1990; Martin, 1990; Seyfried & Hendrick, 1973).

[3]The term "sex" is used in this paper to denote category membership based on biological sex (Deaux, 1993). The term "gender" is used to refer to the many socially constructed aspects which people often equate with belonging to either sex category. As Unger (1979) stated, "*Gender* may be used for those traits for which [biological] sex acts as a stimulus variable, independently of whether those traits have their origin within the subject or not." (p. 1086, her emphasis) In other words, "sex" should evoke "gender" (e.g., gender roles, gender stereotypes), especially within a person perception paradigm.

Peer reaction to girls who deviate from the traditionally feminine role is quite different; their behavior tends to be ignored and sometimes even rewarded with elevated social status in their female peer groups (Fagot, 1977; Hemmer & Kleiber, 1981; Thorne, 1986). This is not to say, however, that female gender role deviations are always met with positive or ambivalent evaluations. Smetana (1986) has shown that, when children view line drawings of boys and girls transgressing traditional gender role norms, they experienced stronger negative reactions to the boys' deviation than the girls', but there *were* negative reactions towards the female figures (see also Damon, 1977, and Stoddart & Turiel, 1985). It has been suggested that gender role transgressions are perceived by children as moral violations (Damon, 1977; Stoddart & Turiel, 1985) and, as such, male transgressions are thought to be stronger violations of the "rule."

This program of differential punishment for gender role transgressions leads many males to avoid what society has prescribed to be female-valued. The "avoidance of femininity" has emerged as a significant factor in all studies attempting to understand the underlying dimensions of masculinity and the male gender role (e.g., Brannon, 1976; Doyle, 1989; O'Neil, Helms, Gable, David, & Wrightsman, 1986; Snell, 1986; Thompson, Pleck, & Ferrera, 1992). Because they avoid the feminine role, males lack the ability to experience as much "femininity" as females experience of "masculinity" and, as a result, they encounter a greater degree of restriction in their gender role development and expression. This concept has been referred to as *male gender role rigidity* (Archer, 1993).

While there is an abundance of reach demonstrating *how* differentially responding to male and female gender role transgressions can lead to the development of male gender role rigidity, few attempts have been made to explain *why* cross-gender behavior is less tolerated in males than in females. Possible explanations can be focused on two separate premises. The first consideration addresses the *social status* (SS) of being and acting like a male or a female and the differences in status between these roles (Feinman, 1981; 1984; Thorne, 1986). Research has shown that stereotypically male gender role characteristics have a higher degree of social desirability and prestige than stereotypically female characteristics (Feinman, 1981; 1984; Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman, & Broverman, 1968). As a result, it has been assumed that the male role possesses higher social status than the female role. When females deviate from the feminine role, the SS model assumes that they are altering their behavior in a direction that is higher in status, prestige, and desirability; as such, they may be viewed more positively by those in their social

environment and, as a result, they may receive more social rewards. Males displaying female-valued behavior, however, are altering their actions in a status-lowering (i.e., undesirable) direction, with the result that they are viewed less positively by those with whom they are interacting (e.g., parents and peers). The SS model would predict that males acting in a cross-gender fashion stand a greater likelihood of being punished for their self-devaluative behavior.[4]

To date, only Feinman (1981; 1984) has directly tested the validity of the SS model. His research has shown that boys are viewed more negatively than girls when displaying cross-gender behaviors. However, Feinman's social status variable is a measure of the degree to which subjects disapprove of the target's cross-gender behavior. Whether or not disapproval can be equated with lower social status is a debatable point. The social status of an individual can also be measured in more sociometric terms, such as the number of friends a person is thought to have, how highly those friends think of that person, perceived competence, and that person's perceived degree of psychological well-being. These variables have emerged from observational studies of children in their peer groups (e.g., Fagot, 1977; Thorne, 1986), interviews with psychotherapists about the most desirable gender role characteristics to possess (Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz, & Vogel, 1970), and more experimentally-based studies of person perception (Jackson & Sullivan, 1990; O'Leary & Donoghue, 1978).

A second line of reasoning which can be used to explain the development of male gender role rigidity is what I have labelled the *sexual orientation* (SO) hypothesis. This hypothesis assumes that observed gender role characteristics and behavior are closely linked with perceived sexual orientation in males, but not in females. Thus, cross-gender behavior in boys (but not in girls) is a sign that they are, or will become (if the display is not stopped and put under control), a homosexual. Since society is homophobic in general (but especially towards males), being homosexual is a r>gative outcome and should be avoided (e.g., Herek, 1984a).

---

[4]The social status model assumes that society provides equal opportunities for males and females to cross traditional gender role boundaries. However, society has begun an *overt* policy of sanctioning new role dimensions for females (dimensions that had previously been male-dominated, such as careers in business and science), while offering none for males. This suggests that society expects more cross-gender behavior from females, since their success in any of these new dimensions is often linked to their ability to act in a male-valued fashion (e.g., Korabik, 1992; Korabik & Ayman, 1989). If this is so, then the relative infrequency of male cross-gender role behavior may make these types of actions more salient and noticeable. Thus, a male acting in a cross-gender manner may not only be punished for his status-lowering behavior but he may also be punished for acting in a socially "deviant" manner.

The sexual orientation hypothesis has not been proposed formerly as a means of explaining why males have been socialized to avoid that which is feminine, although aspects of it have emerged in many different areas of gender role research. The notion of male sexual inversion (Constantinople, 1973; Hathaway & McKinley, 1943; Kite & Deaux, 1987) is perhaps the most widespread form of the SO hypothesis. This idea suggests that masculinity and femininity (both roles and identity) are categorical, bipolar opposites and share a one-to-one relationship with biological sex and sexual orientation. A change in any one of these nominal variables means that all of the others must also change. Thus, all males are expected to be masculine and sexually attracted to females while all women are expected to be feminine and sexually attracted to males. Because male homosexuals are sexually attracted to the same group that females are supposed to be attracted to, they are also expected to display feminine gender roles and have a feminine gender identity (i.e., the psychological equivalent of being a female). According to those who follow this theory, sexual inversion is a psychological disorder and its treatment should progress along the lines of "inverting" these factors back towards the male role norm (e.g., Green, 1975; Green, Williams, & Harper, 1980; Reker & Yates, 1976).

Storms (1980), however, has noted that homosexuals are *not* more likely than heterosexuals to possess either a greater degree of cross-gender traits *or* a cross-gender identity and that the notion of sexual inversion is a stereotype that cannot be supported. Also, Spence and Helmreich (1978) and Robinson, Skeen, and Flake-Hobson (1982) note that most male homosexuals possess neither feminine- nor masculine-typed gender role self-concepts; rather, they tend to be either androgynous or undifferentiated (i.e., a balance of male- and female-valued attributes).

Still, the stereotype of the feminized male homosexual persists, as well as the expectation that female-oriented behavior in men increases the likelihood of them being homosexual. Studies of people's expectations of homosexuals show that, when presented with descriptions of a target described as a homosexual male or female, subjects frequently ascribe cross-gender traits to him or her (e.g., Kite & Deaux, 1987; Taylor, 1983).[5]

[5]Kite and Deaux (1987) demonstrated that the sexual inversion theory was implicitly applied to both males and females. However, the sexual orientation hypothesis that I am postulating suggests that sexuality is *more closely* linked with the display of gender role characteristics and behavior in males. Kite and Deaux, however, offer two bits of information that support the present hypothesis. Their data show that subject-generated attributes of the male homosexual target were dominated by descriptions of how feminine he was. The attributes generated for the female homosexual were less centered on the notion that she was masculine. Secondly, the effect sizes for the male and the female targets showed that, in all but one instance, male homosexual and heterosexual targets were perceived to be different (e.g., male and female roles, physical characteristics) whereas the two female targets were not.

Similarly, when describing a male or female acting in a cross-gender way, subjects often attribute a greater likelihood that the target is a homosexual (e.g., Deaux & Lewis, 1984; Dunbar, Brown, & Amoroso, 1973; Martin, 1990). Even feminized facial expressions are more likely to lead to attributions that a male is homosexual (Dunkle & Francis, 1990). Finally, Antill's (1987) study of parents' beliefs about sexuality and gender roles shows that, even though they believed homosexuality to be biologically based, parents still were more likely to regard cross-gender play as a sign of homosexuality in boys, but not in girls. This leads these parents to display a greater degree of concern for boys' cross-gender behavior.

Although the SS and SO hypotheses are presented here as two separate models which attempt to explain the development of male gender role rigidity, they may not be mutually exclusive. As Herek's (1984b) findings have shown, homosexuality (especially male homosexuality) is perceived to be much less desirable than heterosexuality. As such, the two theories may interact with one another, resulting in perceptions of males who behave in a cross-gender way as both homosexual *and* lower in social status.

The present study was designed to examine why male gender role deviations are more harshly dealt with than female transgressions by directly testing the social status and sexual orientation hypotheses. Participants were presented with the description of a hypothetical target acting in either a gender-congruent or cross-gender manner. They then were asked to make a series of attributions about that target, several of them specifically concerned with the two hypotheses being addressed. Support for the SS model will emerge from a main effect for the gender role descriptions (male- or female-valued) on the social status variables. This should indicate that the male role is perceived to be higher in status than the female role. Support for the SO hypothesis would be found in two ways. First, an interaction between the sex of the target and its gender role description (i.e., male- or female-valued) on attributions of the perceived likelihood that the target is homosexual would demonstrate that males (but not females) acting in cross-gender ways are thought to be homosexual. Further support would come from a main effect for the target's sex on the perceived relationship between gender roles and sexual orientation.

In reviewing the SS and SO literatures, it becomes apparent that the age of the target should be an important consideration in this study. Much of the research reported above used children as either participants or perceptual targets; the assumption appears to be that children are more malleable than adults and thus their behavior is more likely to be influenced by their environment. If children are perceived to be more socially pliant,

then the SS or SO hypotheses may be applied to them more than to adults. For example, Feinman (1984) found that adult male targets were not perceived to lose status for gender role transgressions while boys were. Because of this, the target descriptions will be varied by age. The ages of 8 years and 30 years were selected because the former was representative of the past research and the latter was a point in adulthood which was close to the participants' ages and would be associated closely with adulthood.

METHODS

Subjects

A total of 166 university undergraduates (84 males and 84 females) volunteered to participate in this study. Half of the mostly Caucasian subjects were enrolled in the author's Developmental Psychology course. These students then were asked to recruit a friend of the other sex to complete the pencil and paper survey.

Materials

Descriptions. Subjects were presented with the written description of a hypothetical stimulus person (SP). Each target was described in a brief paragraph, with personality and behavioral adjectives taken from Antill's (1987) research on characteristics that parents believe are stereotypic of boys and girls. The SP displaying male-valued characteristics was described as someone who "has often been described as aggressive, rough, strong, noisy, loud-mouthed, active, energetic, likes outdoor sports, likes team sports, and is mischievous." The SP displaying female-valued traits was described as someone who "has often been described as temperamental, emotional, good at schoolwork, neat, responsible, likes clothes, and takes an interest in cooking."

These SP descriptions were manipulated in a 2 (male or female SP) × 2 (male- versus female-valued characteristics) × 2 (8 year old or 30 year old SP) factorial manner. Each subject rated only one SP.

Measures of Social Status and Homosexuality. A number of variables measured the subjects' attributions of the SP's social status and the likelihood that s/he is (or will become) a homosexual. With regard to the SP's social status, sociometric-like variables were selected for their face validity in measuring status in both children and adults. Subjects were asked to rate their approval of the SP's behavior on a 7-point Likert scale where

-3 was "strongly disapprove," zero was "neither approve nor disapprove," and +3 was "strongly approve." Other measures of social status asked participants to estimate the number of both male and female friends the SP was likely to have, how highly the SP's friends were likely to regard him/her, and how psychologically well-adjusted they felt that SP was. Each of these latter ratings was made on a metric from 1-10, where 1 represented low regard or adjustment and only 1 male and 1 female friend.

The SO hypothesis was assessed by asking for the subject's rating of the likelihood that the target is, or will become, a homosexual, as well as a rating of the extent to which the SP's behavior indicates his/her sexual preference. Again, ratings were made on a scale from 1-10, where 1 represented a low degree of likelihood or no relationship between his/her behavior and sexuality.

Procedure

The developmental psychology students were given an envelope containing two identical pencil and paper questionnaires. The instructions asked the student to complete one survey and then recruit a friend of the other sex to complete the second. They were also asked to return the finished questionnaires, sealed in the envelope with no identifiers, in the next class. The students were instructed on the impact of discussing the survey with others who had not yet completed the questionnaire and they were asked neither to discuss the survey with a friend who had not yet completed theirs, nor compare their responses until after they had each completed their respective questionnaires.

The surveys were distributed at a point in the semester where no mention had yet been made of gender role socialization. However, the students were told that the results of the project would be used as the basis for a future lecture and the specific data would be discussed in class. It should be noted that recruiting subjects in this manner may enhance demand characteristics (e.g., social desirability); this should be considered when interpreting the findings.

RESULTS

Since the social status model and the sexual orientation hypothesis may not be mutually exclusive, all six variables examining these two questions were analyzed together in a 2 (Sex of Subject) × 2 (Sex of SP) × 2 (Gender Role Description) × 2 (Age of SP) multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). The MANOVA revealed significant multivariate main

effects for the Sex of the SP, Pillais $F(13, 130) = 3.60, p = .0001$, the Gender Role Description, Pillais $F(13, 130) = 30.66, p = .0001$, and the Age of the SP, Pillais $F(13, 130) = 3.97, p = .0001$, as well as a significant multivariate interaction between the Sex of the SP and the Gender Role Description, Pillais $F(13, 130) = 2.20, p = .013$. Univariate analyses examined only these specific effects.

The examination of the Age of the SP main effect revealed that 30 year olds were expected to have significantly more male (6.21 vs 5.44, $F(1, 142) = 4.02, p = .05$) and female (5.67 vs 4.18, $F(1, 142) = 13.15$, $p = .0006$) friends than 8 year olds. The older targets (compared to the 8 year olds) also were thought to have a significantly greater likelihood of being a homosexual (3.32 vs 2.23, $F(1, 142) = 13.47, p = .0001$) and their behavior was thought to be a significantly greater indication of their homosexuality than in the younger SPs (3.80 vs 2.18, $F(1, 142) = 12.09, p = .001$).

The Sex of the SP influenced approval of the target's behavior, $F(1, 142) = 5.34, p = .022$, the number of female (but *not* male) friends the SP was expected to have, $F(1, 142) = 13.23, p = .0001$, and the likelihood that his/her behavior is indicative of his/her sexuality, $F(1, 142) = 6.48, p = .012$. Female SPs were approved of to a significantly greater degree than male SPs (.75 vs .26) and female SPs were expected to have a greater number of female friends (5.55 vs. 4.28). Also, sexual orientation was more closely linked to the male SP's behavior than the female SP's behavior. Subjects thought the male's behavior was more indicative of it's sexual orientation than the female's behavior (3.55 vs 2.26).

The Gender Role Description of the SP (i.e., described in either a male-valued or female-valued manner) influenced all variables but that examining the extent to which behavior was indicative of the SP's sexuality. Female-valued behavior was approved of significantly more than male-valued behavior (1.19 vs –.17, $F(1, 142) = 45.82, p = .0001$) and was perceived to be indicative of better psychological adjustment (6.80 vs. 5.54, $F(1, 142) = 14.64, p = .0001$). Those described in a male-valued way were expected to have significantly more male friends (6.98 vs 4.51, $F(1, 142) = 49.99, p = .0001$) while those described in a female-valued way were expected to have significantly more female friends (6.30 vs 3.59, $F(1, 142) = 55.33, p = .0001$). Also, the SP described in a female-valued manner was expected to be held in significantly higher regard (6.95 vs 5.79, $F(1, 142) = 15.96, p = .001$) and was more likely to be perceived as homosexual (3.39 vs 2.14, $F(1, 142) = 13.98, p = .0001$).

This latter point, however, should be examined in light of the significant interaction between the SP's sex and the gender-orientation of the description, which revealed that only the attribution of the target's likelihood of being a homosexual were influenced in this manner, $F(1, 143) = 9.11$,

$p = .003$. Tukey's post hoc tests examined the differences between SPs presented in a male-valued manner and those presented in a female-valued manner, separately for male and female targets. For male SPs, being presented in a female-valued fashion resulted in a significantly stronger perception of being or becoming a homosexual (3.83 vs 1.78, $p < .01$). However, there was no significant difference for female SPs (2.92 vs 2.55).

DISCUSSION

The present study offered a direct test of the social status and sexual orientation hypotheses in an attempt to understand *why* people punish males more than females for transgressing socially prescribed gender role norms. Overall, there was an impressive amount of support for the SO hypothesis. When asked for their perceptions of male and female SPs displaying either male- or female-valued behaviors and personality characteristics, subjects were more likely to perceive the male SP (when compared to a female SP) deviating from traditional gender role prescriptions as a homosexual. Further support for the SO hypothesis came from the finding that subjects considered the behavior and personality characteristics of the male SPs to be a significantly greater indication of their sexual orientation than those of the female SPs (especially for the 30 year-old male targets). These findings support the claim made by the SO hypothesis that gender role attributes and behaviors are more closely linked to perception of a male's, rather than a female's, sexual orientation.

These results suggest that the asymmetry in people's responses to male and female gender role deviations are motivated, in part, by the implicit assumption that male transgressions are symptomatic of a homosexual orientation. This interpretation assumes that since people react negatively to these gender role deviations, attitudes towards homosexuals are more negative than attitudes towards heterosexuals, and that attitudes toward male homosexuals are especially severe; these assumptions are supported in the literature (Herek, 1988; Preston & Stanley, 1987).

Possessing negative attitudes toward homosexuality is often referred to as being *homophobic*. Herek (1984b) has observed that homophobic attitudes are mostly concerned with the condemnation of the homosexual lifestyle, but that they also reflect other beliefs, such as the idea that homosexuals are more similar to the other sex and that they should be kept away from children.

Herek (1984a; 1986) has noted that the negative attitudes which serve to support the homophobic's fear can serve different purposes for different people and different situations. According to Herek's model, the homophobic reactions which appear to be motivating the sex-differentiated re-

sponses to gender role deviations may serve three possible functions. First, homophobic attitudes may serve an *experiential* function, meaning that people may generalize their past experiences with homosexuals to others in that category. This becomes a factor when people's attitudes are based on limited exposure to stereotyped groups. As Herek (1984a) and Kite (1984) have noted, people with more negative attitudes towards homosexuals have had limited interactions with those they know to be homosexual. Secondly, homophobia may serve a *defensive* function in order to protect someone from their own internal conflicts over their sexual feelings (see Herek, 1984a, for a review of the empirical support for this psychodynamic process). Finally, Herek (1984a) believes that homophobic attitudes may serve a *symbolic* function. This function serves to "express the feeling that cherished values are being violated [by a certain group] and that illegitimate demands are being made for changes in the status quo." (p. 12)

Future research needs to examine more closely the impact which these different attitude functions can have on the individual as s/he interacts with others. For example, consider the relatively consistent findings showing that fathers punish cross-gender behavior more than mothers, and that their punishment is more severe when they are responding to a male child's behavior (Langlois & Downs, 1980; Lytton & Romney, 1991). If one assumes that this type of action is an expression of homophobia, then the question arises as to whether the actions serve an experiential, defensive, or symbolic function.

Unfortunately, the data addressing the SS model were less than supportive. The SS model assumes that male role characteristics are more desirable than female role characteristics and that this is a reflection of the higher status of the male gender role. This basic premise, however, could not be upheld. In fact, the main effect for the gender role manipulation showed the *opposite* of what was expected: female-valued characteristics were perceived to be significantly more desirable than male-valued characteristics, stronger indicants of psychological well-being, and a better indication of someone who is held in high regard. Furthermore, female targets were also seen in a more positive manner than male targets, irrespective of their gender role description.

Since this sample did not perceive the male role to be higher in status, there is no reason to punish males for transgressing gender role norms; in fact, the SS hypothesis says that, if female-valued traits are indeed higher in status than male traits, males acting in a feminine manner should be rewarded with higher status. Further research needs to address the failure to support the SS model's basic premise. For example, was this a random result based on the nature of the sample, the sampling procedures, or has society become sensitized to the issue of female role

status? One other possibility concerns the attributes used to describe the male and female roles. These characteristics were taken from Antill's (1987) work on parents' perceptions of gender differences in children and they represent ways in which parents see boys and girls to differ. Perhaps some of these are more socially desirable or undesirable than the *average* and the results are reflecting this and not the failure to confirm the SS model.

The idea that one sex may be punished for acting in a lower status manner, however, is an important issue to continue to address. One point that future research needs to consider is that the participants in this and most other studies examining reactions to male gender role transgressions tend to be either university undergraduates or parents (in other words, adults). Adults may perceive gender role transgressions in a very different manner, especially when compared to children. As Damon (1977) and Smetana (1986) have noted, children display rule-oriented anger at those acting in a cross-gender way. They felt as though cross-gender behavior violated a moral rule and, for them, this was the motivating force behind their anger and their reactions. This motivation may lead children to respond to gender-based transgressions in a way that indicates a gain or loss in social status. Later on, however, these rule-based reactions appear to be replaced with psychologically-based expectations relating to the transgressor's gender identity (Stoddart & Turiel, 1985) and, possibly, their sexuality.

The factors corresponding to this perceptual shift need to be examined more thoroughly in order to determine whether the transition is a function of cognitive or social events. For example, the early adolescent's belief that a male's cross-gender behavior may be indicative of feminine gender identity may be related to the social factors surrounding the onset of puberty. Nevertheless, children (like adolescents and adults) are still more punitive when presented with male cross-gender behavior. The idea of a developmental change in perceptions of gender role transgressions from rule-based to sexuality-based must not only address the issue of change, but must also examine the differential application of these social "rules" to males and females.

A second point to consider when studying the SS hypothesis is the way in which social status is operationalized. In the study presented here, the same measures of social status were applied to both the 8 year old and 30 year old SP. While it is expected that approval, number of friends, high or low regard, and psychological well-being are indicants of social status at all ages, adult status may be determined in a more diverse manner (e.g., competence, power, importance).

REFERENCES

Antill, J. K. (1987). Parents' beliefs and values about sex roles, sex differences, and sexuality. In P. Shaver & C. Hendrick (Eds.), *Sex and gender.* London: Sage.

Archer, J. (1984). Gender roles as developmental pathways. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 23,* 245-256.

Archer, J. (1993). The organization of childhood gender roles. In H. McGurk (Ed.), *Contemporary issues in childhood social development.* London: Routledge.

Brannon, R. (1976). The male sex role: Our culture's blueprint of manhood and what it's done for us lately. In D. S. David & R. Brannon (Eds.), *The forty-nine percent majority: The male sex role.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Broverman, I. K., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., Rosenkrantz, P. S., & Vogel, S. R. (1970). Sex-role stereotypes and clinical judgments of mental health. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 34,* 1-7.

Carter, D. B., & McCloskey, L. A. (1984). Peers and the maintenance of sex-typed behavior. The development of children's conceptions of cross-gender behavior in their peers. *Social Cognition, 2,* 294-314.

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

Costrich, N., Feinstein, J., Kidder, L., Marecek, J., & Pascale, L. (1974). When stereotypes hurt: Three studies of penalties for sex-role reversals. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 11,* 520-530.

Damon, W. (1977). *The social world of the child.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Deaux, K. (1993). Commentary: Sorry, wrong number — A reply to Gentile's call. *Psychological Science, 4,* 125-126.

Deaux, K., & Lewis, L. L. (1984). Structure of gender stereotypes: Interrelationships among components and gender label. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46,* 991-1004.

Dunbar, J., Brown, M., & Amoroso, D. (1973). Some correlates of attitudes toward homosexuality. *Journal of Social Psychology, 89,* 271-279.

Dunkle, J. H., & Francis, P. L. (1990). The role of facial masculinity/femininity in the attribution of homosexuality. *Sex Roles, 23,* 157-167.

Doyle, J. A. (1989). *The male experience* (2nd ed.). Dubuque: W. C. Brown.

Fagot, B. (1977). Consequences of moderate cross-gender behavior in pre-school children. *Child Development, 48,* 902-907.

Feinman, S. (1981). Why is cross-sex-role behavior more approved for girls than for boys? A status characteristic approach. *Sex Roles, 7,* 289-299.

Feinman, S. (1984). A status theory evaluation of sex-role and age-role behavior. *Sex Roles, 10,* 445-456.

Green, R. (1975). Adults who want to change sex, adolescents who cross-dress, and children called "sissy" and "tomboy." In R. Green (Ed.), *Human sexuality: A health practitioner's text.* Baltimore, MD. Williams and Wilkins.

Green, R., Williams, K., & Harper, J. (1980). Cross-identity: Peer group integration and the double standard of childhood sex typing. In J. Samson (Ed.), *Childhood and sexuality: Proceedings of the International Symposium.* Montreal: Editions Etudes Vivantes.

Hathaway, S. R., & McKinley, J. C. (1943). *The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory.* New York: Psychological Corporation.

Hemmer, J. D., & Kleiber, D. A. (1981). Tomboys and sissies: Androgynous children? *Sex Roles, 7,* 1205-1212.

Herek, G. M. (1984a). Beyond "homophobia:" A social psychological perspective on attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. *Journal of Homosexuality, 10,* 1-21.

Herek, G. M. (1984b). Attitudes towards lesbians and gay men: A factor analytic study. *Journal of Homosexuality, 10,* 39-51.

Herek, G. M. (1986). The instrumentality of attitudes: Toward a neofunctional theory. *Journal of Social Issues, 42,* 99-114.

Herek, G. M. (1988). Heterosexuals' attitudes towards lesbians and gay men. *Journal of Sex Research, 25,* 451-477.

Jackson, L. A., & Sullivan, L. A. (1990). Perceptions of multiple role participants. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 53,* 274-282.

Kite, M. E. (1984). Sex differences in attitudes toward homosexuals: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Homosexuality, 10,* 69-81.

Kite, M. E., & Deaux, K. (1987). Gender belief systems: Homosexuality and the implicit inversion theory. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 11,* 83-96.

Korabik, K. (1992, June). The masculinization of women managers. In D. R. McCreary (Chair), *Applied issues in gender research,* Symposium convened at the annual meetings of the Canadian Psychological Association, Quebec City.

Korabik, K., & Ayman, R. (1989). Should women managers have to act like men? *Journal of Management Development, 8,* 23-32.

Langlois, J. H., & Downs, A. C. (1980). Mothers, fathers, and peers as socialization agents of sex-typed play behaviors in young children. *Child Development, 51,* 1237-1247.

Lytton, H., & Romney, D. M. (1991). Parents' differential socialization of boys and girls: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 109,* 267-296.

Maccoby, E. E. (1986). Social groupings in childhood: Their relationships to prosocial and antisocial behavior in boys and girls. In D. Olweus, J. Block, & M. Radke-Yarrow (Eds.), *Development of antisocial and prosocial behavior: Research, theories, and issues.* New York: Academic.

Martin, C. L. (1990). Attitudes and expectations about children with nontraditional and traditional gender roles. *Sex Roles, 22,* 151-165.

Moller, L. C., Hymel, S., & Rubin, K. H. (1992). Sex typing in play and popularity in middle childhood. *Sex Roles, 26,* 331-353.

O'Leary, V. E., & Donoghue, J. M. (1978). Latitudes of masculinity: Reactions to sex-role deviance in men. *Journal of Social Issues, 34,* 17-28.

O'Neil, J. M., Helms, B. J., Gable, R. K., David, L., & Wrightsman, L. S. (1986). Gender Role Conflict Scale: College men's fear of femininity. *Sex Roles, 14,* 335-350.

Preston, K., & Stanley, K. (1987). "What's the worst thing . . .?" Gender-directed insults. *Sex Roles, 17,* 209-219.

Rekers, G. A., & Yates, C. E. (1976). Sex-typed play in feminoid boys versus normal boys and girls. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 4,* 1-8.

Robinson, B. E., Skeen, P., & Flake-Hobson, C. (1982). Sex role endorsement among homosexual men across the life span. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 11,* 355-359.

Rosenkrantz, P., Vogel, S., Bee, H., Broverman, I., & Broverman, D. M. (1968). Sex-role stereotypes and self-concepts in college students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 32,* 287-295.

Seyfried, B. A., & Hendrick, C. (1973). When do opposites attract? When they are opposite in sex and sex-role attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 25,* 15-20.

Smetana, J. (1986). Preschool children's conceptions of sex-role transgressions. *Child Development, 57,* 862-871.

Snell, W. E. (1986). The Masculine Role Inventory: Components and correlates. *Sex Roles, 15,* 443-455.

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

Stoddart, T., & Turiel, E. (1985). Children's concepts of cross-gender activities. *Child Development, 56,* 1241-1252.

Storms, M. D. (1980). Theories of sexual orientation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38,* 783-792.

Taylor, A. (1983). Conceptions of masculinity and femininity as a basis for stereotypes of male and female homosexuals. *Journal of Homosexuality, 9,* 37-53.

Thompson, E. H., Pleck, J. H., & Ferrera, D. L. (1992). Men and masculinities: Scales for masculinity ideology, and masculinity-related constructs. *Sex Roles, 27,* 573-607.

Thorne, B. (1986). Girls and boys together . . .but mostly apart: Gender arrangements in elementary schools. In W. W. Hartup & Z. Rubin (Eds.), *Relationships and Development*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Unger, R. K. (1979). Toward a redefinition of sex and gender. *American Psychologist, 34,* 1085-1094.