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General Introduction and Course Overview

Psychology of Women (PSY 403) as a course focuses on understanding the intricacies of wonders of women being and their interaction on various psychosocial variables. In the course, difference is going to be drawn between gender stereotype and biases. Also, what makes the difference between women of today and of yester years.

Aims of the Course

The aim of the course is to improve students’ understanding of what women are, and how they can be handled on different aspects that affect their lives.

Specific Objectives

The course attempts to achieve the following specific objectives at the end:

- To understand what gender stereotype, gender biases and gender comparisons are. Also, to understand the physical and psychological health affecting women.

- To intimate the students with the local and international issues affecting women. The course also discusses issues involved in pregnancy, childbirth and motherhood.

We expect that every lecture in this course would be taken with all seriousness by the students and with total commitment and dedication for excellent performance.
LECTURE ONE

Introduction

This lecture introduces you to Psychology of Women, the definition and its history. The influence of earlier psychological studies on the concept and view about women aspect of psychology called health psychology. Russo defines the psychology of women as the study of behavior (not excluding male gender-role behavior) mediated by the variable of female sex, in the past, psychology studied behavior, but it was not mediated by the variable of female sex. Thus, the psychology of women is also defined as that which includes all psychological issues pertaining to women and their experiences (Denmark, 1977). In defining the psychology of women in this manner, it is also productive to use Lerner’s (1992) “transitional history” lens (i.e., one where women’s experiences are examined through their multiple layers of understanding).

Objectives

At the end of this lecture, you should be able to

1. Understand what is meant by Psychology of women.
2. Discuss the history of Psychology of women
3. Discuss the theoretical approach to psychology of women

Pre-test

1. Define what is meant by Psychology of Women?
2. Briefly discuss the history of Psychology of Women.

CONTENT
CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

The question has been asked, “what is a woman?” A woman is a person who makes choices. A woman is a dreamer. A woman is a planner. A woman is a maker, and a molder. A woman is a person who makes choices. A woman builds bridges. A woman makes children and makes cars. A woman writes poetry and songs. A woman is a person who makes choices. You cannot even simply become a mother anymore. You must choose motherhood. Will you choose change? Can you become its vanguard?

—Eleanor Holmes Norton

Women are portrayed in terms of the choices we make in our careers, achievement, leadership capacity, friendships and romantic relationships, and education. Women are portrayed as being multidimensional, for example, in the ways we integrate work and family roles. Furthermore, a non-Eurocentric perspective on women is presented.

Women are more visible today than ever before. While this development occurred as a result of many interacting factors, research on and the study of the psychology of women and gender has made a significant and major impact on this phenomenon. This field has had an international impact such that there is no continent that has not been influenced by this development.

The Association for Women in Psychology (AWP) was the first national feminist psychological organization. It was established in 1969 as an independent organization at the APA’s annual
convention. By 1970, AWP members had presented APA with a list of 52 resolutions encompassing:

employment, education, child and health care facilities, psychological theories and practice, conventions, equity in decision making, and the general status of women. Ultimately, these resolutions became the driving force behind the establishment of the Task Force on the Status of Women in Psychology in 1970, an Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Women in Psychology in 1972, and ultimately in 1973 the Committee on Women in Psychology. (Committee on Women in Psychology, 2004)

The AWP was also responsible for creating Division 35, the Division of the Psychology of Women of APA, in 1973.

The goal of AWP’s founders was to establish a scientific and educational feminist organization so as to spotlight the impact of psychology and mental health on women’s lives. The organization focused on encouraging and developing “‘new treatments, research and practice for women and gender, as well as reassessing those established in the past.’” As we can see, the AWP was a significant influence in causing momentous changes in APA. AWP’s international influence increased further as a result of its inclusion as an official nongovernmental organization (NGO) for the United Nations in 1976.

The AWP newsletter, published triannually, was designed to provide information on AWP’s activities and goals to all interested individuals and organizations. The organization has expanded outreach with the establishment of an e-mail list, POWR-L (http://www.awpsych.org/powrl.htm), which is cosponsored by Division 35. This is a non-monitored e-mail list that permits its subscribers to share information.
POWR-L also posts relevant events, publications of interest, and more. Division 35, the Association for the Psychology of Women, was established in 1973 by members of AWP as new division of the APA.

It was established as an APA division to give an organized voice to all who were interested in researching, teaching and practicing in psychology of women....This division emphasizes the importance of improving women’s and girl’s lives by education and research and to empower women in the community.... The division produces a number of publications; among them are the journal Psychology of Women’s Quarterly and the newsletter Feminist Psychologist. (Society for the Psychology of Women, 2006)

The Committee on Women in Psychology (CWP) was established in 1973 to monitor the progress of women’s advancement and equality of women in psychology. The committee’s mandate was to maintain ‘‘an active interaction with relevant organizations such as the division of psychology of women, Association for Women in Psychology and more. Division 35 was established due to a recommendation of CWP following the input of AWP’’ (Women’s Programs Office, 2006b).

The International Council of Psychologists (ICP) should be mentioned at this point. This organization evolved from the National Council of Women Psychologists (NCWP), which had been established in the United States in 1941 as a means to improve the status of women in psychology. Its original goal was to provide access for women psychologists to positions from which women were excluded on the basis of sex during World War II. This council was the first women’s psychological organization to agitate to improve women’s status. However, the group decided to open membership internationally to all psychologists in 1958. This change in focus
prevented NCWP from continuing in the forefront of our field. In fact, the organization changed its name to International Council of Psychologists in 1964 (Russo & Denmark, 1987) the first women’s psychological organization to agitate to improve women’s status. However, the group decided to open membership internationally to all psychologists in 1958. This change in focus prevented NCWP from continuing in the forefront of our field. In fact, the organization changed its name to International Council of Psychologists in 1964 (Russo & Denmark, 1987).

In 1981, ICP was recognized as an NGO by the UN, where it serves as a consultative body. Today ICP’s major purpose is to advance psychology and research on various issues of psychology around the world and to enable communication among psychologists. ICP in 1995 began publishing the journal World Psychology. In keeping with original goals of the NCWP to improve the status of women in psychology, a very active group of members continues to focus on topics relevant to women and gender. However, presentations at the annual conferences on the psychology of women and gender parallel those of the APA conferences and began appearing in the early 1970s.

Mention here should also be made of the National Women’s Studies Association (NWSA), which was established in 1977, at a time when women’s studies was expanding and flourishing. NWSA is located in the University of Maryland. Its major goal is to promote and advance feminist teaching, research, and practice in the community and in academia. Like most of the organizations we are presenting here, NWSA publishes a newsmagazine twice a year, NWS Action, and a scholarly publication, NWSA Journal (National Women’s Studies Association, 2005a).
Mary Roth Walsh (1985) suggested that the psychology of women serves as a ‘‘catalyst of change’’ by revealing serious deficiencies in psychological research and theories relevant to women. Our goal for this edition is the same as we had for the first: to have this chapter be a catalyst for change and a stimulant for further research and advocacy on the psychology of women. Thus, our goal is to have readers do as Eleanor Holmes Norton asked: to choose change, to become its vanguard.

Albert (1988) described advantages in placing culture prominently in the psychology curriculum. We have found these advantages to be especially useful in the psychology of women:

- We can obtain information that is not available in our own culture.
- We can obtain information about the incidence of a psychological issue in a different culture.
- Values that are common to a certain cultural group can be discussed.
- The generalizing ability of psychological research can be assessed by looking at research from several cultures.

**Defining the Psychology of Women**

The psychology of women is an area of scientific investigation that can trace its roots back to early studies of so-called sex differences; however, the field encompasses much more than this variation. Indeed, the emphasis on difference has an implicit assumption of a myriad of differences other than biological sex. While the psychology of gender comparisons is a more apt title, it still leaves out the many topics of investigation that encompass experiences unique to women, such as pregnancy, breast-feeding, and menstruation. The term feminist psychology
seems to invoke too many connotations and has a varied meaning among different feminists. How then can we best define the psychology of women?

Mednick (1976) defined the field as ‘‘the study of variations within a group and across time of the female experience.’’ Henley (1974) favors ‘‘psychology and women’’ as a descriptive term. However, Mednick believes this is too broad.

Russo’s definition of the psychology of women, as the study of behavior (not excluding male gender-role behavior) mediated by the variable of female sex, is one of the most useful. In the past, psychology studied behavior, but it was not mediated by the variable of female sex. Thus, the psychology of women is also defined as that which includes all psychological issues pertaining to women and their experiences (Denmark, 1977). In defining the psychology of women in this manner, it is also productive to use Lerner’s (1992) ‘‘transitional history’’ lens (i.e., one where women’s experiences are examined through their multiple layers of understanding).

**Brief History of the development of Psychology of Women**

In studying the history of psychology, as it is true for other disciplines, the majority of the influential works and theories have been constructed by men and for men. As Gerda Lerner (1979), an American historian, pointed out:

Traditional history has been written and interpreted by men in an androcentric frame of reference; it might quite properly be described as the history of men. The very term ‘‘Women’s History’’ calls attention to the fact that something is missing from historical scholarship. (P. xiv)

Due to the biased social structure and inherent sexism that was predominant from the time of the ancient Greeks until recently, women and psychology had been separated from one another, and
psychology was not considered to be a field “appropriate” for women. As Agnes O’Connell and Nancy Russo (1991) noted, psychology’s history has been a social construction by and for male psychologists. This was the case with the exception of the past few decades. Although women made significant contributions to psychology, they largely remained invisible (Russo & Denmark, 1987; O’Connell & Russo, 1991). However, with the advent of the women’s movement, women fought and increasingly became a valuable part of the discipline. They not only took positions in research as clinicians and teachers, but also made many significant contributions in each of these respective fields.

It is the purpose of this chapter to discuss the history of women and psychology and to give credit to some of the notable women who have worked and studied in psychology and who deserve long-overdue recognition.

**Women in Psychological Research**

In order to understand the contributions that women have made in the field of psychology, one must understand the status of women in psychology prior to this change. Feminists have long argued that the social sciences overlook and distort the study of women in a systematic manner that results favorably to men (Riger, 2002). The inclusion of the variables of sex and gender can be examined in three separate time frames and conceptualizations, according to Jeanne Marecek, Ellen Kimmel, Mary Crawford, and Rachel Hare-Mustin (2003):

1. Woman as problem
2. Female-male differences and similarities
3. Feminist study of women’s lives
When one examines the psychological research from Wundt’s 1874 establishment of the domain of psychology up to recent times, psychology appeared to focus almost exclusively on the behavior of men or male animals. In other words, the first method of examining woman was to categorize them as lacking. Much early research that included female subjects came to the conclusion that women were inferior in some way. Additionally, if females were not included in the sample, sex nor gender differences were reported, which discounted the influence of these factors and, in essence, was an indication of the belief that men were the norm when considering various psychological factors. And again, if women were included in the studies, biased results indicated that women were by nature inferior. For instance, Sir Francis Galton’s work in the 19th century focused on individual differences and concluded that “women tend in all their capacities to be inferior to men” (cited in Lewin & Wild, 1991, p. 582).

However, generally speaking, most early research never investigated comparisons between women and men at all (Schwabacher, 1972). Wendy McKenna and Suzanne Kessler (1976) reported that over 95 percent of all early research did not examine female-male comparisons, therefore ignoring any possible differences due to sex and gender. Prior to the 1970s, almost all research on women had been relegated to the periphery of psychology rather than integrated into its main body. Although the definition of psychology has undergone a metamorphosis over time, one fact remains increasingly clear—women and women’s issues have still not been adequately examined.

In the decades preceding the second wave of feminism, Marecek and colleagues’ (2003)’s second approach to studying women was employed; at this stage, much psychological research assumed profound differences between women and men. This consensus supported male superiority and domination, a societal structure very much in place at the time. Some male
researchers studied sex differences and largely interpreted them to demonstrate female inferiority (Shields, 1975). In contrast, Leta Hollingworth’s work in the early 1900s revealed no evidence of female-male differences in variability. In 1944, one of Freud’s students, Helene Deutsch, wrote the first book entitled The Psychology of Women. Although agreeing with her mentor that women had more delicate psychic structures than men, she did discuss the important role of motherhood and eroticism in her book (Unger, 2001).

Psychology has often been defined as the science of behavior, both human and animal. Yet it was a common practice of researchers to include only white male humans or male animals in their research samples. This is especially ironic because even then every undergraduate statistics book stressed the basic premise that for any study to be generalizable, it had to have a representative, not a skewed, sample. Nevertheless, the idea of “male as representative of the norm” was so strong that even well-trained psychologists did not realize that they were excluding at least 50 percent of the population. What they fostered was not psychology the science of behavior, but psychology the science of white male behavior.

The third method to approach gender research—that which utilizes a feminist perspective (Marecek et al., 2003)—is more often being employed today. History is now viewed as contextual and is sensitive to gender as well as culture. When research is conducted, various factors embedded in this contextual approach should be examined. Feminist researchers are concerned with the particulars of women’s experiences—how and why women come to act, think, and feel the way that they do. Although not an easy answer, it is giving credence to the perspective of woman as a multidimensional and complex being.
Post test

(1) Briefly discuss the approach to psychological research/theory in women
LECTURE TWO

PSYCHOLOGY AND WOMEN TODAY

INTRODUCTION

This lecture discusses the current views about psychology of women in relation to today’s trend while tracing it even from the time of the beginning of psychology to the present moment.

Objectives

At the end of this lecture, you should be able to

1. The current perspectives about women
2. Understand the earlier view of women research

Pre-test

1. Highlight the current views about women today?

INTRODUCTION

We find it curious that thought is still heavily influenced by such nineteenth century theorists as Darwin, Marx, and Freud. As products of their era, they were primarily supportive of the status quo, of upper-class White male privilege with its limited knowledge of and marginal concern for women. If they were alive today, they would be astonished: What? You are still using those old books? Throw them away. (Hare-Mustin & Marecek, 1990).

The psychology of women that has been outlined above continues to grow and develop. There have been major steps taken toward making the psychology of women a legitimate field of study, but there is still much to be done. The history of the psychology of women is not a finished tale. Numerous talented and insightful women are continuing to make strides in the field in research
and gender equality. Feminist psychology has moved beyond finding fault in previous research to conducting sound research in its own right. Today, it is a multifaceted enterprise that has its place in virtually every specialization area as well as encompassing many research studies (Marecek et al., 2003). It has produced a great deal of valid and important research and continues to create such research as well.

There needs to be a continuation of feminist research that builds upon existing theoretical conceptualizations that focus on critical issues in the field of the psychology of women. To do this, there are a few methods that can be employed. The feminist positivist empiricist and contextual approaches to understanding the needs of women help restructure and more thoroughly analyze gender roles and women’s issues.

A positivist empiricist approach utilizes conventional scientific methods to produce “factual” knowledge about a particular question related to something observable and measurable in the external world (Wilkinson, 2001). Thus, feminist empiricists proposed that the problem of gender bias in research can possibly be solved by advocating strict adherence to science (Riger, 2002). This is beneficial, in that, it provides concrete evidence that informs the influence that sex and gender have on research. However, one limitation is that it is only applicable to scientifically measurable concepts.

Maureen McHugh, Randi Koeske, and Irene Frieze (1986) established a set of guidelines for eliminating bias in research. Among the many suggestions they noted are:

- delineating the circumstances in which gender differences are found
- assessing experimental tasks for their sex neutrality
- Examining the effect of a study’s female-male composition as well as the sex similarities and differences that are present.
If this framework is implemented, experiments will neither make unfounded assumptions nor overlook important gender differences that exist.

A contextual approach looks at the psychology of women within a multidimensional framework that takes into account sociological and cultural factors when creating research questions (Wilkinson, 2001). Compared to the empiricist approach previously discussed, an epistemological (or contextual) approach focuses on the whole of women’s lives (Riger, 2002). Therefore, this method encourages feminist psychologists to view women as whole beings or people who exist in a bidirectional relationship with the environment in which they live. As Jeanne Maracek (1989) stated, “what we know and how we know depend on who we are, that is, on the knower’s historical locus and his or her position in the social hierarchy” (p. 372). Maracek et al. (2003) also called for methodological pluralism, which promotes the use of new modes of inquiry such as case studies, focus groups, content analysis, observational techniques, participant-observation, and field research that allow for the study of phenomena outside the laboratory.

Regardless of the approach utilized, there is still much exploration required for the further development of theory and practice that will ultimately add to the contributions women make to the field and to the history of the psychology of women. Although the large “gender gap” has slowly begun to close, upon closer inspection, there still exists a large divide. For instance, in 2004, when membership statistics from APA indicated that 48 percent of the members were men and 52 percent were women, the Fellows of APA were 74 percent men and 26 percent women, indicating a great disparity between men and women in positions of prestige. This suggests that there is much work to be done along the path of establishing a more equitable environment for women.
Critical issues to be explored in the future include changing the negative, inaccurate, and harmful images of women, as well as removing occupational barriers for women who are entering male-dominated fields. The culture of masculinity and its negative impact on both men and women also needs to be redefined. In order to accomplish these goals, we should recognize the importance of qualitative as well as quantitative research methods. Furthermore, integrating both qualitative and quantitative perspectives might be the best approach to operationalize theoretical concepts and accurately answering the resulting research questions (Denmark, Rabinowitz, & Sechzer, 2005).

It’s also important to reiterate that the psychology of women is not limited to the United States. We live in a multicultural world where inclusion of global perspectives and information is critical in conceptualizing women.

Although many view history as occurring exclusively in the past, it is important to remember that history itself is an ongoing process. Therefore, we must rely on feminists to help shape the history of psychology, to draw attention to critical issues in the field of psychology of women, and to continue elucidating the important role that women play in various fields. Those who teach psychology courses should always include a discussion of the role that women have played in that particular sub-field and encourage students to point out the contributions of women wherever appropriate in their courses.

The early years of the 21st century represent a time of rapid social change with profound implications for modifying gender roles. The future is filled with novel challenges that women will have to deal with, as well as opportunities they will be able to explore. It is these obstacles and prospects that will be reflected in the ongoing history of the psychology of women.
GENDER-ROLE INEQUALITY AND ABUSE

The general pattern around the world is that men have higher status and more power than women, but this difference is not the same across cultures (Rosaldo & Lamphere, 1974). Cultures differ in the degree of gender inequality. Inequality in this context is meant to convey more than “unequal treatment.” It includes the heuristic view that the functions ascribed to women, and hence women themselves, are subordinate in status to men. In some cultures, this subordinate status involves a pejorative devaluation of women and women’s work, which creates a diminished quality of life for them, and can be a cause of mental health problems or, in extreme cases, threatens their very lives.

The underlying ideology of this unequal treatment has been called “hostile sexism” in the psychological literature (Glick & Fiske, 2001). Hostile sexism resembles other forms of prejudice typically directed toward groups who are seen as threats to the in-group’s status and power. In contrast, benevolent sexism, despite its oxymoronic quality, is a subjectively favorable, chivalrous ideology that offers protection and affection to women who embrace conventional roles—roles, however, that perpetuate their inequality in a patriarchal society. In some ways, its effects are more pernicious than hostile sexism because men and women, but especially women, embrace this ideology; thus, women tend to be more tolerant of sexist behavior and its consequences on their “inferior” status because they perceive the motivation for the behavior as being protective (Glick & Fiske, 2001).

Even in cultures where an ideal of gender equality is stated explicitly, as in Mao’s China, the practice is inconsistent with the ideal. In band societies, there is often male–female reciprocity and complementarily rather than hierarchy (Triandis, 1994). In stratified societies,
socioeconomic and gender inequalities are often correlated. In Africa, for example, in the non-Muslim areas, the status of women was fairly equal to the status of men until the colonial powers took over (Etienne & Leacock, 1980). Under colonization, economic exploitation occurred and gender inequality increased.

One index of gender inequality is the percentage of illiterates who are women. In general, it is desirable to have an equal number of men and women who are literate, as is the case in Scandinavia and Switzerland. In many of the developing countries, however, far more women than men are illiterate. Even in the United States, women did not match the education levels of men until the late 1970s (Triandis, 1994).

A second index of gender inequality is the gender/earnings ratio, which indicates how much women earn as a percentage of what men earn. In general, women continue to earn less than men.

Indices of gender abuse include the prevalence of wife abuse, genital mutilation of girls and young women, acid throwing, infanticide, and elder abuse (the majority of whom are women). Although husbands can no longer legally beat their wives in the United States, and wives in the United States can legally sue their husbands for damages, domestic violence remains a reality for far too many women and their families. In India, the phenomenon of bride burning has increased in the past 20 years.

An Islamic court in Nigeria overturned an earlier decision that had condemned a divorced mother, Amina Lawal, who had given birth to a child, conceived outside of marriage, to be stoned to death. Her case received worldwide attention, drawing sharp criticism from the Nigerian president and the international community. Some hailed the court’s decision as a
triumph for Islamic justice, while others, who are seen as being conservative, adamantly
denounced the ruling, claiming that there was no justice (New York Times, 2003). What is
important to note in this discussion about gender-role inequality and abuse is that the man who
allegedly was sexually involved with Lawal and was the father of her child was not charged
because he had three witnesses who testified that he had not been involved with Amina Lawal;
that “evidence” was sufficient according to the law. Men in the United States, prior to the
second wave of the feminist movement in the 1960s and developments in the field of DNA
testing, used similar defenses when accused of having sexual relations with a woman and
impregnating her.

Clitordiction and infibulation (technical terms for what is more commonly called “female
genital mutilation”) of girls are practiced in many parts of Africa and the Middle East.
According to the World Health Organization, more than 80 million females have been subjected
to genital mutilation in Africa, ranging from the removal of the foreskin of the clitoris to removal
of the clitoris and labia—often with unsterilized equipment and without anesthesia—and having
the two sides of the vulva sewn together. The practice reflects tribal customs and societal values
and is considered a significant aspect of a woman’s identity. Some men, believing that women’s
sexual organs are unclean and clitordiction/infibulation “purifies” women, will not marry
women who have not undergone the procedure (Heise et al., 1994).

What is so inconceivable to those outside of the cultures in which these practices are
condoned is that they are performed by women and are viewed as a rite of passage. The plight of
19-year-old Fauziya Kasinga, who sought asylum in the United States after fleeing Togo when
she was 16 to escape having a tribal member “scrape my woman parts off,” drew international
attention and condemnation of this type of gender abuse. The collective outcry from Westerners
was garnered by focusing on the medical health hazards for these girls and young women rather than blatantly challenging the belief systems that condone the practice. Apropos of this, legislators in several states, responding to reports that the practice of genital mutilation is occurring in the United States by immigrants from those countries in which the practice is tradition, modeled bills based on a federal bill introduced by Rep. Pat Schroeder (D-CO), which made genital mutilation illegal in the United States.

Although one may fail to comprehend the actions of some women from different cultures that adversely affect not only themselves but also other women in their culture, it undoubtedly is much more difficult to examine the beliefs and practices in one’s own culture that, to outsiders, may be equally incomprehensible and perceived to be abusive to women. An example from American history is illustrative. It is noteworthy that in the 19th century, doctors in England and the United States performed clitoridectomies on women as a viable treatment for masturbation, nymphomania, and psychological problems (Abusharaf, 1998).

The recent medical practice in the United States of discharging a mother and her newborn child within 48 hours of delivery and, more recently, discharging within 48 hours of surgery women who have had mastectomies, prompted legislation to stop these practices that seem, at best, insensitive to the emotional and physical vulnerability of women at these times and, at worst, dangerous to their health and the health of the newborn. The policy for early discharge apparently stemmed from guidelines established by third-party payers (insurance companies) based on greed, albeit couched in terms of cost-effective treatment. The meteoric rise in cosmetic procedures and surgeries (breast enlargement, liposuction, Botox injections, use of steroids and growth hormones, etc.) for women of all ages, but most notably among adolescent females, to
improve their appearance and enhance their emotional sense of well-being may be another illustration of culturally-sanctioned gender-based abuse in the 21st century in America.

In some parts of the world, most notably China, South Korea, India, and Nepal, studies have shown that girls often receive inferior medical care and education and less food than their brothers (Landes, Foster, & Cessna, 1995). In India and China, many women use sonograms and amniocentesis to learn if they are carrying a girl; if they are, the fetus is frequently aborted (Heise, 1994).

**SEXUAL ORIENTATION**

In Engendered Lives, Ellyn Kaschak (1992) writes:

The consensual reality of western culture has held that gender is a given, contained in or identical with the sex of the newborn. Gender and gender linked attributes are viewed as natural rather than as socially and psychologically constructed. Paradoxically, then, all children must be taught what is natural ... and those who do not learn their lessons well are viewed as unnatural. (p. 39)

Kaschak’s incisive analysis draws our attention to an important but frequently overlooked subtlety in this design, revealing its flaws. If specific gendered behaviors are natural outgrowths of biological sex, and if heterosexual sexual orientation is natural for everyone, why would it be necessary to so assiduously teach that which is innate and natural? Furthermore, why would that which is deemed unnatural require such strong prohibitions and stigmatizing to prevent its occurrence? It would seem that natural behavior would just naturally evolve. It is precisely because traditional gender-roles, which include heterosexual sexual orientation as the normative sexual orientation, are not ubiquitously natural or normative; they do not naturally evolve in everyone.
In fact, a natural evolution is not allowed to take place. A culture’s gender-roles are socially constructed, assigned, agreed on, and change over time. It is precisely because of these factors that they require enforcing rather than simply allowing them to naturally evolve. And still, lesbian and gay sexual orientations evolve in individuals in spite of explicit prohibitions, opposition, and punitive responses to them.

Kaschak (1992) observes that it is particularly shameful not to fit neatly into a gender category. This is reflected in the shame and embarrassment that people feel when their gender is mistaken or cannot be quickly discerned. It is as if they have done something wrong, are “queer,” “peculiar” or as if something is seriously wrong with them. She adds that when methods of enforcing traditional gender-roles and categories fail, or as a result of the damage caused by them, the person in question may be deemed ill and in need of psychotherapy.

Despite many significant advances in GLB (gay, lesbian, and bisexual) psychology in the last several decades, the next century confronts us with many new challenges in the need to explore the more complex nuances and varied meanings of sexual orientation, as well as the many ways it is interrelated to other aspects of human identity. It is also necessary to conduct similar explorations of heterosexism and its connection to other forms of social oppression.

Heterosexism is not a singular or isolated experience or event. As such, heterosexism cannot be disconnected from the broader context of an individual’s development or existence any more than sexism, for example, can be understood apart from the context of a woman’s ethnicity, socioeconomic class, religion, or other significant aspects of her life. An exclusive focus on heterosexism as the primary locus of oppression for all lesbians and gay men presumes that it is experienced in the same way for all group members and that it has the same meaning and
consequences for them. The core of this assumption is commons in the psychological literature as well as in practice.

THE DENIAL OF DISADVANTAGE

Women’s failure to perceive the personal relevance of gender injustice in society contributes to the slow pace of change toward gender equality in the workplace. The “denial of individual disadvantage” (i.e., the failure to recognize that women we know face the same employment disadvantages as women in general) has been found in research in samples of heterosexual women (Crosby, 1982), lesbians (Crosby, Pufall, Snyder, O’Connell, & Whalen, 1989), blacks (Abeles, 1976), and French Canadians (Guimond & Dube-Simard, 1983). Sometimes that individual is ourselves, and the phenomenon is more aptly termed “denial of personal disadvantage” (Crosby et al., 1989, p. 81).

Crosby and her colleagues (1989) summarize emotional and cognitive mechanisms that help account for the denial of women’s disadvantage on the part of both women and men, including self-protective cognitions. They point out the importance of identification with an oppressed group for discrimination to be perceived. They also document men and women’s difficulty in perceiving discrimination when data are presented on a case-by-case basis, showing the need for information in aggregate form before discriminatory patterns can be revealed. They underscore that all people, whether gender-biased or not, have difficulty in perceiving gender bias in individual cases. They conclude that the need for social reform should not be measured by how concerned people are with their personal situation—people do not have a well-developed sense of their personal disadvantage. Their advice to employers:

Do not trust your own impressions any more than you trust the impressions of the women in your organization. Women may be motivated to deny their own disadvantage; but nobody should trust
conclusions based on unaggregated figures. Only by bringing all the data together can one see patterns.

Strategies for Changing Women’s Status in the Workplace

Women’s strategies to eliminate inequity have differed in different occupations (Sacks, 1983), and there is much to be learned from each of them. These strategies include individual and class-action lawsuits; proposing legislation; lobbying; formation of unions; collective bargaining; strikes and sit-ins; stockholder proxy fights; consumer boycotts; changing professional ethics, accreditation, and licensing criteria to prohibit discriminatory behavior; forming women-oriented businesses to compete against sexist institutions; and public ridicule. Diversity training has become routine for big business, and “diversity management” a new field of expertise (Agars & Kottke, 2004). A more nuanced and contextualized understanding of what combinations of strategies are effective for what particular problems under what conditions is now needed. In particular, more attention needs to be paid to the subtleties of modern discrimination, particularly as it is expressed in selective incivility and interpersonal maltreatment in the workplace.

The research on women’s status referenced suggests a variety of strategies for empowering women at work and eliminating inequalities in the workplace. Some of them focus on the women themselves. Workshops, networking groups, and other vehicles to help prepare women to deal with issues in the workplace, particularly when they are tokens, are one approach. Such workshops could help raise women’s sense of entitlement and eliminate their denial of personal disadvantage by increasing their comparison standards and helping them understand how procedures and practices in the workplace promote gender bias in opportunities and outcomes.
Changing women’s response to their treatment in the workplace is not sufficient, however. In addition to workshops designed to help women deal with issues in the workplace, the persistence of evaluation bias suggests the need for workshops targeted toward (1) eliminating stereotyping and bias on the part of evaluators and (2) educating employers about the denial of individual disadvantage. Blanchard and Crosby (1989) argue that, given that women and other disadvantaged groups minimize the level of their personal suffering from discrimination, affirmative action (which does not require members of disadvantaged groups to come forward on their own behalf) is critical for progress to occur.

Certainly effective change requires that strategies aimed at individuals must be complemented by a variety of institutional and policy-oriented efforts, including adequate compensation for ‘women’s work’ (including a decent minimum wage), paid family and medical leave, and workplace flexibility. Salary secrecy can be eliminated, and employers can be required to provide aggregate data on salaries and other forms of compensation so that bias in employment rewards can be monitored. Rewards, accolades, and other indicators of quality also play an important role in eliminating evaluation bias and discriminatory behavior. If an authority ‘certifies’ the quality of a product by a woman, it is less likely to be perceived as unequal (Pheterson, Kiesler, & Goldberg, 1971). The purpose and criteria for rewards can be scrutinized, modified if necessary, and monitored.

Public reminders about attitudes toward, and commitments to, affirmative action before each evaluation also help to reduce discriminatory behaviors (Snyder & Swann, 1976). Larwood, Szwajkowski, and Rose (1988) have pointed out that even well-intentioned managers ‘rationally’ make discriminatory decisions in order to impress their higher-ups. Their research has shown that, in the absence of contrary evidence, managers will discriminate against women
and ethnic minorities based on their beliefs about the preferences of those having power over them. Their work suggests that individuals holding power at the top of an organization will be perceived as preferring white males unless clear evidence to the contrary is provided. Larwood and her colleagues suggest that such evidence might include appointing minorities and women to key positions, placing them in positions of authority that require others to work for them, and taking unusual steps to communicate a credible preference for equal opportunity that go beyond typical nondiscrimination pronouncements. Progress is being made with regard to the development of “family friendly” policies. Originally conceptualized in terms of childcare benefits and parental leave, they now include alternative work arrangements such as job sharing, flexible scheduling, and telecommuting (Catalyst, www.catalyst.org, is a good source for information about adoption of diversity- and family-related policies by business). Even as we must challenge obsolete beliefs and stereotypes about women, particularly mothers, we must challenge the workaholic stereotype of the “ideal worker” and the equation of long hours with higher commitment and productivity. Best Buy provides an example of an alternative approach. In response to retention and morale issues, this company instituted a policy called ROWE (Results-Only Work Environment), whereby workers set their own schedules and are responsible for meeting performance goals. Reports suggest a positive outcome, including improved retention and productivity (Day & Hill, 2007).

POST TEST

(1) How can women status be changed in the workplace?
LECTURE THREE

GENDER STEREOTYPES

INTRODUCTION

This course introduces you to concepts like gender stereotype, gender bias and gender comparisons.

OBJECTIVES

At the end of the chapter, the student should be able to understand:

(1) How gender stereotype can be acquired
(2) What is gender bias, and
(3) What does gender comparison mean?

PRETEST

(1) What is gender stereotype

(2) What difference has gender bias and stereotype

The subtle influence of sex upon a person’s perceptions may vary with each observer and play both an unconscious and conscious role in influencing actions taken. (Gesell, 1990, p. 9)

Judge Gerhard Gesell of the U.S. Court of Appeals wrote those words in his precedent-setting decision awarding a partnership to a woman who had been discriminated against on the basis of gender. In 1982, Ann Hopkins had been denied promotion to partner at the accounting firm of Price Waterhouse, despite a strong record of performance. She was the only woman considered for partnership that year; at the time, the company had only seven women among its 662 partners. Hopkins was not told to work harder. Rather, she was given advice that focused on her makeup, her jewelry, and her style of walk and talk. Hopkins then sued the firm and won, and
she continued to win as the case was appealed, heard by the US Supreme Court, and returned to the court of appeals (on a legal issue of burden of proof), where Judge Gesell made his decision awarding her a partnership.

The 1989 case of Price Water house v. Hopkins (490U.S.228) marked a rite of passage for research on gender stereotypes. The empirical and theoretical literature of social scientists was an integral part of the process, first represented at the lower court in expert witness testimony (Fiske, 1989) and later in an amicus brief filed with the Supreme Court (Fiske, Bersoff, Borgida, Deaux, & Heilman, 1991). At each level of decision, the courts recognized the role that gender stereotypes had played in the evaluation of Hopkins.

**The Content of Gender Stereotypes**

“‘We have met the enemy...and he is us,’” Walt Kelly’s comic-strip character Pogo famously said, and so it is with stereotyping, a ubiquitous process to which we all succumb. Stereotypes are not simply labels, but are assumptions about traits and behaviors that people in the labeled categories are thought to possess.

Gender stereotypes have a familiar quality, and most people would readily recognize the list of traits commonly identified as descriptive of women and men. These traits have been the focus of decades of research on gender-based stereotypes (Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz, 1972; Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman, & Broverman, 1968; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974). Early researchers identified two principal dimensions: beliefs that women are concerned with the welfare of other people (labeled expressive or communal) and beliefs that men are assertive and controlling (labeled instrumental or agentic).
More recent research verifies that these constellations of personality traits remain strongly associated with women and men (see Deaux & LaFrance, 1998, for a review). Women, for example, are viewed as more emotional, gentle, understanding, and devoted, whereas men are seen as more active, competitive, independent, and self-confident. The association between gender and these traits is remarkably consistent across respondent age, geographic region, and respondent sex.

Researchers have expanded our understanding of gender-based stereotypes by identifying other dimensions that perceivers use to categorize women and men. Men and women are thought to occupy distinct societal roles, for example. Men are viewed as leaders, financial providers, and heads of households, while women are seen as caregivers who shop, tend the house, and provide emotional support (Cejka & Eagly, 1999; Deaux & Lewis, 1984). People report that men are good at abstract thinking and problem solving, whereas women excel in artistic and verbal reasoning (Cejka & Eagly, 1999). Popular descriptions reflect marked differences in gender stereotypes about women’s and men’s physical appearance: women’s physical attributes include dainty, pretty, soft-voiced, and graceful; men’s include athletic, brawny, broad shouldered, and physically strong (Cejka & Eagly, 1999; Deaux & Lewis, 1984).

Finally, emotions are believed to be at once gender-segregated and more firmly associated with femininity. That is, women are believed to both experience and express a broader range of emotions than are men, although two emotions—anger and pride—are more strongly associated with men (Plant, Hyde, Keltner, & Devine, 2000). Moreover, when women do express anger, perceivers infer that this expression is a combination of anger and sadness, whereas they believe men’s expression of anger represents only that emotion. Interestingly, strongly expressed emotions are viewed more negatively when the emotion is gender stereotypic. Men whose anger
suggests an overreaction to an event are viewed negatively, and so are women who express excessive happiness (Huston-Comeaux & Kelly, 2002). In reality, sex differences in emotion are more evident in expression than in emotional experience and are far less prevalent than the stereotypes would lead us to believe (Fischer, 2000; LaFrance & Banaji, 1992). Nonetheless, it is testimony to the power of stereotypes that belief in the “emotional woman” persist.

Across these categories, an overarching belief in gender polarization is evident—that is, an assumption that gender-associated characteristics are bipolar (Bem, 1993). If people know, for example, that a woman has a stereotypically feminine appearance, they also expect that she will have feminine traits and occupy feminine gender roles (Deaux & Lewis, 1984). People also appear to be more certain about this consistency for male-associated characteristics, which may be related to the perceived power and status of male gender role (Conway, Mount, & Pizzamiglio, 1996; McCreary, 1994). Such beliefs have implications for how perceivers use gender-linked information. Finally, gender-stereotypic beliefs serve both descriptive and prescriptive functions: they inform us about what women and men are like and also lay ground rules for how men and women should be. Specifically, occupants of both roles are believed to have agentic characteristics (Eagly & Karau, 2002). If societal changes in gender roles reflect women’s movement into the traditional male roles, it follows that changes in gender-stereotypic beliefs would likely be evidenced in women’s and men’s perceived agency and not necessarily in their perceived communion. Research supports this hypothesis. Diekman and Eagly (2000) asked people to describe the gender-associated characteristics of women and men in the past (1950s), present, and future (2050). Across all time periods, the belief that women are more communal than men and that men are more agentic than women persisted. Even so, results showed a clear narrowing of the gap for agency, with smaller perceived differences in the present compared
with the past and with projections that those differences would continue to shrink. Put another way, people saw stability in men’s agency and women’s communion over time, but also perceived an increase in women’s agency (and no change in men’s level of communion) that they expected to continue into the future.

**Subtypes**

Stereotypes of women and men are very general categories. In theory, each gender stereotype refers to approximately half of the world’s population. Although the distinction between male and female appears to be a primary line of demarcation (Fiske, 1998; Vonk & Ashmore, 2003), having only two global, super-ordinate categories often proves unsatisfactory, lacking discriminatory power in daily usage. As a consequence, people develop subcategories about particular kinds of women and men that they encounter, typically endowing these more specific stereotypes with greater detail and often more vivid imagery.

People’s propensity to form these more specific categories is evidenced by the identification of more than 200 gender-associated subtypes (Vonk & Ashmore, 2003; see also Deaux, Winton, Crowley & Lewis, 1985; Eckes, 1994). This impressively large number of gender subtypes can generally be reduced, however, into a smaller set of primary categories that includes occupations (e.g., career woman, businessman), family roles (e.g., housewife, breadwinner), ideologies (e.g., feminist), physical features and activities (e.g., athlete), and sexuality related terms (e.g., sexy woman, macho man), as Carpenter and Trentman (1998) have shown. Each of these subtype categories is associated with a distinctive set of characteristics. The career woman, for example, is described as intelligent, determined, knowledgeable, and goal
oriented, terms that do not overlap with the characterization of a sexy woman as flirtatious and seductive (Noseworthy & Lott, 1984).

Gender subtypes vary in their evaluative tone as well, although the patterns are not always consistent. In the case of the ideologically based subtype of feminist, for example, Twenge and Zucker (1999) found that feminists were seen as serious, intelligent, knowledgeable, productive, and modern. At the same time, on a less positive note, feminists also were believed to be opinionated and outspoken, and when asked to write a description of a feminist, 36 percent of their respondents included negative statements. More generally, subtypes defined as traditional are preferred to subtypes defined as modern (Haddock & Zanna, 1994; Kite & Branscombe, 1998).

Research on stereotypes has shown the predominance of two distinct dimensions, one concerned with perceived competence and the other with perceived warmth (Fiske, Xu, Cuddy, & Glick, 1999; Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002; Fiske, 2004). Often groups are characterized as being high on one of the dimensions but low on the other. For example, Eckes (2002) reported that although feminists are believed to be high on competence but low on warmth, housewives were rated just the opposite—high on warmth but low on competence. The pattern seems to be that people who fill roles requiring male-associated characteristics, such as competence, are not necessarily liked, whereas people who fill roles requiring female-associated characteristics, such as warmth, are not necessarily respected. Employment status serves as one cue to perceived competence, as suggested earlier. Even the distinction between full-time and part-time work influences competent judgments, such that the former is seen as more agentic than the latter (Eagly & Steffen, 1986). Jost and Kay (2005) also have demonstrated the complementary nature of gender stereotypes such that both positive and negative qualities (e.g., women as communal
but incompetent) underlie gender stereotypes. These complementary stereotypes are endorsed by both men and women, and they appear to enhance the legitimacy and stability of the status quo.

**Stereotype Acquisition**

There is little doubt that, early in life, children learn to categorize on the basis of gender and, in doing so, acquire the building blocks for gender-based stereotyping. Research suggests that by between the ages of 3 and 12 months children have acquired the ability to visually discriminate between males and females (Leinbach & Fagot, 1993); this ability develops well before the ability to verbalize such distinctions (Fagan & Singer, 1979). Evidence for visual discrimination comes from studies of infants’ habituation to stimuli. In this procedure, infants are shown pictures of one gender until it are no longer novel; then the original picture is paired with a new picture and the time spent attending to both pictures is assessed. The assumption is that if infants spend more time looking at the novel face, they have successfully discriminated between the two categories. Because this technique is based on nonverbal responses, however, there are limitations to the conclusions that can be drawn. Infants, for example, may not be attending to the biological characteristics that differentiate the sexes, but rather to a series of cues that co-occur with sex, such as clothing and hairstyle (see Arthur et al., 2008). Whatever the bases of this discrimination, it seems clear that the categories “male” and “female” are implemented at an early age.

Stereotype development also is influenced by the social rewards or punishments associated with our own and others’ actions (Bandura, 1986). Consistent with social learning theory, reinforcement is often direct, as when parents encourage children to play with gender-appropriate toys or explicitly discourage an interest in counterstereotypic behavior (Bigler &
Liben, 1999). Evidence suggests that adults verbally convey information about gender stereotypes and its importance to our culture. In doing so, they increase the psychological salience of gender; the result is an increased readiness for children to stereotype on the basis of gender (see, e.g., Arthur et al., 2008; Bem, 1993).

Learning about gender stereotypes also occurs indirectly, as when children observe others being rewarded for gender-appropriate behavior (Bandura, 1986). A central prediction of social learning theory is that future behavior is patterned after those actions that have previously been positively or negatively reinforced; rewarded behaviors are chosen and punished or ignored behaviors eschewed. Importantly, reinforcements are associated with the basic categories children have developed (such as gender), leading to beliefs about the appropriate characteristics and roles for each gender.

Ample evidence shows that children follow adults’ cues. By approximately two years of age, for example, most children can correctly identify and verbalize an actor’s gender (e.g., Campbell, Shirley, & Caygill, 2002; Gelman et al., 2004). Additional evidence comes from research showing that, by around 18 months, children prefer gender-stereotyped toys and can associate those toys with the ‘‘appropriate’’ sex, such as trucks with boys’ faces (Serbin, Poulin-Dubois, Colburne, Sen, & Eichstedt, 2001). Research suggests that children learn first about gender differences in adults’ attributes and physical appearance and later, especially in the elementary years, expand their knowledge to the occupations and school tasks associated with women and men and boys and girls (Ruble, Martin, & Berenbaum, 2006). As children develop, they become more flexible in their gender-stereotypic beliefs. Young children, for example, are likely to base judgments strictly on biological sex, but by around age nine, they begin to process information about gender related activities and interests (Martin 1989).
GENDER BIAS

When examining gender bias, it is important to define and understand the term. Gender is defined by the American Heritage Dictionary as "classification of sex." According to this same source, bias is defined as "preference or inclination that inhibits impartiality; prejudice" (American Heritage Dictionary, 1983). Thus gender bias is separation of gender in a way which prefers one sex over the other. Gender bias is a preference or prejudice toward one gender over the other. Bias can be conscious or unconscious, and may manifest in many ways, both subtle and obvious. In many countries, eliminating gender bias is the basis of many laws, including those that govern workplaces, family courts, and even the voting booth. Despite these efforts, many legal and political scholars argue that total gender parity remains a far off goal, one which many regions are not remotely close to reaching.

Gender bias can be subtle or overt, and may result in small or large consequences. For instance, the biased assumption that girl's school sports are less important than boy's school sports lead to an inequality in funding and access to facilities, which in turn lead in part to the creation of the Title IX section of the Equal opportunity in Education Act of 1972, a United States law prohibiting gender discrimination in public education, including in sports.

The legality of gender bias is an area of huge contention in regard to pay equity between the sexes. Historically in many countries, men make more money over a career than women, even if they hold the same job. While the disparity has dwindled since the mid-20th century, it still exists in most areas to some degree. Opponents of additional laws increasing protection of women's equal pay argue that this may be due to women working less over their lives, instead
making a choice to remain at home and raise children. Women's rights activists often cite this argument as part of the overall gender bias of modern society, suggesting that women are financially punished for choosing to rear children, despite the fact that this action is vital to the continuance of the state.

It is important to note that gender bias exists in both directions. Although many historical examples and evidence suggest that bias has typically gone against women, there are certainly cases to the contrary. Abortion legality, for instance, is often a situation where gender bias claims against men are suggested, as some biological fathers insist they should have the right to prevent an abortion in order to raise their biological child.

It is also important to remember when considering gender bias and the law, that not all regions approve or desire gender equality under the law. In some countries, women are not allowed to drive, let alone vote. Studies of some regions have also showed tremendous gender bias in laws, with women being subject to severe penalties, including execution, for crimes such as adultery, whereas for men, adultery may not be considered a crime at all or may have lighter sentencing guides.

In other parts of the world, the complexity of gender issues and overall desire to create an equitable society has lead legal systems with an interest in eliminating gender bias to institute laws prohibiting overt gender prejudice. The first law allowing women voting rights was passed in New Zealand in 1893, although earlier laws existed in Scandinavia that allowed limited female voting. England, the United States, and Ireland all have laws prohibiting pay inequity based on gender; however these are not often strictly enforced.
Post Test:

1. Is there any form of association between being gender biased and gender stereotypical
LESSON FOUR
WOMEN AND WORK

INTRODUCTION
This course introduces you to women and work, without going far, in this part of the world one can easily pattern some work to women due to factors that make us to do so. Therefore, in the context, we shall discuss it broadly.

OBJECTIVES
At the end of the chapter, the student should be to understand:

1. What the trend is, was and will be about women and work

Content:

Gender inequalities in the workplace and work-life balance issues have become increasingly important as employment rates of women have continued to grow in all Member States. But, although, in 2009, 58.6% of the European work force (EU-27) was female and women filled 59% of all newly created jobs, the extent to which women contribute economically still seems to be underestimated. A modern organization of work, a knowledge economy, competitiveness and more and better jobs are central to the post-2010 Lisbon Strategy and the EU’s 2020 Strategy. Women are essential to the workforce in terms of providing an active and sustainable source of labour and in June 2010, the European Council has set a new ambitious target aiming to raise to 75% the employment rate by 2020 for women and men aged 20-64, including through the greater participation of young people, older workers and low-skilled workers and the better integration of legal migrants. But, although employment rates for women are increasing, a lot still remains to
be done, especially for older and younger women, to reach this goal and at the same time ensure
decent work for all.

In 1940, 28 percent of American women were in the labor force (US Bureau of the Census, 1960) and this percentage steadily increased over time to 60 percent in 1997 (US Bureau of
Labor Statistics, 1998). In addition, women have increasingly become a more substantial
proportion of the labor force. In 1940 women made up one quarter of the labor force (US Bureau
of the Census, 1960). By 1997 women constituted nearly half of the labor force (US Bureau of

Previous research has found that during recessions or in times of high unemployment, women's
labor force participation rates tend to level off or decline (Leibowitz and Klerman, 1995).

Recently, women's labor force participation and issues of parental leave have been of utmost
importance not only to families and individuals, but also to policy makers, researchers, and
employers. Over the past fifteen years, we have seen an advancing public policy debate starting
with the Pregnancy Discrimination Act (PDA) in 1978 and culminating with the passage of the
Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA) in 1993. Under the PDA, it is illegal for an employer to
discriminate against an employee because of pregnancy, childbirth, or pregnancy-related
conditions. Thus, women cannot be fired, denied a job, or denied a promotion because they are
pregnant. The FMLA furthers parent's ability "to strike a workable balance between the
competing demands of the workplace and the home" (Commission on Family and Medical
Leave, 1996) by guaranteeing up to 12 weeks of job-protected leave without pay during any 12
month period to qualifying employees - fathers as well as mothers. This act is important for
many reasons, one being that it is the first federal law that requires some US employers to offer
parental leave to women and men with qualifying employment histories. Women's labor force participation especially surrounding childbirth has been, and continues to be, a governmental and national concern, rather than just a family or individual interest.

The issue of occupational safety and health (OSH) for women who work within the European Union (EU) is central to an understanding of the working environment. Previous research has shown that women’s OSH has to be improved. Research from the European Commission illustrates that already in 1995; women's ill health was close to or above half of all cases, e.g. allergies (45%), infectious illnesses (61%), neurological complaints (55%), and hepatic and dermatological complaints (48%). And the situation has not improved. Further, 'women's jobs' such as those within the health and social services, retail and the hospitality sector, highlight an increase in accident rates, inclusive of fatal accidents; while women are more likely to be bullied and harassed, inclusive of dealing with sexual harassment; and have to use poorly fitting personal protective equipment as it is not sized generally for a smaller frame.

Conclusions on various studies on issues in the women and work are summarized below:

Continuous efforts are needed to improve the working conditions of both women and men.

Gender differences in employment conditions have a major impact on gender differences in work-related health outcomes. Research and interventions must take account of the real jobs that men and women do and differences in exposure and working conditions.

We can improve research and monitoring by systematically including the gender dimension in data collection, adjusting for hours worked (as women generally work shorter hours than men)
and basing exposure assessment on the real work carried out. Epidemiological methods should be assessed for any gender bias. Indicators in monitoring systems, such as national accident reporting and surveys, should effectively cover occupational risks to women.

Work-related risks to women’s safety and health have been underestimated and neglected compared to men’s, both regarding research and prevention. This imbalance should be addressed in research, awareness raising and prevention activities.

Taking a gender-neutral approach in policy and legislation has contributed to less attention and fewer resources being directed towards work-related risks to women and their prevention. European safety and health directives do not cover (predominantly female) domestic workers. Women working informally, for example wives or partners of men in family farming businesses, may not always be covered by legislation. Gender impact assessments should be carried out on existing and future OSH directives, standard setting and compensation arrangements.

Based on current knowledge of prevention and mainstreaming gender into OSH, existing directives could be implemented in a more gender-sensitive way, despite the need for gender-impact assessments and attention to gaps in knowledge.

Gender-sensitive interventions should take a participatory approach, involving the workers concerned and based on an examination of the real work situations.
Improving women’s occupational safety and health cannot be viewed separately from wider discrimination issues at work and in society. Employment equality actions should include OSH. Activities to mainstream occupational safety and health into other policy areas, such as public health or corporate social responsibility initiatives, should include a gender element.

Women are under-represented in the decision-making concerning occupational health and safety at all levels. They should be more directly involved and women’s views, experiences, knowledge and skills should be reflected in formulating and implementing OSH strategies.

There are successful examples of including or targeting gender in research approaches, interventions, consultation and decision-making, tools and actions. Existing experiences and resources should be shared.

While the general trends in women’s working conditions and situation are similar across the Member States and candidate countries, there are also country differences within these general trends. Individual countries should examine their particular circumstances regarding gender and OSH, in order to plan appropriate actions.

The Characteristics and Motivations of Women Entrepreneurs

Academic studies have highlighted the broad similarities between women and men in their characteristics and motivations to start a business. Differences can be seen in: the relative youth of women business owners; women’s propensity to start businesses in retailing and services industries; women’s lack of prior work experience, training and business experience; and women’s desire to start businesses as a means of circumventing the ‘glass ceiling’.
Increasingly, research into the characteristics and motivations of women entrepreneurs is becoming more specialized. In particular, three sub-themes can be identified. These are:

- Differences in psychological characteristics of women and men
- Social background and business differences of women and men
- Links between entrepreneurial motivations and the labour market

**Psychological Differences**

Research investigating differences in psychological characteristics either between female and male entrepreneurs or between female entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs has revealed few differences. Despite this, the search for differences in psychological characteristics remains a popular, albeit many believe a fruitless, theme.

**Social Background and Business Differences**

Research has, however, revealed many social background and business differences between women and men. While conflicting evidence emerges with regard to differences in educational levels, family background and position, ethnicity etc, most studies report the youthfulness of women business owners compared with men, and the newness of their businesses. These findings have been consistent across many studies, irrespective of country of origin.

**Entrepreneurial Motivations and the Labour Market**

European researchers, in particular, have sought to establish links between women’s’ motivation to start up businesses and their overall position within the labour market. Many studies have speculated that female entrepreneurship occurs as a consequence of individual women seeking to gain control over their careers following a lack of progression associated with the ‘glass ceiling’.
While it is likely that this occurs, and there is plenty of anecdotal evidence of this, as yet there is insufficient research evidence quantifying the importance of this factor and clarifying the exact processes involved.

In West Africa, a study by IFAD submitted that women farmers usually work longer and harder than men. IFAD Assessment of Rural Poverty confirms this pattern in the West and Central African countries.

In the first place, poorer rural women in West Africa usually work longer hours a day than males in similar circumstances.

- In the Central Province of Cameroon, women’s working week is longer than 64 hours, whereas for men it is only about 32 hours. About half of women’s time is spent on domestic tasks, but even then women spend more time on agriculture than men do (26 hours/week compared with only 12 hours/week for men).

- In Burkina Faso, the average working day for men is 8.5 hours, but for women it is 14 hours.

- In Gabon, women perform 95% of farm work, usually working around 15 hours of day. Even during peak agricultural periods, males spend only about 2 to 3 hours a day on agriculture.

The Central Plateau of Burkina Faso provides a more detailed illustration of rural women’s workload. Here there are family plots (average size about 3 ha), which are under the control of the male family head, and women’s individual plots (500-1 000 m2). Priority is given to the ‘family plot’, and women work on their own crops in the time left over. Women grow various
crops in their own plots, mainly for the sauces that accompany the cereals, but also for sale. Often the women have to walk for one to two hours before they reach their plots. They are also responsible for poultry and ruminants kept by the family, and for looking after children and performing household chores.

Second, women’s agricultural and domestic tasks are physically strenuous, often more than they need to be, owing to poverty and cultural reasons.

In the Central Plateau of Burkina Faso, an estimated 5% of households own animal-draught equipment and animals. When it is available, animal traction is used mainly by men for primary tillage and inter-row cultivation of the family plot. Women rarely have access to or receive the benefits from animal traction for their plots, even though their plots’ soil is often hard and stony. Polygamy apparently influences the extent to which men will help out on women’s plots. If a man has only one wife, and he has access to animal traction, he may help prepare the land in his wife’s plot. However, if he has several wives, apparently he seldom provides any assistance with their plots, even if he has access to animal traction, for fear that it will cause jealousy among his wives. The exception occurs if a wife is going to plant groundnuts, which require a loose and deep seedbed for water retention and growth, in which case he may plough the soil for her. This means that if women cannot afford to hire male labour, they have to do very heavy land preparation work and other difficult tasks such as weeding by hand, using simple hand tools such as hand-hoes. Furthermore, cultural conditioning requires that women use hoes with short handles, forcing them to bend over double while working. This is not only tiring, but also leads to backache.
The situation is somewhat different in parts of Senegal. The IFAD/FAO/Government of Japan study conducted extensive field research in the areas around Kaolack and Diourbel, to the southeast and east of Dakar. Again, there the system of the family plot and women’s smaller plots, allocated to them by their husbands, exists. As in Burkina Faso, the family plot in these regions of Senegal always receives priority. If there is also an adult son with his own plot, then his plot is the next to be tended to. Only then does the woman’s plot receive attention. According to a 1999 IFAD/FAO/Government of Japan study, men prepare and sow the plots, using animal traction when they have access to it. When there is more than one wife, the husband starts with the plot of the first wife. This means that some women’s plots are worked later than they should be. But at least the women appear to have more help for the hardest tasks.

Women also perform heavy work in terms of head-loading produce to market and in carrying water, fuel wood and consumer goods. The IFAD Assessment of Rural Poverty estimates that the average woman in the region spends between 1 and 2.5 hours per day on transportation. Village surveys in Ghana and Tanzania show that women transport about four times as much in volume as men do and spend about three times as much time involved in transportation activities. In Burkina Faso, it is estimated that, assuming a 300-working-day year, the average farm woman carries about 20 kg over a distance of 2.5 km every day.

Much of the heavy workload of women could be decreased through better access to technology such as animal traction and animal transport. Even when this is culturally acceptable, it is usually beyond the financial means of poorer women in the region like the customs of sharing agricultural implements and the existence in some places of women’s groups who work collective plots.
LECTURE FIVE

MARGINALIZATION OF WOMEN

INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes what is meant by marginalization and marginality; it discusses how they are different from each other and also the similarities.

Post test:

1. Define marginalization

2. Are women being marginalized, discuss?

Content:

Marginalization is the psychosocial process of becoming or being relegated to the fringe of society e.g.; "the marginalization of the underclass", "marginalization of intellect", etc. A marginalized woman is a woman who has been pushed to the edges; viewed as less than human.

Throughout the world today, women are owned as property, forced to deny them education, and victimized by violence and assault.

There is a connection between the need to establish clear boundaries among groups differing in ethnicity, class, sexual orientation, and so forth in our society and the existence of privilege and social disadvantage.

The socially constructed boundaries between men and women, lower and upper socioeconomic classes, people of color and white Americans, and other groups are not needed to provide accurate descriptive information about them. These boundaries are in place to maintain and justify the system of social privilege and disadvantage associated with those characteristics. The
The ultimate goal is to make sure that the privileged maintain their privileges while others do not gain similar access and instead are marginalized.

The ill effects of oppression and discrimination are evident among women and men who report experiencing a sense of marginality or invisibility as a function of one or more of their “minority identities” (Comas-Diaz & Greene, 1994; Chisholm, 1996). By “marginality,” we mean to suggest that many individuals experience a profound schism between their public and private presentations of self, which reflects an awareness of how the dominant other perceives (or rather misperceives by “not seeing,” stereotyping, etc.) them in those social contexts in which the minority identity or identities may be salient (e.g., family, school, work, relationships, etc.) and in which there is a dynamic interplay between designated “majority” and “minority” status. The “not seeing” results in a sense of invisibility despite the fact that the individual may be highly visible—that is, they may be invisible in terms of influence while being visible in terms of tokenism. The individual experiencing marginality exists uncomfortably in both the worlds of the dominant other and of the minority group and is perceived and treated differently in each. In the world of work, for example, the person, marginalized because of her or his ethnicity/race, is defined by ethnicity/race and gender as well as competence. In their personal life, they often feel set apart from family and friends, who experience their “successes”—whatever may be, as determined by the dominant group—as a moving away from the minority group, sometimes literally, as in leaving the old neighborhood, or emotionally.

The psychological literature has begun to explore what has been common knowledge among those identified as being “different,” “ethnic,” or “a minority”: individuals have multiple identities, any of which may be “majority” or “minority”—the social context
determines the salience of the one(s) operating at any given time (Sedikides & Brewer, 2001; Hornsey & Hogg, 2000). As identity represents an interaction between the social and internal world, some of our identities or differences in group membership are private and some are public; some are visible, some invisible. When conducting psychological research, it is important to ascertain the salience of the identity in question to the individual when that characteristic of the individual is a variable in a study. Failure to do so may lead to a sampling error where homogeneity among the participants is assumed but in fact is nonexistent. Cole (1986) captures the dilemma facing scientists and practitioners who strive for competency with respect to race/ethnicity, gender, religion, age, sexual orientation, socioeconomic class, and disability:

That which US women have in common must always be viewed in relation to the particularities of a group, for even when we narrow our focus to one particular group of women it is possible for differences within that group to challenge the primacy of what is shared in common. For example, what have we said and what have we failed to say when we speak of ‘‘Asian American women’’?

When the external, social world distorts one’s identity and imposes barriers to opportunities based on that identity, the groundwork has been laid for a distorted image of one’s self and sense of self-worth and a distorted perception of others. These are fertile conditions for the development of mental health problems. Mental health interventions may assist women of color who confront this dilemma, but if mental health practitioners are not sensitive to social marginalization as a contextual factor, it may also harm them.
LECTURE FIVE

Women and Health

This chapter discusses the various health issues that conflict and confront with women. At the end of the lecture, you are expected to:

1. Be able to identify women’s health issues

Contents:

Women physical health has received attentions right from time immemorial. Different health conditions have been talked and some are discussed here:

The first of these that occurs developmentally is precocious puberty, which is sexual development that starts much too early, sometimes as early as age two. This is a rare disorder that affects about five times more girls than boys. An effective treatment has recently been developed at the National Institutes of Health (NIH). Using luteinizing hormone-releasing hormone analogues, the pituitary can be "turned off," which eliminates the stimulus to the gonads and thus reverses the signs and symptoms of precocious puberty and delays puberty until the normal time. This has been a significant clinical advance, which is based on Nobel prize-winning basic research in reproductive biology supported by NIH.

Next to appear developmentally are eating disorders. Anorexia and bulimia are up to 10 times more frequent in females than males. Obesity also is more prevalent in females than in males. The cause of these eating disorders is still not known, and there is no effective treatment. These disorders affect a significant and probably increasing proportion of the population, and since
severe anorexia and bulimia have a mortality of 10 to 15 percent, it is extremely important that we do more research to try to understand them and develop a more effective treatment. With menarche comes the entire set of reproductive health concerns that will be part of women’s lives even after menopause. Many issues need to be addressed here, including pregnancy and unintended pregnancy, pregnancy care, and menstrual cycle disorders. Looking first at unintended pregnancy, it should be noted that women today have far greater control over their reproductive life than at any time in history. Yet 52 percent of pregnancies in the United States are unintended, either at all or at the time that they occur. Nearly half of these unintended pregnancies occur among teenagers.

Good contraceptives are available, but they are not used or not used effectively, partly because of unjustified fear of adverse side effects. Forty percent of women having an abortion say that they did not use contraceptives because of fear of side effects.

Research has demonstrated that the newer oral contraceptives do not increase the risk of breast cancer, they decrease the risk of ovarian and endometrial cancer, and they do not increase the risk of cardiovascular disease unless the woman is a smoker. Also, spermicides do not increase the risk of prematurity or of birth defects. Still, there is a need for better contraception and a number of new approaches are being studied.

**Women’s mental health concerns**

Women’s concerns with psychological well being extend across the life cycle and cannot be confined to reproductive functioning. In attempting to differentiate women’s mental health concerns from those of men, it might be argued that they could be defined as including, but not being limited to, conditions, diseases or disorders which are unique to women; occur more
commonly in women; have different risk factors for women; or follow a different course in women relative to men. However, this approach omits those mental health conditions shared by men and women but for which women may receive different forms of treatment even when the same symptoms are manifested (Mastroianni, Faden & Federman, 1994). For example, an Australian study found that even when there were similar numbers of men and women with high scores on the General Health Questionnaire (a screening measure of psychiatric disorder) that primary care physicians classified significantly more women as disturbed than men (Redman et al, 1991). Unless such differences in treatment have a sound evidential basis, they are suggestive of gender stereotyping, lead to inappropriate care such as the prescription of psychotropic drugs for women who are not disturbed and are a significant source of concern. Women's mental health concerns also extend beyond specific conditions or problems. They encompass the structures that govern the provision of health related education, information and health care delivery, the processes that influence women's interactions with the health care system and the factors that determine whether the treatment they receive is gender sensitive. One important influence is caregivers' professional training and education. Without an understanding of a gendered, social model of health, quality of care can be compromised (Mammen & Astbury, 1997). At the present time, an accurate needs assessment of women's mental health, an essential element in effective health promotion, remains hampered by inadequate sources of data, an overly biological, individual focus in research and theoretical models which often neglect to consider how women's low social status and material circumstances intersect with their family roles and their participation in paid employment in determining mental health outcomes. The omission of these social factors from studies of women's 'vulnerability' to mental health problems, amounts to a
form of selection bias which precludes the very possibility of examining how gender inequalities might determine women’s emotional well being.
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LECTURE SIX

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN: International Sexual Harassment

Sexual harassment is a worldwide problem that has received considerable research attention in recent years. It is difficult to assess the incidence of sexual harassment cross-culturally for a number of reasons. In some cultures, the concept does not even exist; definition of sexual
harassment vary in other cultures, and methodological issues complicate cross-national comparisons.

In a study conducted in Europe and edited by Zimmerman (2006) about violence with women who were being trafficked submitted that; women, when asked about their experience of physical violence, sexual violence, threats, and restrictions on their movement while they were trafficked; nearly all women (95%) reported physical or sexual violence, with three quarters of respondents having been physically hurt, and 90% reporting having been sexually assaulted. The majority of women also reported threats of violence to themselves (89%), and many reported threats to their children and family (36%).

Almost three-quarters of women (77%) reported that they had no freedom of movement, and those who reported a degree of freedom generally described being accompanied by minders to prevent their escape.

**Physical violence**

Women were asked whether anyone had ever hit, kicked or otherwise physically hurt them while they were in the trafficking situation. Nearly eight in every ten women (76%) had been physically assaulted by traffickers, pimps, madams, brothel and club owners, clients, or their boyfriends. Respondents described being kicked while pregnant, burned with cigarettes, having their head slammed against floors or walls, hit with bats or other objects, dragged across the room by their hair, and punched in the face. Sixty-one women (30%) in the study reported being hurt or threatened with a “knife, gun, or other object”. An indication of the severity of the physical violence can be gained by the extent to which women reported being injured. Over half of the women interviewed (58%) said they have been injured at some point while they were trafficked.
Among these women, 57% stated that an injury sustained during that time still caused problems or pain. In addition, in a separate question asking women about problems they experienced in the past two weeks, 12% reported fractures, or sprains, and 8% reported facial injuries. Physical sites of women’s injuries spanned their entire bodies and included: head, face, mouth, nose, eyes, back, neck, spine, legs, hands, feet, kidneys, pelvis, abdomen, and the genital area. One woman recalled being beaten so badly that she was hospitalized in the neurosurgical department [for head trauma].

**Sexual violence**

Women were asked if they were physically forced or coerced by fear or threats to have sex or do something sexual. Nine out of ten women in this study (90%) reported having been physically forced or intimidated into sex or doing something sexual. The majority of women who reported being coerced into sex (83%) were also physically forced (92%). Among the 10% who did not report experiencing sexual violence, 48% reported physical injuries and 71% reported being threatened while trafficked. Eighteen of the women in the study reported that they had no sexual intercourse experience (i.e., were virgins) prior to being trafficked.

**Threats to the woman and her family**

Traffickers maintained control over women by creating an unpredictable and unsafe environment to keep women continually “on edge”. Threats were reported by 89% of the women. These included threats of death, beatings, increased debt, harm to their children and families and retrafficking. Among the women who reported being threatened, 82% confirmed that these threats were often carried out as promised.)
Domestic violence also is an international problem affecting countless women. Once again, cross-cultural incidence figures are difficult to obtain, particularly in countries where the government refuses to acknowledge that domestic violence is a problem. Both domestic violence and workplace sexual harassment may be conceptualized as human rights violations. Sexual harassment generally is seen both as violence against women and as a form of sex discrimination that prevents women from achieving their rightful place in employment and academic settings. However, it also can be seen as interfering with human rights. Since sexual harassment victims still are predominantly women, men may attempt to use power and sexual harassment to subordinate women in the workplace.

Domestic violence clearly is a human rights issue in which victims experience severe physical and psychological consequences. Women constitute the majority of domestic violence victims. In the home setting, men use a form of more direct violence against women than with workplace sexual harassment, but the motivation is similar: to keep women in their place and under the control of men.

In both cases, the primary perpetrators are male, and the majority of victims are female. Both processes involve human rights violations. Intimate partner violence is more personal and physical because the male head of the family has more direct control over his spouse than employers have over their employees. Workplace perpetrators cannot beat or physically harm the women in their employ, so the employer attacks them sexually to maintain his power over women. In both types of behavior, the victim often feels responsible for her punishment (e.g., domestic violence victims may think, “I have not been a good wife”; sexual harassment victims may believe that they “must have given the wrong signals”), and some of the physical and psychological consequences are comparable. There also may be common characteristics of
perpetrators in both types of settings. In addition, conceptually similar terms might be used to describe each setting: ‘‘hostile work environment’’ for workplace sexual harassment, and ‘‘hostile home environment’’ for domestic violence.

THEORIES AND MODELS

Integrated Model of Sexual Harassment:

In 1995, Fitzgerald, Hulin, and Drasgow developed a theoretical model designed to predict the occurrence of sexual harassment in workplace settings. There were two essential components in this model:

1. Organizational climate: the attitudes among employees and managers concerning support for, or opposition to, sexual harassment behavior. Clearly, if these attitudes are supportive of sexually harassing acts and protective of harassers, then there is a greater likelihood that sexual harassments is prevalent in the organization.

2. Job gender context: factors such as the ratio of male to female employees, and whether or not the jobs are associated with traditional male or female role structures.

Feminist, Socio-cultural, and Power Models of Domestic Violence

The basic conceptualization common to these explanations of domestic violence is that it is gender based and fostered through socialization resulting in acceptance of traditional gender-roles. In this traditional gender-role framework, the male role is to provide for the family economically, as well as to offer protection and security for the family. The female role is to raise the children and to have responsibility for providing a smooth and comfortable family life. In addition to the perception of the traditional roles that men and women should play in the family, there are associated traits that men and women are supposed to embody. For example, the
man is supposed to be strong and dominating, whereas women should be weak and submissive (Sigal & Nally, 2004, pp. 27–28).

One possible consequence of the traditional gender-role assumption is that men will have more power and status than women in society, a consequence that feminist theorists interpret as the oppression of women. Patriarchal cultures, which embody traditional role structures, can be characterized as supporting dominance by men over women in all important areas of society, including familial, governmental, and economic. Men are seen as superior to women and traditional gender roles are generally reinforced, thus producing significant gender inequality in the society. Araji and Carlson (2001) suggest that patriarchal societies may foster domestic violence because the dominant male is perceived to be “appropriately” disciplining and controlling the behavior of the subordinate females in the family.

In its extreme form, patriarchal cultures may develop into “cultures of honor.” In certain cultures, the honor of the patriarch, or male head of a family, is dependent on the behavior of others in the family, particularly the chastity of the women. In order to maintain his honor, the patriarch must strictly control the women’s behavior to keep them from “straying” (Baker, Gregware, & Cassidy, 1999). In other words, women in patriarchal and particularly in cultures of honor are almost entirely restricted to the home setting. If a woman behaves in a manner that adversely affects the honor of the patriarch, he is expected to punish her severely to restore his honor. In this manner, culture-of-honor societies are supportive of wife beating.

Although the culture-of-honor formulation applies solely to domestic violence, the concepts of power and the subordination of women also are congruent with the occurrence of sexual harassment. Particularly in countries with a patriarchal structure, but in other cultures as well, men generally are in powerful positions in the workplace and therefore would have the

CROSS-CULTURAL WORKPLACE SEXUAL HARASSMENT

- Definition

The U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission’s (2005) basic definition of workplace sexual harassment states:

Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature constitute sexual harassment when this conduct explicitly or implicitly affects an individual’s employment, unreasonably interferes with an individual’s work performance, or creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive work environment.

In effect, the EEOC is distinguishing between coercive ‘‘quid pro quo’’ or ‘‘sex for favors’’ and ‘‘hostile work environment’’ sexual harassment.

Recent psychological definitions have somewhat clarified and expanded the EEOC’s definition. Gelfand, Fitzgerald, and Drasgow (1995) identified the following categories of sexual harassment:

1. Gender harassment: Disparagement of women in general, stemming from adversarial attitudes toward women, and other behaviors engaged in to distress women (in 1999, Fitzgerald, Magley, Drasgow, and Waldo further subdivided this category into sexist hostility, referring to gender based inequitable treatment or discrimination, and sexual hostility, a term describing persistent sexually related jokes or remarks)
2. Unwanted sexual attention: Continually asking someone for a date despite her refusals, but without negative consequences.

3. Sexual coercion or ‘‘quid pro quo.’’

International Laws against Sexual Harassment

Workplace sexual harassment is not a problem that is specific to America or Western countries. The movement of women into traditionally male-dominated fields of employment is a global trend. As a result, issues of gender-related power and dominance are being observed in workplaces worldwide. The reaction from governments and communities to this problem has ranged from denial of its existence to criminal prosecution of perpetrators.

In 1992, the International Labor Organization (ILO) conducted one of the earliest international surveys to assess the legislative responses of 23 industrialized countries to workplace sexual harassment. All surveyed countries were found to have some kind of law on the subject in place, although the legal categories varied from equal opportunity employment statutes to labor, tort, and criminal laws. For example, Australia, Canada, Denmark, Ireland, New Zealand, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States all have equal employment opportunity laws. The majority of the surveyed countries have labor laws focusing on quid pro quo sexual harassment cases in which the employee was forced to quit to avoid the offensive behavior or the employee was fired for refusing to submit to unfair labor practices. Tort law, which is defined as a legal wrong that can be remedied by court action, has been applied to sexual harassment in Japan, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and the United States. France was the only country at the time that had passed a criminal law related to sexual harassment; however, in other countries, sexual harassment could rise to the level of criminality in extreme
cases such as assault or indecent behavior. Also, only seven countries at the time of the survey had specific sexual harassment laws in place.

In less industrialized countries, the response to sexual harassment has been more gradual. For example, in Malaysia, women’s groups have been pressuring the government and employers to adopt and enforce the existing code on sexual harassment. The Code of Practice on the Prevention and Eradication of Sexual Harassment in the Workplace, as it is called, is not a legally enforceable statute, although it does provide guidelines for employers to deal privately with sexual harassment issues on the job. The code lists specific acts that are construed as sexual harassment, such as leering, lewd jokes, crude sounds and gestures, and flirting. Despite political pressure, only about 1 percent of companies in the country were reported to have adopted the code by the late 1990s, thus prompting calls for stricter, more enforceable laws on the issue (McCarthy, 1997).

Aside from the ILO, which has been criticized by other world organizations such as the International Labor Rights Fund for not having a more specific convention against workplace sexual harassment (Kompipote, 2002), much of the international momentum toward addressing sexual harassment as a problem has come from the United Nations Convention on Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), which was adopted in 1979 by the UN General Assembly. According to this convention, discrimination against women is defined as:

Any distinction, exclusion, or restriction made on the basis of sex which has the effect or purpose of impairing or nullifying the recognition, enjoyment, or exercise by women, irrespective of their marital status, on the basis of equality of men and women, of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the political, economic, social, cultural, civil, or any other field. (United Nations, 1979, Article 1)
CEDAW has called on member states to take all appropriate measures to eliminate discrimination against women by any person, organization, or enterprise. Under general international law and specific human rights covenants, states also may be responsible for providing compensation, as well as investigating and punishing acts of violence, if they fail to act with due diligence to prevent violations of rights (United Nations, 2003).

Sexual harassment is considered by CEDAW as a form of violence against women, and as a result all member states are encouraged to develop legal channels to address such cases in their countries.

A 2003 report by the special rapporteur to the Commission on Human Rights presented a detailed and extensive review of developments both within the UN system and in member countries with respect to issues of violence against women, including sexual harassment legislation (United Nations, 2003). The report showed that over the period of 1994 to 2003, several countries, including developing nations such as Kenya, Senegal, Bolivia, and Jordan, instituted specific codes and laws against sexual harassment. In other countries, such as Ghana, that do not have explicit laws, individuals can find redress to sexual harassment by referencing more general laws on workplace discrimination or sexual assault.

In India, where it is reported that every 51 minutes, a woman is harassed (Srinivasan, 1998), a recent court decision has moved the country toward more stringent prosecution of harassment cases. The Indian Supreme Court ruled that in the absence of domestic law, international conventions could be referred to in interpreting and safeguarding women against harassment.
Outcomes for Victims

The integrated model developed by Fitzgerald, Hulin, and Drasgow (1995) predicted that women who are sexually harassed would experience negative physical and mental health consequences. In a study supporting the model, Cortina, Fitzgerald, and Drasgow (2002) reported that, in their Latina sample, individuals who experienced sexual harassment in its more extreme forms had higher levels of depression and anxiety than other respondents. In another investigation, Dansky and Kilpatrick (1997) surveyed more than 3,000 participants from the United States to examine the psychological consequences of sexual harassment victimization. Using standardized diagnostic measures, the researchers found that women who had been sexually harassed were more likely to suffer from posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and depression than those who had not been victimized. Once again, these results supported the integrated model.

Types of Perpetrators

In one of the earliest attempts to categorize perpetrators, Pryor (Pryor, 1987; Pryor, Lavite, & Stoller, 1993) established the Likelihood of Sexually Harassing (LSH) scale. Pryor proposed that men varied in terms of their propensity to engage in sexual harassment behavior and indicated that these individual tendencies would combine with a supportive workplace climate to facilitate the expression of these types of behavior.

More recently, Lengnick-Hall (1995) developed the following three classifications of workplace sexual harassers:

1. Hard-core harassers: Men who actively look for settings and situations where they can harass victims.

2. Opportunists: Men who engage in sexual harassment only when given an opportunity.

3. Insensitive individuals: Men do not realize that their behavior is causing discomfort.
Both types 2 and 3 can be stopped from harassing women, whereas it is difficult to prevent type 1 harassers from engaging in this behavior.

Lucero, Middleton, Finch, and Valentine (2003) analyzed a large number of published arbitration cases to further identify categories of perpetrators. Based on these cases, these authors clarified the types of men who engaged in the most prevalent workplace sexual harassment as:

1. Persistent harassers: This category included men who harassed varying numbers of women either using extreme (“hard-core”) or less extreme forms of harassment.

2. Exploitives: These individuals were opportunists who took advantage of the situation, but also seemed to engage in more sexually related behaviors than the persistent perpetrators.

Lucero and colleagues suggested that interventions be developed to match the type of harasser. One problem with this study, however, is that many victims do not report being harassed, and the majority of incidents probably do not reach the arbitration stage, thus qualifying the authors’ conclusions.

LECTURE EIGHT
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Introduction

In this lecture, you to be acquitted with domestic violence and practical examples will be blown up for vivid knowledge.

Content:

The American Psychological Association Task Force on Violence and the Family (American Psychological Association, 1996) defined intimate partner violence or domestic violence as “a pattern of abusive behaviors including a wide range of physical, sexual, and psychological
maltreatment used by one person in an intimate relationship against another to gain power unfairly or maintain that person’s misuse of power, control, and authority.” A variation on this basic statement was expressed in the United Nations’ definition of violence against women, which was adopted by the General Assembly in the 1993 Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women. The definition states that violence against women is any act of gender-based violence that results in, or is likely to result in, physical, sexual, or psychological harm or suffering to women, including threats of such acts, coercion, or arbitrary deprivation of liberty, whether occurring in public or private life. (United Nations, 1993, Article 1)

Although there are commonalities in these two definitions, particularly in the specification of types of harm or maltreatment, the differences are interesting. The UN definition includes the identification of the victims as women, whereas the APA definition is basically gender neutral. In addition, the UN definition specifies that harm has to occur or be likely to occur, is applicable to any specific behavior, and doesn’t mention intention. Conversely, the APA definition is related to a pattern of abusive behavior and includes the concept of abusive behaviors designed to achieve or maintain unfair power over another person.

**International Laws on Domestic Violence**

The United Nations is one of the foremost international entities working toward developing legal means of addressing issues of gender-based violence. As with sexual harassment, its Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women focuses on helping UN member nations to develop legal means of dealing with domestic violence, which is deemed a violation of a basic human right. In a 2000 report, the special rapporteur to the United Nations on
violence against women, Radhika Coomaraswamy, examined the issues that individual countries are facing in developing laws against domestic violence.

According to the report (Coomaraswamy, 2000), under international human rights law, states have a duty not only to avoid committing human rights violations themselves but also to prevent and respond to human rights abuses perpetrated by their citizens. CEDAW has made recommendations to states as to how they should proceed in implementing domestic violence laws. The report also presents different strategies used internationally to address domestic violence.

**Types of Intimate Partner Violence**

Wallace (1998) cited Walker’s well-known “cycle of violence” as a significant conceptualization of the course of spouse battering. According to this cycle, the first stage is “tension building,” in which the abuser becomes increasingly angry and enraged and engages in smaller acts of spouse battering. This stage is followed by the “explosion stage,” in which the battering becomes extremely violent. Finally, there is a period of “calm, loving respite,” with contrition and apologies on the part of the abuser, along with his promises that he will never hurt her again.

In another approach, Johnson and Ferraro (2000) identified the following four categories of partner violence:

1. Common couple violence occurs in the course of arguments and is unlikely to lead to abusive and violent patterns of behavior.

2. Intimate terrorism, according to the authors, is a pattern of behavior that is most relevant to the current presentation. It is conceptualized as a means used to control the other person and as more likely to evolve into violent attacks. It is perpetrated much more
frequently by men than by women and is most likely to cause injury and be associated with emotional abuse.

3. Violent resistance is violence by women in response to abuse perpetrated by their partners.

4. Mutual violent control is unusual in that both partners engage in violence to control the other person.

CROSS-CULTURAL STUDIES OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

AFRICA

Koenig et al. (2003) surveyed more than 5,000 women in a rural community in southwest Uganda (the Rakai area, where the majority of residents are of the Baganda ethnic group) in 2000–2001. The researchers stated that the predominant pattern was “patrilineal” (i.e., where women stay with their husband’s clan) and a significant number of men had many wives or sexual partners. Women were questioned about domestic violence with a revised form of the CTS, and the interviewers were experienced and of the same gender as the respondents. Approximately 40 percent of the women were found to be victims of psychological or verbal violence, and a little over 30 percent experienced physical abuse. Both failure to take care of the house or the husband and disobedience by the wife were cited as common precipitants for violence, as well as excessive drinking by the male spouse. A large majority of women (and a higher percentage of men whose attitudes also were measured) condoned abuse of the female spouse in certain situations.

This study had many positive points, including the large sample, the high response rate, the inclusion of attitude measures, and the use of the basic standardized CTS. Questions that
remain include whether there was underreporting of abuse and how well the results would generalize to other areas of Uganda.

In general, domestic violence in many cultures as being due in part to both the patriarchal nature of the societies and the social climate in various countries. In particular, Latin American, Middle Eastern, and Asian studies provided the strongest confirmation of the validity of the integrated model and power theories as explanations of international intimate partner violence.

A recent analysis by Archer (2006) reached somewhat similar conclusions. The researcher reviewed studies conducted in various countries and stated that “husbands’ physical aggression against wives is inversely related to women’s societal power” (p. 147), an association which “clearly support[s] the link between patriarchal values and physical aggression by husbands” (p. 47). Archer also suggested that collectivist cultures, in which the welfare of the society, family, and culture is seen as more important than the needs of the individual, are associated with higher levels of spousal abuse of women than individualist cultures.

- Middle East

Recently, researchers have begun to explore domestic violence in Middle Eastern countries. Many of these countries conform to the patriarchal culture described earlier, and some of these countries are characterized as “cultures of honor.” In addition, support for domestic violence as a method of controlling female behavior and protection of abusers are strong components of the cultural climate in these nations.

In a significant investigation in Israel, Haj-Yahia (2000) surveyed 1,111 Arab women to determine the extent of domestic violence they experienced during the period of time of their
engagement. In an attempt to obtain a representative sample in a sensitive manner, the author approached clergymen in the Arab community to obtain a list of names of Arab women whose engagement had been announced. The average engagement period was a little more than a year. The majority of women were Muslim, and all were going to marry partners of the same religion.

The study utilized women from the respondent’s community as assistants and included the administration of the self-report measure of the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2; Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996), which was adjusted to be culturally appropriate. Haj Yahia found that psychological abuse had been experienced most often by the engaged women (close to 75% of the women had been psychologically abused at least once), followed by smaller percentages of physical abuse (just under 20%), and then by sexual abuse (13%).

Haj Yahia’s investigation had many strengths, including the use of the standardized Revised CTS, evaluated and adjusted for cultural appropriateness; the involvement of community women as research assistants to enhance the comfort and security of participants; the large return rate (close to 80%); and the sensitive manner in which the sample was recruited. Again, issues arise in terms of the use of a self-report measure, and the nature of the sample, although in this case an attempt was made to make the sample as representative as possible to ensure generalization to other Arab women in Israel. Finally, it may be questioned as to whether Arab women in Israel are comparable to Arab women residing in Arab countries.

In another study by Haj Yahia (2002) conducted in Jordan, the country is described as a patriarchal society in which traditional gender roles are paramount and where men are considered to be dominant both according to Islam as it is interpreted (although he mentions that clearly there are other more egalitarian interpretations of the Koran) and in society and the culture. Within this framework, Haj Yahia investigated attitudes toward wife beating among
more than 350 Jordanian wives, the majority of whom were Muslim. Respondents were approached in public organizational settings such as health clinics in three different locations: a city, a village on the outskirts of the city, and a refugee camp. In the study measuring female attitudes, a standardized scale, the revised Inventory of Beliefs about Wife-Beating (IBWB; Saunders, Lynch, Grayson, & Linz, 1987) and the Familial Patriarchal Beliefs Scale (FPB scale; Smith, 1990), among other measures, were administered to participants. All measures were modified to be culturally appropriate.

Haj Yahia found that a strong tendency emerged among Jordanian women in his sample to justify wife beating (from about 35% to close to 70%, depending on the described behavior of the wife), particularly if she is disobedient or does not respect her husband’s family. In general, Jordanian women saw the women’s behavior as being the cause of the beating and believed that the beating would help them to become better wives. These wives also tended to dismiss the violent behavior of the husbands (e.g., ‘‘they are men and that’s how men are,’’ Haj Yahia, 2002, p. 288) and failed to support punishment for abusive husbands. Haj Yahia stated that most Arab countries do not have specific laws against domestic abuse. It could be inferred that, far from seeing the abuse even as a ‘‘private family matter’’ as was indicated in some of the studies performed in Latin America, these respondents did not view the abuse as a problem at all, although Haj Yahia did not reach this conclusion. Patriarchal beliefs also played a role in predicting these attitudes.

This second Haj Yahia study also was a significant contribution to cross-cultural investigations of domestic abuse in part because of the standardized measures used, which were reviewed for cultural appropriateness, and for the sensitive manner in which the materials were administered.
However, as Haj Yahia stated, the study still involved a convenience sample, which would limit generalization of the results, and all measures were self-reports. Most importantly, as indicated by the author, the investigator did not ask if the women had been physically or psychologically abused. However, it is an important initial attempt to describe the influence of a variety of factors on attitudes toward wife beating in Jordan. Of course, sampling men, although it would be extremely difficult, would add to the generalizing ability of the results.

- **Europe**

McCloskey, Treviso, Scionti, and dal Pozzo (2002) compared characteristics and risk factors of abused women in Italy with those in the United States. Thirty-two battered women were recruited from a hotline service in Rome (the author indicated that it was unclear what the response rate was for this sample), and their responses were compared with 50 women recruited from shelters in the southwest part of the United States, representing a response rate of 50 percent. The U.S. sample consisted of approximately equal numbers of Hispanic and European-American women. The researchers administered a modified version of the CTS and a measure of psychopathology (the Brief Symptom Inventory; Derogatis & Melisaratos, 1983).

All samples in the study demonstrated comparable levels of physical abuse, but American women had experienced sexual abuse more frequently than Italian women. One important difference was that Italian women generally stayed in their marriages longer than American women, which could be attributed in part to the Italian family structure, which may be more patriarchal, according to the authors, making it more difficult for the wives to leave. The researchers found that alcohol was implicated in wife beating in the United States, but not in Italy.
McCloskey et al. (2002) reviewed several limitations of their study, including the fact that the samples were self-selected and therefore generalization was limited, there was an absence of control samples of women who were not abused, the measures were all based on self-reports, and there might have been underreporting of the abuse. In addition, the numbers of respondents were small for both samples, and the Italian group was recruited from a source (hotline) that was different from the American sample, which was recruited from shelters.

An analysis of domestic violence in Russia was proposed by Horne (1999). In her article, Horne cited a number of sources that suggested the rate of domestic violence in Russia could be at least four or five times as extensive as that in other Western nations. In examining the possible causes of this increased incidence of intimate partner violence, she discussed the influence of the lowered status of women as well as the reemergence of traditional gender-roles in Russian society. Horne proposed that these factors are a more significant determination of high rates of incidence than the commonly held perceptions that the unpredictability of the changing economic and political climate, the general increase of violence in society, and the problem of alcoholism are the primary causes of increased violence against female partners. To support her contention, Horne discussed the concept of domestic violence as a family issue rather than a national social problem, as well as the difficulties that women face in the Russian legal system.

Types of Perpetrators of Domestic Violence

One of the most frequently cited classification of perpetrators was developed by Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994). This categorization identified three types of potential abusers:
1. ‘‘Family-only’’ batterers: This type of perpetrator engages in less violent behavior and is not likely to be psychologically disturbed.

2. Dysphoric-borderline men engage in more violent behavior both against their wives and other people outside the family home. These abusers are psychologically disturbed, exhibit borderline personality characteristics, and may have an alcohol abuse problem.

3. Violent antisocial abusers are the most violent both at home and elsewhere and exhibit antisocial personality disorder characteristics.

More recently, Jacobson and Gottman (1998) used a dual classification system to identify abusers as either ‘‘cobras,’’ who were described as ‘‘cold,’’ as detected by physiological measures, even when attacking their victims, and ‘‘pit bulls,’’ who showed more physiological activation patterns when attacking their partners. Johnson and Ferraro (2000) compared the cobra category to the antisocial abusers of the above system, and the pit bulls to the dysphoric-borderline category.

Clearly it is important to understand perpetrators’ behavior and characteristics so that prevention and intervention programs may be developed to eliminate domestic violence cross-culturally. Primary prevention programs are targeted to large groups of individuals, but likely would be most effective with the family-only batterers. Secondary programs developed to target at-risk abusers might be effective with the dysphoric-borderline perpetrators. However, it is possible that any prevention program would be ineffective with violent antisocial abusers.

The issue of classification of batterers and development of appropriate prevention programs cross-culturally is a significant step forward. In many countries, the issue is seen as a private one that is not discussed in public; there is cultural support for wife battering, which sometimes is internalized by battered women; or prevention programs are directed solely or
primarily at domestic violence victims. It is important for societies to assign responsibility for violence to perpetrators and to develop programs to reduce spousal violence, as well as to train victims to protect themselves and to provide these battered spouses with supportive services and shelters.

**Specific Comparisons of Workplace Sexual Harassment and Domestic Violence**

Beyond the theoretical comparisons, there are other conceptual parallels that can be drawn between the two types of violence. For example, sexual harassment can be divided into two forms: quid pro quo and hostile work environment; domestic violence also can be assigned categories: physical abuse (including murder), psychological abuse, and sexual abuse. Although power and dominance issues are relevant to all categories of sexual harassment and intimate partner violence, quid pro quo can be seen as conceptually similar to physical abuse, and hostile work environment appears to be more related to psychological abuse.

Both quid pro quo and physical abuse are clearer examples of inappropriate behavior and are more difficult to misinterpret than psychological abuse and hostile work environment. In legal cases, quid pro quo harassment incidents have to happen only once to be actionable; similarly, severe physical abuse clearly can lead to arrest and convictions of the abuser. However, hostile work environment sexual harassment is much more difficult to prosecute, as is psychological domestic abuse, even though these types of behaviors probably occur more frequently than the more severe forms of violence. In each case, there has to be a pattern of behavior before action can be instituted.

The public view of psychological abuse and hostile workplace climate clearly is less negative than reactions to more severe forms of abuse. The lesser forms of abuse are seen as
relatively ambiguous, and as not very serious, which can lead to legal problems in prosecution. Physical evidence is readily available in physical abuse cases, but not in psychological abuse.

Another similar aspect of both types of violence is that laws may be passed prohibiting the behavior, but enforcement of these laws lags behind the legislation in many countries, and not just in patriarchal societies. Abused wives often are discouraged and fail to report the abuse, and the same pattern is true for victims of workplace sexual harassment.

**Reactions of Victims, Outcomes for Victims, and Types of Perpetrators**

In both types of violent behavior, female victims often internalize blame or responsibility for their victimization (as seen, for example, in the Haj Yahia, 2002, finding that Jordanian women believe that women who are physically abused deserve this treatment because they are “bad wives”). In terms of outcomes, the clearest psychological consequence of both intimate partner violence and workplace sexual harassment is depression. The issue of whether or not PTSD is associated with these types of victimization has to be resolved through more methodologically sound studies.

Comparisons of types of perpetrators of sexually harassing behaviors and intimate partner violence are less clear-cut, primarily because there has not been sufficient research related to perpetrators. It is possible, however, to conceptually relate chronic, persistent quid pro quo sexual harassers to “hard-core” domestic abusers. In both cases, treatment would be unlikely to eliminate the harassers’ behavior. Family only batterers may be similar to opportunistic harassers—more situational perpetrators. Victims are readily accessible in the family setting, and situational factors such as frustration (e.g., financial, relatives, crying babies) may contribute to these types of spouse abusers. In a comparable sense, opportunistic harassers do not continually
seek out victims, but if they are available and the workplace climate is supportive of harassment and protective of harassers, then the sexual harassment behavior may occur. Similarities between the two types of perpetrators also focus on the prediction that family-only batterers and opportunistic sexual harassers may be prevented from engaging in the negative behavior by secondary prevention programs directed toward at-risk individuals.

LECTURE NINE
Girls to Women: Developmental Theory, Research, and Issues

Introduction:
This lecture discusses the developmental stages that girls go through before being called women. After this, you will be vast at knowing the processes.

Content:
How do girls become women? We believe that any response to this question must explain more than a change in size and physical maturation over time. This is not merely asking how girls mature, but how girls come to have different expectations, specific family and social roles, and characteristic interpersonal styles. Further, we consider to what extent they behave differently based on gender, and how can we
explain the changes across the early life span. The goal in this chapter is to examine the theories, research, and issues relevant to girls’ development. A relatively comprehensive, although not exhaustive, perspective of the conditions and circumstances that influence the gender-specific development of girls from infancy through adolescence. During this examination, with particularly focus on the diversity among girls and how development evolves in different cultural and social contexts.

In virtually every society, there is a process through which female children pass on their way to mature womanhood. While we recognize the importance of genetic predisposition and physical growth, the metamorphosis also involves emotional, psychological, and social domains. In our fast-paced modern world, the complexity of growing up female has been heightened by changing definitions regarding the female role and the conflicting expectations of society. The primarily biological aspects of female behavior we will refer to as ‘‘sex’’-related, that is, genetic or innate.

Knaak (2004) argued that gender is actually a multidimensional construct with subjective dimensions about the meaning that have yet to be fully explored. She further suggested that gender includes organizational and cultural components that are inseparable in our understanding and explanations. This is consistent with Thorne’s thesis (2001), which describes gender boundaries as flexible and specific to individual contexts.

MAJOR DEVELOPMENTAL ISSUES

At the basic level, development can be defined as a combination of quantitative and qualitative growth that occurs over time. We see growth as a young girl’s body grows into that of a woman’s. We see the results of development in her increasing grasp of language and social skills and in greater intellectual achievements. Development is also obvious in the young woman’s increasing recognition of societal expectations and her possible acceptance of limits on her future behavior and aspirations.

Developmental Approach

The developmental approach to studying behavior is an attempt to establish the rules for the changes that may be observed over time (Newman & Newman, 1987). Much of developmental theory may be found to revolve about a core set of issues. In the examination of girls’ development, one begins by addressing these traditional issues that provide a context for examining girls’ changing status. We ask to what extent nature and nurture influence development; we also ask about gender constancy, and to what extent children are active in defining their role. These questions help frame our understanding of the various factors moving girls from infancy toward adulthood.

Nature and Nurture

The question of whether female development and stereotypic female behavior occurs due to the forces of nature (genetic, biological, and inherited factors) or nurture (learned, experiential, and
environmental factors) provided the basis of much of developmental research through the early decades of child study. Early developmental investigators posed the issue as an ‘either/or’ question. Today, most psychologists accept the belief that an understanding of both the biological concomitants of behavior and the external influences on that behavior is necessary for a psychology of women that is accurate and complete (Baumeister, 2000).

A decision to accept the interactivity of both inherited and environmental influences can have far-reaching impact. For example, in discussing the role of women in the workplace, a recently fought court case hinged on testimony from researchers claiming, on behalf of the company, that women were not interested in or suited for the higher paying jobs because of the skills required, while other social scientists, on behalf of the female plaintiffs, presented facts suggesting that women were discouraged from pursuing the lucrative posts (Nelson & Bridges, 1999). Even for school-age girls, arguments continue about girls’ aptitude and interest in science, mathematics, technological subjects, and sports. The beliefs and expectations of parents, teachers, and peers may, indeed, shape the opportunities for a girl’s future role (Frome & Eccles, 1998; Howes, Phillipsen, Peisner-Feingberg, 2000).

Gender Constancy, Behavior, or Salience

Cognitive-developmental theorists and researchers, such as Piaget (1947) and Kohlberg (1976), suggested that children actively engage the environment to understand the roles of male and female. The focus on constructing understanding of gender is described as important for the child to sustain constancy in her understanding of what it means to be a girl so that she can behave in accordance with her beliefs. Social learning theorists, on the other hand, proposed that situations and actions lead to consistent gender behaviors (Bandura & Walters, 1963). This more passive view of children’s development suggests that that rewards and patterns of support shape the beliefs and gender view that children hold. More recently, gender schema theorists have studied the salience of gender roles for children’s lives and proposed that this dimension has greatest impact on development (Thorne & Luria, 2003). In one effort to clarify the relationship among these three domains of gender development (i.e., constancy beliefs, consistent behaviors, and saliency), researchers studied preschool children and found that gender salience and gender-typed behavior were strongly related and predicted children’s masculinity or femininity, whereas understanding of gender constancy was not a predictor of behavior (Levy, Barth, & Zimmerman, 1998).

Critical Periods versus Plasticity

Developmental research has traditionally raised the question of whether there are critical times during which a particular developmental change should occur for optimal results. The importance of determining when one set of changes influences another may be illustrated by recent environmental changes shown to affect girls’ biological development. For example, until recent years the onset of menstruation and physical changes of puberty were expected to occur in the early teen years. Now, girls
as young as eight years old may manifest signs of pubescence. Some researchers have attributed early onset of puberty to hormonal supplements to food sources and changes in diet (Phinney, Jensen, & Olson, 1990). This premature maturation appears to upset social and psychological development in ways we are just beginning to understand.

**SOCIETAL EXPECTATIONS AND GENDER-ROLE PRESCRIPTIONS**

Female roles are prescribed in every society with clear and distinct behavioral expectations for girls and women (Bem, 1981). The behavior our society accepts as appropriate for young girls and women has been defined and carefully socialized into our consciousness through a variety of sources, both personal and institutional. While there are some cultural and ethnic differences, there is a surprisingly strong consensus across groups as to what constitutes gender-appropriate behaviors for girls and women (Lott, 1987). For instance, girls are expected to be gentle, obedient, caring, and nurturing. An important notion underlying these societal expectations is that relationships and interconnectedness with others is an important aspect in the lives of girls and women (Taylor, Gilligan, & Sullivan, 1995). Although these societal expectations and gender-role prescriptions are still prevalent in today’s society, now there is much more flexibility in the ways women and girls can define themselves.

Scholars have focused on the ways in which girls prepare themselves to negotiate these gender roles. While psychological theory has promoted the notion that “feminine” and “masculine” characteristics are both necessary and complementary components of a well-adjusted adult (Bem, 1983), some people have been resistant to relinquishing the notion that gender-role-related characteristics are opposite and contradictory to one another. Girls, at an early age, are able to recognize and distinguish these societal expectations and gender-role prescriptions (Martin & Ruble, 2004). Given that young girls can comprehend these societal expectations and gender-role prescriptions, it is safe to say that they can have a major impact on their growth and development. Thus, to fully understand the impact of these societal expectations on girls, we should acknowledge that gender-role-related information emanates from many sources. In the section below, we will highlight the two most influential contexts for the gender development of girls: home and school. Additionally, this section highlights the influence of the media as well as culture influences on gender development.

**Influence of Parents**

Undoubtedly, parents play an important role in the shaping of a girl’s development of gender-role-appropriate behaviors and ideas (Lanvers, 2004; Martin, 2000). Surveys and discussions with parents of young children demonstrate a general consensus that girls are expected to be verbal, compliant; physically weak, quiet, and clean (Basow, 1992). For newborns, both parents, but fathers especially, perceive their daughters as smaller, more delicate, less active, and weaker than they perceive sons (Delk, Madden, Livingston, & Ryan, 1986). In a recent study, Peterson (2004) found that both mothers and
fathers were more descriptive of their daughters’ injuries than sons; the author speculated that this increased discourse surrounding the details of the injury may be related to parents’ endorsement of gender roles, particularly the fragility of their daughters.

The same pattern of gender-distinctive treatment has been found in studies regarding toy selection. Typically, these studies have found that while girls are given dolls, dollhouses, and miniature household appliances (Etaugh & Liss, 1992), boys are provided with building blocks, sports equipment, models of vehicles, and animals. In a recent study, Blakemore and Centers (2005) found that girls’ toys were associated with more feminine characteristics, such as physical attractiveness and nurturance, and that boys’ toys were associated with more masculine stereotyped characteristics, such as violence and competitiveness.

Parents’ gender-stereotyped perceptions may also influence how parents behave in daily interactions with their daughters and sons. For instance, parents were observed to engage in more “rescuing” behavior with girls, that is, assisting and accompanying girls more often than necessary (Marmion & Lundberg-Love, 2004) than with boys. Additionally, parents, particularly mothers, appear to engage in more supportive and encouraging discussions with their daughters than with sons (Leaper, Anderson, & Sanders, 1998). Fathers, on the other hand, are found to be less involved with their daughters than sons (Stright & Bales, 2003).

These gender-role beliefs may ultimately have an indirect influence on the school performance of girls; parents’ beliefs about their daughters, in turn, influence the daughters’ own academic self-perceptions in negative ways (Jacobs, 1991). Additional studies have found that the association between parents and the child’s self-perceptions strengthen with age, suggesting that girls may internalize their parents’ gender-stereotype views of girls’ abilities (cf. Tiedemann, 2000; Wigfield et al., 1997).

It is important to assert that other family characteristics, such as social class, religion, lifestyle, and so forth, may also influence gender typed behaviors and activities. However, most studies have not examined how these factors may influence gender-typed parenting. There is some indication that socialization of feminine gender-role behavior does vary with social class and that this socialization would impact directly the achievement behavior exhibited by girls. Carr and Mednick’s (1988) study of African American preschool children supported this contention. In particular, they found that girls with greater nontraditional gender-role training were higher in achievement. Other studies also have found class differences among African American families that suggest that working-class girls will have fewer gender-role constraints (Romer & Cherry, 1980). However, Higginbotham and Weber (1992) and Hill (1999) suggested that middle-class families had higher academic and career expectations as well as greater involvement in the education-related activities of their daughters than working-class families. Although there have been few studies that have taken an intersectional approach, several scholars have
asserted the importance of examining how race, gender, and social class interact to influence the gender development of girls (Collins, 1998; Denner & Dunbar, 2004; Hill, 2002; Reid et al., 1989).

Ethnicity and social class are important influences in the gender development of girls, but it is also important to mention other parenting characteristics that influence gender roles. One area of focus has been mothers’ employment status and its role in girls’ development (Dundas & Kaufman, 2000; Marmion & Lundberg-Love, 2004). There is some evidence that daughters of employed mothers may be more likely to perceive women’s roles as involving freedom of choice and satisfaction (Baruch & Barnett, 1986).

Although parents have an important role in the gender development of their children, it is not the sole factor. We note that children’s own characteristics also influence gender-role-related expectations and behaviors. In particular, research has indicated that parents appear to modify their gendered expectations and treatment of their children as they become older (van Welter Bogt, & Raaijmakers, 2002). Research data also show how various characteristics of children, such as temperament, activity-level, and responsiveness, have also been found to influence the expectations parents may hold for their daughters (Karraker & Coleman, 2005). Thus, daughters’ characteristics may serve as important moderators for parents’ gender-typed behaviors and expectations for them.

Influence of School

Just as parents cannot be considered the sole agent of gender-role typing, we must recognize that their influence is not constant across childhood. Researchers suggest that parental influence on children’s attitudes become less prominent as children transition into adolescence (Baruch & Barnett, 1986; Basow & Rubin, 1999). We must, therefore, consider other socialization agents if we are to understand fully the influences on gender-role development.

In our society, as children mature, they are particularly exposed to societal expectations in school settings. Both teachers and peers have been found to serve as strong agents for appropriate gender role-related behaviors (Maccoby, 1998). Some studies have suggested that teachers are more open to explore gender roles with girls than boys (Cahill & Adams, 1997). Yet, much of the literature has found that, like parents, teachers reinforce gender-typed behaviors and activities. For example, teachers report more dependency in their relationships with female students (Halliday, McNaughton & Glynn, 1985; Howes et al., 2000). Also, in a recent observational study of preschool children, Chick, Heilman-Houser, and Hunter (2003) found that teachers engage in multiple gender-typed behaviors in the classroom, including girls receiving less teacher attention, girls receiving comments about their appearance and ability to help others, teachers expressing more emotion in communication with girls, and use of gender-typed toys and classroom activities. Teachers have also been found to hold gender stereotypes regarding their students.
For instance, teachers have been found to perceive higher ability for girls in verbal ability and to perceive that males have higher ability in math (Eccles, 1993; Frome & Eccles, 1998; Herbert & Stipek, 2005).

As youth enter school, interactions with peers become increasingly important in shaping and reinforcing the gender-typed behaviors of girls (Witt, 2000). Gender roles are clearly present in the peer interactions of girls, particularly behaviors that reinforce female gender stereotypes (Galambos, 2004; Marmion & Lundberg-Love, 2004). Although research findings are somewhat equivocal on this point, there is some indication that girls engage in more female gender-typed behaviors in peer interactions, exhibiting more collaboration (Hops, Alpert, & Davis, 1997; Phelps, 2001), more nurturing behavior (Jarvinen & Nicholls, 1996), and more self-disclosure in their friendships (Lansford & Parker, 1999) compared to boys. These gender-typed characteristics are also encouraged by both male and female peers. For instance, peers’ popularity ratings of girls have been found to be based on common female gender-stereotyped characteristics, such as physical appearance and social skills (Adler, Kless, & Adler, 1992). Thus, those girls who are designated as most popular by their male and female peers often exhibit traditionally female gender-typed characteristics and behaviors.

In their interactions with male peers, girls often exhibit more subordinate behaviors. Specifically, the literature has suggested that girls accept subordinate positions even when they may possess superior knowledge and expertise (Lockheed & Hall, 1976; Mathews, 1975). Although girls may exert influence over same-sex peers’ behaviors, they do not appear to exert the same influence within cross-sex friendships (Gaughan, 2006). Thus, even at an early age, female-stereotyped behaviors that emphasize passivity and submissiveness in exchanges with males are reinforced through their interactions with male peers. As girls mature, peers become more flexible with respect to gender-typed behaviors (McHale, Kim, Whiteman, & Crouter, 2004; Ruble & Martin, 1998). However, by that time, these gender-role-related behaviors and beliefs may be deeply entrenched. Thus, these behaviors that are reinforced through their peer interactions have important implications for the growth and development of girls.

**PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT**

Despite the recent focus on the integration of multiple perspectives (e.g., biopsychosocial models) and environmental influences on development, physical development and biological events remain important throughout the life span. With an understanding of how females develop through childhood and adolescence, it is important to examine the interaction between internal and external factors (Reid & Paludi, 1993).

**Childhood Development**

The first two years of life is one of the periods, along with adolescence, where the most rapid growth occurs. During this time, girls are generally smaller in size compared with boys, but girls have more advanced skeletal and neurological systems and greater sensitivity to auditory stimuli (Paludi,
1985). In early childhood, girls have an advantage in fine motor skills and those gross motor skills that require balance, compared to boys (Thomas & French, 1985).

Research has not revealed consistent sex differences in the area of early learning, but much research has focused on physical activity. While findings have been mixed at this stage, research on physical changes during childhood and adolescence has suggested sex differences. Sports-related skills are greater among young boys, and this gap increases around adolescence (Malina & Bouchard, 1991). What is important to note is that this difference is most likely not only due to differences in muscle development. While girls’ involvement in sports has increased over the past decades, boys still outnumber girls in team sports, and girls are in general less physically active, in part because boys have traditionally received more encouragement for developing sports-related skills (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 1999).

Consistent with research, it appears that sex differences can be interpreted not only as biological but also as a reflection of the interaction between social environment and biology (Bem, 1981; Tobach, 2004). It is not that girls are biologically inferior; in fact, girls’ language acquisition is quite rapid and typically surpasses that of boys through grade school. Rather, it is the interaction of low expectations and lack of rewards for physical performance that contribute to girls’ lower performance in areas that have been traditionally defined as more appropriate for boys. Whatever genetic differences might exist are exacerbated by socially constructed norms. Culturally prescribed characteristics of femininity are congruent with the lack of physical prowess.

It seems more difficult for society to focus on the physical achievements of female athletes. For example, African American tennis champions Venus and Serena Williams have been discussed in the media for their grunts during play, wardrobe, and experiences with poverty, with such commentary often overshadowing their athletic dominance on the court. Similarly, several Eastern European female tennis players are widely recognized for their physical attractiveness. A recent advertisement juxtaposed Maria Sharapova’s athletic prowess with the song ‘‘I Feel Pretty.’’ Research has investigated how cultural expectations can exert themselves through atmosphere and social pressure in unspoken and unmarked ways in the sports arena (Douglas, 2005). The message continues to be that women athletes are still judged by stereotypic norms, not by their sports-related achievements.

**Adolescent Development**

Puberty, another period of rapid growth, marks the beginning of adolescence and involves hormonal and bodily changes. The hypothalamus, pituitary gland, and gonads play key roles in this process. The hypothalamus signals the pituitary gland to release the hormone known as gonadotropin, which can occur during adolescents’ sleep a year or so before any of the physical changes associated with puberty appear (Schowalter & Anyan, 1981). Estrogens are the dominant hormone related to female
development and increase during puberty. Estradiol is an estrogen that influences breast development, uterine development, and skeletal changes. Despite the known biological links, social factors, behavior, and mood can also affect hormones and subsequently adolescent development (Brooks-Gunn & Warren, 1989; Paikoff, Buchanan, & Brooks-Gunn, 1991).

Data indicate that in most cultures the age at which girls begin to menstruate has been dropping steadily for the last several centuries. In the United States, the age when puberty is reached has steadily decreased, with the trend now leveling off. On average, most girls experience a height spurt, breast growth, and growth of pubic hair around age 10, and experience menarche, or first menstruation, around 13 years of age (Reid & Paludi, 1993). Girls typically mature on the average of two years earlier than boys. In the United States, menarche is considered in the normal range between the ages of 9 and 15. One of the contributing factors to early puberty is obesity, possibly explained by the finding that fat cells stimulate the production of sex hormones. These linkages could explain why breast and pubic hair growth and menarche occur earlier for heavy and obese girls (Must & Strauss, 1999).

In general, adolescent girls are less satisfied with their bodies and have more negative body images compared to boys (Brooks-Gunn & Paikoff, 1993). Girls who matured early had more negative feelings about menstruation compared to average or late maturing girls. Early maturing girls have also been found to be vulnerable to problem behaviors (e.g., smoking, drinking, eating disorders; Dick, Rose, Viken, & Kaprio, 2000; Petersen, 1993). These girls often feel pressure of sexual responsibilities that they are not emotionally prepared to accept. Some suggest that the late-maturing girls are more satisfied with their body image since they more closely model the ideal of being tall and thin.

It is important to note that the effects of puberty are numerous and complex. There is not one course of events that occurs for early-, average-, or late-maturing girls. Qualitative research suggests that girls who were prepared for the change of menarche were better able to accept the body changes (Teitelman, 2004). In general, it seems that numerous socialization agents, including parents, peers, and media, among others, contribute to adolescent girls’ perception of their bodies and puberty. Further, gendered socialization from these agents, particularly parents and significant others intensifies during this time (Galambos, 2004).

COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT

There are few differences in the areas of cognitive abilities for girls compared to boys, or women compared to men. While some scholars have suggested that males and females are innately different with respect to cognitive ability, others have asserted that males and females exhibit more similarities than dissimilarities on cognitive variables (Hyde, 2005; see also Walsh, 1997). Given this difference of opinion, the debate continues as researchers examine and attempt to explain the role of gender in cognitive ability. For males and females, cognitive development, memory, language, spatial
understanding, facial recognition, numerical comprehension, and other cognitive skills proceed along similar timelines. Developmentally, girls typically advance faster through infancy. However, individual differences offer a broad array of environmental factors (including birth order and family practices) that play a role in development. Meta-analyses of research on a variety of abilities demonstrated few consistent findings linking gender to cognitive traits (Jacklin, 1989; Maccoby & Jacklin, 1987). Still, interest in examining gender–cognitive relationships continues to be high.
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The earliest efforts to uncover gender differences focused on defining women as inferior based on biological traits (e.g., smaller brains, ignoring the body–brain ratio); such investigations created considerable wariness of even the most scientifically conducted studies (Shields, 1975). Thus, conclusions that suggest the cognitive abilities of girls and women are due to purely biological factors are routinely challenged (Safir, 1986), even as researchers provide clear evidence of biological forces (Resnick, Gottesman, Berenbaum, & Bouchard, 1986).

Language Ability

An area of clear distinction for girls is language ability. Girls have been found to outperform boys on verbal and language tasks (Bornstein, Haynes, Painter, & Genevro, 2000; Galsworthy, Dionne, Dale, & Plomin, 2000; Haden, Haine, & Fivush, 1997). On average, girls begin to vocalize at an earlier age than boys, are more responsive to their mothers’ speech, and demonstrate more adeptness at verbal tasks (Hyde, Fennema, & Lamon, 1990; Hyde & McKinley, 1997). Studies have also demonstrated that girls exhibit more word-fluency than boys (Halpern & Wright, 1996). These findings have been replicated in more recent studies (Lawton & Hatcher, 2005). In particular, studies have indicated that girls acquire
language more quickly than boys (Haden et al., 1997). Additionally, studies have found that girls had better memory recall than boys, particularly when recalling words (Geffen, Moar, O’Hanlan, Clark, & Geffen, 1990). In support of these findings, the literature has suggested that boys are also more likely to be diagnosed with reading disabilities and speech disorders than girls (Liederman, Kantrowitz, & Flannery, 2005; Rutter et al., 2004).

Although these studies may support assumptions about gender differences in cognitive abilities, several investigations have indicated that there is more complexity than ‘‘girls are better in verbal tasks’’ (Hyde & McKinley, 1997; Hyde, Fennema, & Lamon, 1990). In particular, although girls had better performance on verbal tasks, particularly in the early years, a number of studies found that boys had higher scores on verbal standardized tests (Hyde & McKinley, 1997; Kramer, Kaplan, Delis, O’Donnell, & Prifitera, 1997; Morisset, Barnars, & Booth, 1995). These findings are even further complicated given that girls have been consistently found to have higher levels of academic achievement in language and writing courses compared to their male counterparts (American Association of University Women Educational Foundation, 1998; Willingham & Cole, 1997).

Mathematical Reasoning and Visual-Spatial Skills

Mathematical reasoning is the ability to apply verbal information in the process of reaching a mathematical conclusion, that is, word-problem solving. Visual-spatial skills can be globally defined as the ‘‘ability to discern the relationship between shapes and objects’’ and include special perception, mental rotation, and spatial visualization as important components (Halpern, 2000, p. 98). Both mathematical reasoning and visual-spatial skills are utilized in a variety of scientific, technological, engineering, and mathematical (STEM) fields (Halpern, 2000, p. 100). Considerable discussion has been focused on how gender differences in these areas may explain the underrepresentation of women in engineering and architectural careers.

Studies investigating gender differences in visual-spatial reasoning have consistently found that boys perform better on spatial tasks than girls (Lawton & Hatcher, 2005; Levine, Huttenlocher, Taylor, & Langrock, 1999; McGuinness & Morley, 1991). Both Halpern (2000) and Hedges and Nowell (1995) found that boys performed better on visual-spatial tasks than girls did. The conclusions of a meta-analysis by Voyer, Voyer, and Bryden (1995) concurred, and in particular suggested that gender differences in spatial perception and mental rotation represented significant and meaningful variances in abilities.

Physical-Cognitive Functions
There are a number of physical functions with cognitive connections that researchers have evaluated in terms of gender. For example, studies have suggested that girls are more sensitive to touch than boys (Reinisch & Sanders, 1992). Shaffer (1989) reviewed a number of studies focused on complex cognitive functioning and found that girls were more responsive to infants, less demanding, and more likely to respond to parents’ social overtures. Similarly, research by McClure (2000) also supports the idea that girls are more responsive to others’ facial expressions than boys. Investigations of emotional expressiveness suggested that girls are more emotionally expressive and are also more in tune to social cues than boys are (Cervantes & Callahan, 1998). Interestingly, whether these myriad differences are due to biological underpinnings or differential socialization practices for boys and girls has not been determined.

**Social Influences on Cognitive Development**

Although researchers are still exploring sex differences in cognitive abilities, the literature has now begun to focus on how both biological and environment factors may explain girls’ superior performance on verbal tasks and boys’ superior performance on mathematical and spatial tasks (Van Hulle, Goldsmith, & Lemery, 2004). Some scholars have suggested that these gender differences in cognitive ability may have biological explanations, but that they are also cultivated through socialization (Eccles et al., 2000; Maccoby, 1998). Investigations also suggest that disadvantageous circumstances in environment or experience may affect attitudes toward learning and styles of interacting with other people (Rutter, 1985).

Extrapolating from these general findings to understand the development of girls’ cognitive skills leads us to expect that there will be an interaction of cognitive functioning with socialization experiences in ways that are not yet fully understood. For example, studies have found that girls’ perceptions of their mathematical ability may be heightened by intervention programs (Reid & Roberts, 2006). Thus, discussions of ability on cognitive tasks should be centered on gender-role prescriptions, as well as on how girls and women are socialized in our society.

**Adolescent Thought**

Childhood egocentrism is defined as the inability to take another’s perspective, but for adolescents, egocentrism is self-focus related to interest. Elkind (1967) notes that adolescents assume that other people are as interested in, and fascinated by, them and their behavior as they are themselves. There is, thus, a failure to distinguish between their personal concerns and the opinions of others. Some researchers have asserted that, during adolescence, youth are also more likely to define themselves based on their relation and connections to others (Labouvie-Vief, Chiodo, Goguen, Diehl, & Orwoll, 1995). Such connections appear to be of greater importance for girls and women compared to boys and men.
(Rycek, Stuhr, McDermott, Benker, & Schwartz, 1998). Studies that have investigated this perspective, however, have not fully proven that egocentric thought is entirely characteristic of adolescence.

Adolescence also ushers in more complex cognitive-processing and reasoning skills for youth (Piaget, 1947). In particular, this developmental period brings the ability to integrate their experiences and the experiences of others (Quintana, 1998). Deductive and conditional reasoning also emerge in adolescence (Muller, Overton, & Reene, 2001; Ward & Overton, 1990). Given that gender-role socialization may intensify during adolescence, these cognitive-processing skills may now allow girls to recognize and interpret conveyed gender-typed behaviors and expectations. It is safe to presume that this ability to interpret these behaviors and expectations also may influence the worldviews of adolescent girls. Further, adolescent girls may be more equipped to communicate these newly developed worldviews with important others in their lives (Reich, Oser, & Valentin, 1994).

**Cultural Concerns and Issues**

Girls’ and women’s development must be viewed as taking place within a well-defined cultural and social context. During the past few decades, increasing attention has been given to identifying and understanding these contexts. Thus, a concerted effort has been undertaken to extend understanding of female experiences beyond the limits of white, middle-class contexts. Investigations have begun to examine gender-role definitions as they operate within Asian, black, and Hispanic American communities (Chow, Wilinson, & Zinn, 1996; Denner & Guzman, 2006; Jordan, 1997). Researchers seek to identify normative patterns of behavior within a variety of social class conditions. These many worlds of girls and women are important for consideration if a complete understanding of the factors that influence developmental processes are to be established.

An important concern of researchers interested in understanding the processes that lead to gender-role development in girls is the use of the assumption of universality. Study after study repeats the fatal flaw by issuing conclusions about developmental processes that influence “girls or women,” when in fact only one group, white girls or women, has been observed. Serious consideration is certainly due the suggestion that there are often significant differences in the socialization experiences of ethnic minority girls. The choice to ignore the differences and to pretend that universality is the rule appears increasingly unacceptable.

On the other hand, a total rejection of applicability of findings across cultural or racial groups is also unsound. A reasonable solution may be found in the recognition that various degrees of duality exist in the socialization process for ethnic minority girls. Minority group girls, like white girls in our society, are socialized to accept various expectations and roles for which parents, community institutions, and others prepare them (Lott, 1987; Reid, 1981). Girls, regardless of race, are expected to be interested in babies, to develop verbal skills, and to be more nurturing, quieter, and more disciplined than boys. While
these and many other similarities in girls’ experiences may be identified, we must also recognize the differences for children in ethnic communities. The recognition includes understanding that the differences profoundly impact the way the lives of girls evolve.

Post test:
1. Explain and list stages in girls to women

LECTURE TEN
Women's Career Development

Introduction:
In this lecture you will be made to understand how career is developed for women and some career roles with various challenges attached to it.

Content:
As recently as 1964, the preface to Borow’s volume Man in a World at Work stated:
Work is the social act around which each of us establishes a meaningful and rewarding life routine. One has but to witness the lives of men without work, or of men who lack edifying work—alienated, thwarted and cutoff from the fulfillment of the most human of sentiments, a sense of usefulness and purpose—to recognize the validity of the commonly voiced doctrine that work is, indeed, a way of life.

In this poignant statement, there is no acknowledgment of nor any concern expressed for women—it was assumed that when women ‘‘worked’’ (as in outside the home), it was because their labor was needed by the economy, as was the case with the Rosie the Riveters of World War II (Colman, 1995), that they were working until they could ‘‘land’’ a husband, or that they were that most pitiable of characters—the spinster (see, for example, Toibin, 2004).
It has only been since the 1960s that women’s work has been taken seriously by at least some segments within psychology and society, and the concept of women actually having careers, vocations other than motherhood, received serious study. Today the study of women’s career development is a vibrant and critically important field of psychology—we now take women’s careers seriously.

Not surprisingly, the most common family lifestyle today is the “dual earner” family (Gilbert & Kearney, 2006). As described by Gilbert and Kearney (2006) and by Barnett and Hyde (2001), we now have “work-family convergence” (Gilbert & Kearney, 2006, p. 196), where both work and family are considered important in the lives of both women and men, and where many if not most workers prefer the two roles equally. Thus, as psychologists, educators, and counselors, it is essential to understand the issues facing women at work and the reality that both work and family roles are salient in the lives of contemporary women and men.

WHY CAREERS ARE IMPORTANT TO A WOMAN’S QUALITY OF LIFE

Women, like men, need a variety of major sources of satisfaction in their lives—as once stated by Freud (according to Erickson, 1950), the psychologically well-adjusted human being is able “to love and to work” effectively. Both women and men need not only the satisfactions of interpersonal relationships, with family and/or friends, but also the satisfaction of achievement in the outside world. We now have research evidence that women, like men, need to utilize their talents and abilities and that multiple roles are important for people’s psychological well-being.

Utilization of Abilities

Research has shown that the fulfillment of individual potential for achievement is vitally important. Although the roles of homemaker and mother are important and often very satisfying, they do not allow most women to fulfill their unique abilities and talents. These, rather, must be fulfilled through career pursuits or volunteer and vocational activities, just as they are in men. This is not to discount the importance of childrearing, but only to point out its insufficiency as a lifelong answer to the issue of self-realization. Even if a woman spends a number of years creatively rearing children, these children inevitably grow up and begin their own lives—lives that must of necessity be increasingly independent from the parental home.

Kerr (1997; Kerr, Foley-Nicpon, & Zapata, 2005), in an extensive program of research on gifted girls, notes that, although the aspirations of girls are as high as are those of their gifted male counterparts, “the theme of their lives is one of declining achievement goals” (Kerr et al., 2005, p. 19). Gifted girls often experience pressure, subtle or not so subtle, to do an “about-face” (Kerr, 1997; Reis, Callahan, & Goldsmith, 1996) during adolescence—to shift their personal priorities and self-evaluations from academic achievement to the achievement of romance.
Gifted girls were also quite concerned about the effects of their giftedness on others’ attitudes toward them, fearing that these attitudes would be negative (Kerr, Colangelo, & Gaeth, 1988). Not surprisingly, by the sophomore year of college, gifted young women have likely changed their majors to less challenging areas, by their senior year they have reduced the level of their career goals, and by college graduation they have given up their former career dreams altogether, all because of the pervasive “culture of romance” (Holland & Eisenhart, 1990; Kerr et al., 1988, p. 16). It does not seem unreasonable to suggest that these young women of today will experience the same eventual loss of self and the psychological problems experienced by the gifted women in the older Terman studies.

Multiple Roles

In a related vein, there is strong evidence for the beneficial effects of working outside the home on a woman’s psychological adjustment, regardless of her marital status. Early research on the relationship between marital status and psychological health concluded that the healthiest individuals were the married men and the single women, whereas married women were at particularly high risk for psychological distress (Bernard, 1971). However, it does not seem to be marriage per se that is detrimental to women’s psychological adjustment, but rather the lack of meaningful paid employment. In these studies, the women who were not employed accounted for the more frequent occurrence of psychological distress among the married women.

In a related vein, there is strong evidence that multiple roles, that is, those of both worker and family member, are important to women’s mental and physical health (Barnett & Hyde, 2001). Most research finds that even though multiple roles are time consuming and can be stressful, they are protective against depression (Crosby, 1991) and are facilitative of positive mental health.

There are several hypotheses concerning why multiple roles are beneficial for women (Barnett & Hyde, 2001). First, when more than one role is important in one’s life, stress or disappointment in one domain can be “buffered” by success or satisfaction in another role. Second, the added income of a second job/career can reduce the stress of being the sole bread winner and can in fact provide an economic “lifeline” when one spouse or partner becomes unemployed. In difficult economic times, characterized by high unemployment and corporate downsizing or collapse, two incomes can be virtually life-saving. Third, jobs provide an additional source of social support, which increases well-being (Barrett & Hyde, 2001). For example, Greenberger and O’Neil (1993) found that although men’s well-being was related most significantly to social support from their wives, women’s well-being was related to support from neighbors, supervisors, and coworkers, as well as from husbands.

In considering women’s career development and multiple roles, it should also be noted that there are today many lifestyle alternatives. There are 12 million single parents in this country, most of them women (Gilbert, 2002). There is also an increasing number of people who choose to remain single, as
well as growing numbers of committed gay and lesbian couples, many of whom are now choosing to have or adopt children. Thus, although the heterosexual dual-career marriage will be the modal lifestyle, the options of remaining single or in a committed same-sex or non-marital partnership should also be considered viable in life planning (see Farmer, 1997).

**BARRIERS TO WOMEN’S PERCEIVED CAREER OPTIONS AND CHOICES**

Some barriers to career choices are socialized barriers, that is, socialized belief systems or behavior patterns that lead women themselves to avoid certain career fields. Factors that will be discussed herein are avoidance of mathematics coursework, low self-efficacy and outcome expectations, gender and occupational stereotypes, and a restricted range of vocational interests. Problems with our educational system, the concept of the null educational environment, and multiple-role concerns are other barriers to women’s career development.

**Math: The Critical Filter**

The critical importance of a sound mathematics background for entrance to many of the best career opportunities in our society (e.g., engineering, scientific, and medical careers, computer science, business, and the skilled trades) is now generally agreed upon (Chipman & Wilson, 1985), and a lack of math background constitutes one of the major barriers to women’s career development.

The classic study of the importance of math to career options was that of Sells (1973). In a study of freshmen at the University of California at Berkeley, Sells found that only 8 percent of the women, compared to 57 percent of the men, had taken four years of high school math. Four years of high school math was prerequisite to entering calculus or intermediate statistics courses required in three-fourths of the university’s major fields, and the university did not provide remedial courses to allow a student to complete the prerequisites post hoc. Thus, 92 percent of the freshmen women at Berkeley were prevented by lack of math background from even considering 15 of the 20 major fields. The five remaining options were predictable—such traditionally female major areas as education, the humanities, the social sciences, librarianship, and social welfare. Thus, decisions to “choose” these majors may have in many cases been by default, through failure to qualify for any major requiring considerable math background.

Sells (1982) further elaborated the vital importance of math preparation for both career options and future earnings. Four full years of high school math are vital to surviving the standard freshman calculus course, now required for most undergraduate majors in business administration, economics, agriculture, engineering, forestry, health sciences, nutrition, food sciences, and natural, physical, and computer sciences. Only the arts and humanities do not now require a math background. Further, Sells (1982) showed a strong and direct relationship between college calculus background and both starting salaries and employers’ willingness to interview students for a given job. Mathematics and science are important even for non college-degree technical occupations (U.S. Department of Labor, 2000). As so
well stated by Sells (1982), “Mastery of mathematics and science has become essential for full participation in the world of employment in an increasingly technological society” (p. 7).

Self-Efficacy Expectations

The concept of self-efficacy expectations has become one of the most important in helping to understand the career options that people consider. Self-efficacy expectations (Bandura, 1977, 1997) refer to people’s beliefs that they can successfully complete specific tasks or behaviors to reach goals. For example, an individual may perceive herself as able (or unable) to solve algebraic equations, fix a flat tire, or care for an infant. Self-efficacy expectations are postulated by Bandura (1977, 1997) to have at least three behavioral consequences:

1. Approach versus avoidance behavior
2. Quality of performance of behaviors in the target domain
3. Persistence in the face of obstacles or disconfirming experiences

Thus, low self-efficacy expectations regarding various behavioral domains are postulated to lead to avoidance of those domains, poorer performance in them, and an increased tendency to “give up” when faced with discouragement or failure. In the context of career development, self-efficacy expectations can influence the types of courses, majors, and careers individuals feel comfortable attempting. They can influence performance on the tests necessary to complete college course work or the requirements of a job training program. Finally, the postulated effects of self-efficacy on persistence influence long-term pursuit of one’s goals in the face of obstacles, occasional failures, and dissuading messages from the environment, such as gender or race-based discrimination or harassment.

In education or job-content domains, college women tend to score lower than college men on self-efficacy in domains having to do with math, science, computer science and technology, mechanical activities, and outdoor and physical activities (Betz & Hackett, 1981, 1997; Betz, Borgen, Rottinghaus, Paulsen, Halper, & Harmon, 2003; Borgen & Betz, 2007). Women tend to score higher than men on self-efficacy in social domains of activity, such as teaching and counseling. For example, we asked college women and men to report whether or not they felt themselves capable of completing various educational majors (Betz & Hackett, 1981). Even though men and women as a group did not differ in their tested abilities, they differed significantly in their self-efficacy beliefs. These differences were especially striking toward occupations involving mathematics: 59 percent of college men versus 41 percent of college women believed themselves able to complete a degree in that field. Seventy-four percent of men, compared to 59 percent of women, believed they could be accountants. Most dramatically, 70 percent of college men but only 30 percent of comparably able women believed themselves able to complete a degree in engineering.

Thus, low self-efficacy, especially in relationship to male-dominated careers or careers requiring mathematical or technical expertise, may reduce the self-perceived career options of women. Another
concept in Bandura’s (1997) social cognitive theory that is important for women is that of outcome expectations, the belief that desired outcomes will follow from successful behaviors. Given continuing discrimination in the workforce, it would not be surprising if women felt that competent work behavior might not be rewarded or might even be disparaged in certain contexts. Women of color may have particularly low outcome, as well as self-efficacy, expectations due to experiences with oppression and racial bias (Byars & Hackett, 1998).

Restricted Vocational Interests

Ability, aptitude, and vocational interest measures are extensively used in career assessment and counseling with the idea of achieving a fit or match between the person and environment. This objective can be traced back to Frank Parsons’s (1909) “matching men and jobs” approach as discussed in the introduction to this chapter. Now referred to in more contemporary terms as “person–environment fit” or “trait factor” models (Dawis, 1992, 2000), the basic assumptions of the model remain elegant in their simplicity, yet broad in their usefulness. Simply stated, the bases of this approach are that:

1. Individuals differ in their job-related abilities and interests
2. Job/occupational environments differ in their requirements and in the kinds of interests to which they appeal
3. Congruence or “fit” between an individual’s characteristics and the characteristics of the job is an important consideration in making good career choices

Among the important variables to be taken into consideration in these models are abilities and aptitudes, such as those measured by the Differential Aptitude Tests (DAT) and Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB), and vocational interests as included in Holland’s theory (1997) and measured by the Strong Interest Inventory (Donnay, Morris, Schaubhut, & Thompson, 2005; see also Walsh & Betz, 2001, for a comprehensive discussion of career assessment methods). From the matching perspective, the purpose of assessment is to assist a student or adult in generating educational or career options that represent a good person–environment fit.

Using Holland’s (1997) vocational theory as an example, women score lower on Realistic themes and higher on Social themes than men when raw scores (simple number of items endorsed) are used to measure the Holland types (Lunneborg, 1979). The Realistic theme includes technical, outdoor, and “hands-on” activities—the kinds of skills often taught in high school “shop,” electronics, and trades courses or under the tutelage of a parent comfortable with home and automobile repair. Realistic interests are part of inventory suggestions for careers in engineering, and thus lower scores on this theme constitute a significant barrier to the suggestion of this occupational field to young women. The Social theme includes social, interpersonal skills often thought important to teach girls but neglected in the teaching of boys (Tipping, 1997; Yoder, 1999).

When such measures are used, gender stereotypes tend to be perpetuated by the test materials themselves. There is strong evidence that these interest differences are in part due to stereotypic gender
socialization, because boys are exposed to different types of learning opportunities growing up than are girls. Educational and career options are thus restricted because of restricted interest development. Although part of the answer to this problem is to increase the breadth of socialization experiences afforded to both genders, at a practical level we can also address these problems by using interest inventories that are not gender restrictive—that is, that do not perpetuate gender stereotypes. This can be done using within-gender normative scores (comparing raw scores to those of members of the same gender) and gender balanced interest inventories (where interest scales include items familiar to both genders rather than primarily to just one). These approaches will be discussed in the last section on implications for education and interventions.

**Supports to Women’s Career Choices**

Among the factors that have been found to facilitate women’s career achievements, including perceiving a broader array of career options, are a number of variables which, by their absence, can serve as barriers. Just as unsupportive environments can serve as barriers, supportive environments can be very helpful. One of the most crucial areas of support is that from families, especially parents and older relatives, and this has been found true for women of all racial and ethnic groups. Studies by Fisher and Padminawidjaja (1999), Pearson and Bieschke (2001), and Juntrunen, Barraclough, Broneck, Seibel, Winlow, and Morin (2001), among others, have found parental support and availability to be very important in the career aspirations and achievements of Mexican American, African American, and Native American, as well as white, women. Kitano and Perkins (1996) noted that high-achieving girls in Latino and Asian cultures are those with extra encouragement from their families.

A number of other studies have found maternal employment, particularly in nontraditional career fields, is related to daughters’ higher career aspirations (e.g., Selkow, 1984). Gomez, Fassinger, Prosser, Cooke, Mejia, and Luna (2001) found that although Latina high achievers came from families where traditional gender-roles were emphasized, most also had nontraditional female role models—for example, their mothers were often nontraditionally employed or, if homemakers, held leadership roles in community organizations. On the other hand, Hackett, Esposito, and O’Halloran (1989) and Weishaar, Green, and Craighead (1981), among others, have reported that the presence of a supportive male family member was important in girls’ pursuit of nontraditional career fields. Many women pursuing nontraditional career fields relied heavily on male mentors (Betz, 2002), since no female mentors were available in their environments.

In addition to supportive family and mentors, much previous research has shown the importance of personality factors such as instrumentality, internal locus of control, high self-esteem, and a feminist orientation in women’s career achievements (Betz & Fitzgerald, 1987; Fassinger, 1990). Instrumentality,
one of the critical factors in Farmer’s (1997) study, refers to a constellation of traits that were previously called “masculinity” but were seen eventually to reflect a collection of characteristics having to do with independence, self-sufficiency, and the feeling that one was in control of one’s life. It has also been described as “agency” and has much in common with self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997).

The possession of instrumental traits does not mean that one cannot also possess the most traditionally feminine traits of nurturance and sensitivity to others. These characteristics are now referred to as “expressiveness” or “communion.” Together, instrumentality and expressiveness form the “androgynous” personality style, which is thought to be desirable for both women and men. Thus, positive factors related to support and mentoring from others, along with a personality characterized by high self-esteem and self-efficacy and a sense of self-sufficiency and instrumentality, can help women reach their career goals.

SUPPORTS TO CAREER ACHIEVEMENT AND SATISFACTION

A useful framework for considering supports to women’s career development has come from Fassinger’s (2002b) series of studies on diverse groups of eminent women. Using qualitative methodologies and modified grounded theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1998); they have studied eminent African American and Caucasian women (Richie, Fassinger, Lenn, Johnson, Prosser, & Robinson, 1997), Asian American women (Prosser, Chopra, & Fassinger, 1998), lesbians (Hollingsworth, Tomlinson, & Fassinger, 1997), Latinas (Gomez et al., 2001), and women with physical and sensory disabilities (Noonan, Gallor, Hensler-McGinnis, Fassinger, Wang, & Goodman, 2004). They summarize findings of the supports that enabled these women to persist and succeed in spite of extensive experience with oppression with the words “persistence, connection, and passion” (Richie et al., 1997). These might also be viewed as strengths of women that carry them through or enable them to surmount the barriers they confront.

Persistence is critical to succeeding in the face of obstacles, and strong self-efficacy expectations for one’s career, self-esteem, and sense of purpose are essential to persistence. The characteristics of instrumentality discussed previously—the sense of being in control of one’s own life and destiny, of being agentic, able to act on one’s own behalf—are also important to persistence.

Related to both self-efficacy and instrumentality is “coping efficacy,” which plays an increasingly important role in Lent, Brown, and Hackett’s (1994, 2000) social cognitive career theory. In their words, “When confronted with adverse contextual conditions, persons with a strong sense of coping efficacy (beliefs regarding one’s capabilities to negotiate particular environmental obstacles) may be more likely to persevere toward their goals” (Lent et al., 2000, p. 76). Gomez et al. (2001) found coping
strategies especially important to their highly achieving Latinas, as did Richie et al. (1997) with highly achieving African Americans and white women. These strategies include:

- tenacity and persistence;
- flexibility;
- creativity;
- reframing and redefining challenges, barriers, or mistakes;
- maintaining a balanced perspective in understanding how racism and sexism may affect career-related behaviors;
- developing support networks congruent with personal style, values, and culture;
- and developing bicultural skills where applicable. (Gomez et al., 2001, p. 298)

Connection refers to the essential part played by familiar and peer/friend support in facilitating persistence in one’s goals. There is ample literature documenting the importance of family, including spouse and children, friends both at work and outside of work, and mentors. This importance has been shown for women of color as well as for white women. As a few examples, Gilbert (1994) and Gomez et al. (2001) discussed the crucial role of a supportive spouse in managing both career and home/family responsibilities. Gomez et al. (2001) reported that supportive families were crucial in maintaining women’s career commitment after the birth of children. Richie et al. (1997) emphasized the importance of interconnectedness with others in the continuing high achievement of both African American and white women. Connection may also be facilitated by a feminist orientation, which gives women a sense of community beyond themselves. Feminist orientation has consistently been shown to be a facilitative factor in women’s career achievements (Fassinger, 1990).

Finally, passion is, for some women, loving what they do; for others, it’s feeling that they have made a difference in the world (Gomez et al., 2001). For many women, this is the sense of a life’s “calling.” Although not all people, women or men, are lucky enough to have such a passion in their work, helping people find careers about which they can feel passionate should be one of the goals of the psychologist.

**IMPLICATIONS FOR INTERVENTIONS**

The preceding sections of this chapter have emphasized the importance to women of successful career development, as well as success in their personal relationships, yet have also outlined ways in which women continue to lag behind men in both the variety of career options they consider and the subsequent success in these pursuits. Psychologists and educators may be able to help women to close these gaps. In general, suggestions for interventions can be divided into those facilitating the career choice process and those enabling the career adjustment process.

**Counseling for Career Choice**

Because a sexist society and stereotypic socialization have often stood in the way of women’s pursuit of a full range of career options, research supports overt attempts to restore options that society
has taken away. In other words, psychologists need to remain aware of the possible impact of sexism and stereotyping in concert with null environments and to accept the role of active options restorers.

The following guidelines for assisting women in the process of making educational and career decisions are derived from the literature reviewed in the first part of this chapter. They can be used by psychologists, counselors, educators, parents, and those in positions to influence public policy (see Fassinger, in press).

1. Encourage high-quality and extensive education and training. Do not overlook the importance of technical schools, two-year and community colleges, and the military for excellent training and education.
2. Adopt the rule that one cannot take too much math. Encourage young women to stay in math coursework as long as possible. Math background opens options and prevents others from being eliminated by default.
3. When in doubt, stress decisions that eliminate the fewest options, such as staying in school and continuing in math.
4. Serve as a catalyst for the creation of new learning experiences for women, so that they can fully develop all their capabilities, including those not reinforced by traditional gender stereotyping.
5. Explore a woman’s outcome expectations and barriers to her goal pursuits, with the idea of helping her to develop coping mechanisms, coping self-efficacy, and barrier-surmounting sources of social support.
6. Remember that all it takes is one supportive psychologist, counselor, teacher, or parent to enrich the null environment.
7. Assess the role of culture and ethnicity in the client’s career planning. Help her to make decisions that, as far as possible, integrate her individual and cultural values.
8. Integrate facilitative psychological and career theories as appropriate in counseling and educational practice.

Counseling for Career Achievement and Satisfaction

For employed women, concerns usually fall in the areas of success/performance and satisfaction. As was indicated previously, discrimination, sexual harassment, tokenism, and lack of support represent a few barriers to women’s career success and satisfaction. Additionally, the overload that may be experienced from two full-time jobs, rather than one, for women taking full responsibility for family and housework can be a major cause of decrements in both performance and satisfaction. A few general guidelines may be useful.

1. Help women at work develop support systems.
2. Help change the system, or help young women and men change the system, as it pertains to flexible work schedules and family leave policies (which ideally allow leave for adoption as well as childbearing and for elder care, and which assume that men are as willing to be responsible for those they love as are women).

3. Help token women (especially women of color) to find support, often by broadening the net that is cast to find support. For example, the lone woman faculty member in chemistry (see Fassinger, in press) may find support in a group consisting of all the faculty women in the College of Sciences.

4. Teach women to expect full participation in homemaking and childrearing from their husbands or partners. Teach men that it is their responsibility, and also to their benefit, to participate fully in home and family life and work.

5. Help women develop effective cognitive and behavioral coping strategies, as discussed earlier in the section on supports for career achievement and satisfaction.

There also may be cases where a woman is in an occupation with poor fit for her abilities or interests. In such cases, “going back to the beginning”—doing a comprehensive assessment of her abilities, interests, values, and self-perceptions may be the best place to start.

**Organizational and Structural Change**

We in psychology and counseling also have a responsibility to work for organizational, legal, and societal changes that will reduce sexism, stereotyping, discrimination, and harassment and create more flexible and “family-friendly” workplaces (Meara, 1997). In focusing on women’s career development and what is needed in order to facilitate it, Harmon (1997) also noted that we may have shortchanged the other side of the issue—that is, how to facilitate men’s development in homemaking and childrearing roles. For example, as we counselors provide support for women’s working and help them gain self-efficacy for nontraditional careers, we should also support men’s pursuits of nurturing roles and help them gain self-efficacy with respect to nurturing and multiple-role management. Gilbert (1994) and Harmon (1997) both suggest that it is time to develop theories that conceptualize career development and family life in a more interactive way. Such theory development would hopefully increase the satisfaction and well-being of both women and men in multiple life roles.

**Post test:**

1. What is organizational structure?

2. What is your understanding of counseling career and achievement?
LECTURE ELEVEN

Women’s Friendships and Romantic Relationships

Introduction:
Here you will be made to know how women form relationships.

Content:
As social beings, we have a strong need to be around and interact with other people, and to establish relationships with them (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Harlow, 1958; Fisher, 2004). The term relationship implies something more than a transitory interaction or superficial feeling for another and it is in our relationships with friends and romantic partners that we often experience our deepest emotional connections.

Although both women and men need and seek out close relationships, several theories propose that relationships may be particularly important in women’s lives. For example, differential gender socialization may promote a greater interest in and concern for relationships among women than among men (Cancian, 1987; Maccoby, 1998). Object relations (Chodorow, 1978; Jordan & Surrey, 1986) and self-in-relation theory (Jordan & Surrey, 1986; Surrey, 1993) posit that relationships are more central to women’s sense of self than to men’s. The centrality of relationships for women is thought to stem from differing developmental experiences and
pathways, that is, the continuity of women’s identification with mothers from early infancy, contrasted with men’s emotional and psychic separation from mothers in early infancy, thought to be necessary for men to establish a masculine identity.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE ON WOMEN’S FRIENDSHIPS

Although strong, affectionate, and enduring relationships between women have existed throughout history, women’s close relationships with each other have historically been viewed as less important than men’s relationships with men, and this devaluation has been reflected, up until recently, in the invisibility of the study of women’s friendships in the research literature (O’Connor, 1992). At least in the Western world, friendship has been conceptualized primarily in terms of men’s experience of this relationship and has included notions of bravery, duty, honor, loyalty, and a depth of feeling not necessarily expressed except at moments of extreme danger or death (Easterling, 1989; Nardi, 1992; Neve, 1989). Male friendships were a coming together of equals for pleasant conversation, camaraderie, and even the expression of affection (Easterling, 1989; Hansen, 1992). In fact, prior to the late nineteenth century, when same-gender close relationships began to be medicalized and stigmatized as inner “perversions,” both women and men were allowed a range of physical and emotional expression in their same-gender friendships, although the notion of emotional self-reliance in relationships was still more an expectation of men than women (Faderman, 1981; Hansen, 1992; Rotundo, 1989).

Social conventions prohibited women, for the most part, from frequenting the public gathering places in which men were able to develop and carry out friendships, such as cafes, pubs, taverns, fraternal clubs, markets, barbershops, and street corners; therefore, women’s friendships took place primarily in the private realm (Wellman, 1992). Women’s relationships with each other were also, and to some extent still are, considered secondary to those with their spouses, children, and relatives. Thus, women, whose relationships with each other were replete with expression of emotions and needs and with physical demonstrativeness and were lived out within the mundane confines of daily domestic life, were believed incapable of development of true friendships with each other.

Beginning in the early 1900s, changes in the structure, meaning, and role of women’s friendships with each other began to emerge. This is not to say that friendships were reduced in importance within individual women’s lives or that the centrality of support, intimate
exchange, and companionship did not continue to exist, but these changes reflect a shift to a modern conceptualization of women’s friendships (see Faderman, 1981; Smith-Rosenberg, 1985). Particularly after 1920, a new emotional culture arose where emotion management, rather than the florid sentimentality of the Victorian period, was valued. This modern emotional culture deemphasized the intense and fervent self-disclosure characteristic of women’s friendships in the previous century. At the same time, at least for middle-class women, an increasing cultural emphasis on the heterosexual imperative and companionate marriage emerged, detracting from the centrality of women’s friendships with each other. Women began to interact more and more in the context of organizations, clubs, and work as their roles and options outside the home increased. These transformations imposed an instrumental and superficial quality on some women’s friendships. Greater geographic and social mobility also reduced the degree of face-to-face visiting and lengthy correspondence that women in the previous century used to maintain their friendships. Finally, growing societal concerns about homosexuality in the early 20th century resulted in disapproval of intensely intimate relationships between women and continue today to affect what is considered appropriate emotional expressiveness between women (Rosenzweig, 1999).

An especially significant historical factor related to women’s friendships was the rise of the women’s movement in the 1960s and into the 1970s. In contrast to the up-to-then prevailing cultural images of women’s friendships with each other as superficial, fraught with envy and competition for male attention, and secondary to relationships with men, in the women’s movement, friendships between women were considered primary. Its liberal ideology of sisterhood legitimated women’s relationships with each other and encouraged solidarity between women. In fact, uniting at both the personal and political levels was considered the avenue toward overcoming oppression in a sexist society (Morgan, 1970).

Subsequent interrogation of the ideology of sisterhood has exposed its shortcomings—for example, it ignored inequalities between women based upon social class, ethnicity/race, and sexual orientation that continue to make friendships between women difficult or conflictual (Hurtado, 1996; Kilcooley, 1997; Simmonds, 1997). Women do not necessarily gravitate toward each other just because they are women, nor are friendships, even close and long-lasting ones, safe harbors from larger social divisions. A legacy of the women’s movement, however, is that it demonstrates women’s relationships with each other, not only are a source of individual
affirmation and strength, but also have the potential to initiate social change and challenge the status quo surrounding gender relations in the larger society (Morgan, 1970; O’Connor, 1998; Rose & Roades, 1987).

CHARACTERISTICS OF WOMEN’S FRIENDSHIPS

Friendships constitute some of the most important relationships women establish in their lifetime. They provide women with social support (Aronson, 1998; Lu & Argyle, 1992; Mays, 1985; Nyamathi, Bennett, Leake, & Chen, 1995; Severance, 2005), opportunities for companionship and enjoyable social interaction (Fehr, 1996; Severance, 2005), intimacy (Fehr, 2004; Parks & Floyd, 1996b; Sapadin, 1988), and instrumental assistance (Nyamathi et al., 1995; Patterson & Bettini, 1993; Walker, 1995), and they contribute to our social and personal identities (Johnson & Aries, 1983).

Despite the many important contributions of friendship to women’s lives, its essence is difficult to capture. As Fehr (1996) says, “everyone knows what friendship is—until asked to define it” (p. 5). Women’s friendships with each other have often been portrayed as idyllic, where cooperation, sharing, and support-giving dominate. The negative side of these relationships has also been caricatured, where envy, competition, and jealousy prevail, often related to access to the attentions of a powerful male. Although neither picture is particularly accurate, they hint at the complexity and contradictions of women’s relationships with each other (see Rind, 2002).

Implicitly, or sometimes explicitly, definitions of friendship include the notion that they are entered into and maintained voluntarily and that, unlike other significant relationships, friendships in Western cultures are not formalized through familial or societal structures or obligations (Fehr, 1996; Stein, 1993). In fact, the imposition of rigid role structures may be viewed as antithetical to formation of true friendship bonds (Bell & Coleman, 1999).

On the other hand, some researchers remind us that friendships may not be completely voluntary. We are most likely to become friends with those who are of the same gender; similar in age, social class, sexual orientation, and race/ethnicity; and who live in the same geographic area (Rose, 1995). Immigrant women may be further limited in their friendship choices by language, the ethnic/racial diversity of the communities they live in, and the degree of emphasis on family versus nonfamily social network development (Serafica, Weng, & Kim,
Among Latinas, friendships with women family members are emphasized and may be especially close (Hurtado, 2003).

Among working-class women, friendships with family members are also more common than among middle-class women, and working class women tend to actually interact more frequently with their friends than middle-class women (Walker, 1995). In addition, class differences are seen in the types of activities working- and middle-class women engage in—for example, working-class women place more emphasis on same-gender socializing and are more likely to engage in “girls’ night out” activities with their women friends, while middle-class women are more likely engage in mixed-gender socializing activities (Walker, 1995). Policy itself may contribute to or constrain women’s friendships—for example, women of color who are poor may be especially subject to housing policies that ignore women’s social network and emotional needs (Cook, Bruin, & Crull, 2000).

Another unspoken rule that influences women’s friendship is that competitiveness should not be a part of these relationships (Rind, 2002). For women, if friendships are arenas of nurturance, care, and liking, the presence of competition can lead to feelings of ambivalence and discomfort (Rind, 2002). In a series of interviews with women, specifically about their best friends, Rind (2002) found that three major themes emerged, including knowing and understanding, neediness and dependence, but also competition between women. In this case, competition between women friends took place over jobs, academic performance, and social standing, among other arenas, but all the participants experienced competition negatively.

Part of the difficulty with competition may stem from women’s socialization surrounding competition. Women are not necessarily socialized to deal forthrightly with competition; while girls’ play activities certainly include achievement, they are not necessarily at the expense of other girls—for example, jump rope or hopscotch (Lever, 1976). Competition is more prevalent in boy’s play activities than those of girls, and boys learn early on to negotiate competition in their playtime so that the activities can continue (Maccoby, 1998). Boys’ activities are also more rule governed than relationship governed. Thus, when disputes develop among girls, they are more likely to dissolve their play activities than are boys (Maccoby, 1998). These interaction patterns may continue into adulthood and affect how women respond to competition in their friendships with women.
Related to the notion of relationship rules is that the cultural scripts surrounding women’s friendships, and the theories and research derived from these scripts, have been guided by assumptions of heterosexual norms (Rose, 2000; Weinstock & Rothblum, 1996). Research on lesbian friendships provides a picture of some of the diverse and alternative forms that friendships between women can take and may challenge narrower views of this relationship currently available in the research literature. For example, sexuality is always thought to be potentially present in cross-sex friendships (Bleske&Buss, 2000; Kaplan&Keys, 1997; Sapadin, 1988), but research on the role of sexuality in friendships between heterosexual women, on its developmental importance among heterosexual adolescent girls is virtually unheard of (Diamond, 2000). Other research shows that, among lesbian women, friendships may be less distinctly separated from romantic relationships, and lesbian women appear to be more likely to remain close friends with their ex-lovers than are heterosexual women (see Kitzinger, 1996; Kitzinger & Perkins, 1993; Weinstock, 2004).

An overriding feature of women’s friendships is intimacy. Intimacy is often estimated from the extent of self-disclosure, or self-revealing talk, that occurs between two persons and results in each feeling known and validated by the other (Altman & Taylor, 1973; Clark & Reis, 1988; Mark & Alper, 1985). Even though both women and men recognize the importance of talk for developing deep intimacy (Fehr, 2004; Radmacher & Azmitia, 2006), women engage in this talk more than men in their friendships (Adam, Blieszner, & De Vries, 2000; Hays, 1985), and this is true across age groups among women (Goldman, Cooper, Ahern, & Corsini, 1981). This may be a reason that, when friendship quality ratings are compared, men’s friendships with each other usually rank lowest in quality (Elkins & Peterson, 1993) or strength (Wright & Scanlon, 1991) compared to women’s same-sex and cross-sex friendships. Even friendships maintained exclusively online, those between women, or between women and men, show greater intimacy after two years than those between men (Cheng, Chan, & Tong, 2006).

To date, a considerable amount of research has been done to explore and explain gender differences in friendship intimacy (see Monsour, 2002)—attesting to the cultural primacy given to women’s relationships with men that we mentioned earlier. But from a feminist perspective, a more important question is, how might the social construction of these differences support and reinforce gender inequalities? Women’s friendships may be valorized for their greater intimacy than those of men, but women still have less access to important resources, and they
continue to occupy a secondary status in relation to men in society. In the work world, access to power, influence, and upward mobility continue to be more available to men.

Intimacy and expressiveness in relationships are resources that women have in greater abundance than men do, but these resources do not obtain for them greater mobility in the highest echelons of economic and political power. In fact, the qualities of caring, closeness, and intimacy that women may be more adept at in their social relationships continue to be devalued in the larger culture (Taylor, 2002). Despite the emergence of a feminized version of friendship that is now considered the standard by which both women and men’s friendships are evaluated, and the idea that men’s friendships might even be seen as deficient in comparison to women’s friendships (Cancian, 1990), this in no way alters patriarchal cultural, political, or institutional structures in society (O’Connor, 1998; Rose, 1995).

WOMEN’S FRIENDSHIPS ONLINE

Electronically mediated communication, such as e-mail, chat rooms, news rooms, instant messaging, and so on, provide a newer social context for development of friendships and other close relationships. Up until recently, men have been the predominant users of the Internet, but today women and men are almost equally likely to use it (Pew Internet and American Life Project, 2005). Furthermore, women are just as likely, and sometimes even more likely, to develop friendships online with either women or men (Parks & Floyd, 1996a; Parks & Roberts, 1998). Why women may be more likely than men to form online relationships is not clear—possibly more women are looking for friends, they may be more willing to label their online contacts as relationships, or they may be more sought after on the Internet (Parks & Floyd, 1996a).

Contrary to what is generally believed, online relationships can be similar in strength, quality, and degree of self-disclosure to offline relationships, although offline relationships may be of longer duration than those that are online (see McKenna & Bargh, 2000; Parks & Roberts, 1998). Furthermore, a significant proportion of online relationship partners go on to meet each other in person (McCown, Fischer, Page, & Homant, 2001; Parks & Roberts, 1998), suggesting that the boundaries between online and offline relationships are not highly defined.

Consistent with research on face-to-face relationships, women more than men use the Internet for interpersonal communication, such as chatting online and sending e-mail (Weiser, 2000). Women, more than men, use it to maintain contact with distant (as opposed to local)
friends, and they are more likely to send e-mail to parents and other extended family members (Pew Internet and American Life Project, 2005). Although men use the Internet more intensely, that is, they log on more often and spend more time online, women include a wider array of topics in their online communications and are more satisfied with the role e-mail plays in nurturing their relationships (Pew Internet and American Life Project, 2005). On the other hand, one study found that both women and men preferred to develop online relationships with friends, rather than family members or coworkers. Furthermore, the only significant predictor of preference for online communication and relationship building was extent of Internet use, in that those who were high users of the Internet had a greater preference for online communication and relationship building than those who used the Internet less (Thayer & Ray, 2006).

To date, research specifically on women’s Internet friendships is rare, and the implications of technology for women’s friendships are not yet fully understood. As women increase the amount and diversity of their online communication, we are likely to continue to see gender variation in friendship preferences, formation, and functions. In some cases, use of online communication may reinforce current gender expectations and patterns surrounding communication, support giving and receiving, and relationship development, while in others these expectations and patterns may be destabilized (Pew Internet and American Life Project, 2007; Seale, 2006; Thayer & Ray, 2006). An important understanding is that neither gender nor the Internet itself may be causally related to relationship formation and behavior, as compared to the motives, personalities, and identities of the persons involved (McKenna & Bargh, 2000; Peter, Valkenburg, & Schouten, 2005).

Online interactions are different from offline ones in that the former can be anonymous, without the visual cues that influence interpersonal perceptual processes, and offer the possibility of constructing multiple identities across social interactions (McKenna & Bargh, 2000). In fact, for those with identities that are marginalized in the larger society, such as those with stigmatized sexual identities, participation in online relationships can positively transform those identities and lead to the desire to more greatly express and incorporate them in real-world relationships (McKenna & Bargh, 1998; McKenna, Green, & Smith, 2001). Nonetheless, even with the democratizing and transformative potential of the Internet, other studies remind us that forces of traditional culture, ideology, politics, and economics do not disappear with
technology use and these forces can insert themselves in Internet relationships as in relationships in the real world (Beetham, 2006; see Chiou & Wan, 2006).

WOMEN’S FRIENDSHIPS AS A FORM OF RESISTANCE

In psychology, women’s friendships have been studied as relatively separate from the larger public world of work, politics, and social and cultural movements. Conversely, women’s solidarity and sisterhood in political and social uplift work has been extensively studied (e.g., Giddings, 1985; Liss, Crawford, & Popp, 2004; Morgan, 1970), but relatively little emphasis has been placed on the role of friendship in these efforts. Women’s friendships have been viewed as an aspect of the private sphere, part of each woman’s domestic and emotional world. Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to ignore how women’s friendships with each other can be connected to change at the larger social and cultural level—that women’s friendships with each other can be viewed as “acts of resistance” (Andrew & Montague, 1998, p. 361).

Women’s friendships may provide for women a location in which they can explore, redefine, and subvert their devaluation in the larger society, and friendships can form the basis for working for social change in the larger culture (Johnson & Aries, 1983). This is not a trivial consequence of friendship and can be a transformative experience for women. For example, social support, help in career advancement, and improvement in workplace atmosphere are all benefits derived from friendships at work (Berman et al., 2002), but these benefits do not accrue just to individual women—they may also empower and help women to resist male domination in a gendered workplace and beyond (Andrew & Montegue, 1998).

With this shift in focus, we also begin to see the cumulative and influential effect of women’s activities that are enacted outside the traditional oppositional politics and activism characteristic of social movements. Women’s resistance in oppressive marriages; caring and providing for children despite economic hardships; contending with racism, sexism, and sexual harassment in the workplace; and interacting with hostile and unresponsive institutions—in other words, the daily lives of women—can lead to social change, and all these activities are so often made possible with the help of supportive friends (Aptheker, 1989).

Emotional and personal connection in a friendship can be empowering; it can sustain us in difficult times and provide the support to continue to struggle against oppression and inequality, not just for women but for all marginalized and oppressed people. Greater investigation of the connection between women’s friendships and social change can provide
models of the power of women’s friendships and expand the definition and function of these relationships.

Post test:
1. What are the characteristics embedded in women’s relationships?

LECTURE TWELVE
Theories of Female Personality

Introduction:
This aspect introduces you to women’s personality theory. At the end of the lecture, it is expected of you to have accumulated knowledge that will enhance a better relationship having known the theories that support women persons.

Content:
*They told the story the other way around (Adam forfeits ribs: Eve is born) – Obvious irony. Everyone knew that women do the bearing; men are born.*

— Erica Jong

*Equality is valued nearly everywhere but practiced almost nowhere.*

— Catharine MacKinnon

Assume that you are in a small theater watching a strange pantomime between two people. The actors are wearing hoods, masks, and costumes that make them completely unrecognizable to the audience. One is somewhat shorter and moves gracefully. The other is larger, moves more vigorously and occupies more space on the stage. At one point the two sit down upon a bench and begin interacting. The taller one sits down first, occupying more than half the bench while the other tries to find space to sit down. The shorter one tries to initiate communication
(nonverbally, so we get no voice cues). With each attempt, however, the taller one either looks away or interrupts.

As a spectator, do you think these two actors just differ in personality or might you be willing to conclude that these differences may be attributable to factors other than individual differences? They might differ in age (the shorter one being older), or in nationality, but the most likely assumption that most observers would make is that they differ in gender.

Why? The only distinguishing cues mentioned in the hypothetical scene were the heights, types of movement, and interaction styles of the two individuals. Other possible visual or auditory differences (such as voice or speech style) were not attributed. Nevertheless, most spectators would still conclude (1) that the characters differ in gender, (2) that the shorter one is female, and (3) that whatever personality differences are exhibited within this brief episode are probably attributable to the assumed gender differences. This is because our expectations are that people will act in accordance with our gender stereotypes, that is, that women will be more deferential, men more assertive, and so forth. Such assumptions and attributions are far from atypical in our everyday lives, whether or not we proclaim ourselves personality theorists. This example demonstrates the pervasiveness of gender in our construction and interpretation of social reality.

As scientists, we are trained to understand the overlap in statistical distributions of traits. Nevertheless, we also manifest strong biases to perceive and magnify sex differences (what Hare-Mustin & Maracek, 1988, have labeled “alpha bias”) even when they have not been substantiated. Despite enormous gender similarities (e.g., Hyde, 2005), the focus of most scientists (together with the lay public) has been on differences.

Early personality theorists were not immune to such biases and dealt with them in a variety of ways. For some, the bias was so strong that gender attributions were treated as not requiring additional explanation. Others, however, regarded perceived gender differences as “noise” in their theories, an annoying variability. Consequently, many focused only on males and assumed that female behavior represented relatively minor variations from a supposedly universal male norm. Still others assumed that female behavior, which differed too much from the male norm, was essentially deviant, a function of irrationality or other negative attributions. Males were viewed as central, and females as “other” (see Beauvoir, 1952, for an elegant elaboration of this argument). Early theories about achievement motivation (McClelland, Atkinson, Clark, & Lowell, 1953) were a prime example of how women were ignored. Human nature was essentially male nature.

Psychological theory serves a variety of functions, including global goals such as the understanding and prediction of individual behavior and explanations of a variety of group phenomena. Of the theories employed in psychology, personality theories have often been the most all-encompassing in their attempts to explain complex human behavior. These theories have also been influential in guiding research. Perhaps even more significantly, they have influenced generations of clinical practitioners in their treatment of males and females, an influence that has been decisive even in the absence of acceptable scientific evidence.
Irrespective of whether or not these theories are susceptible to scientific test, they provide clinicians with conceptual categories, values about what constitutes healthy functioning, and preferred modes of intervention (Barlow, 1981; Giorgi, 1970; Mahrer, 1978; Frank, 2000).

There may be some readers who question why a specific focus on female personality is needed at all. Isn’t an emphasis on human personality sufficient? Indeed, a cursory glance at the table of contents of most undergraduate textbooks about personality theory might suggest that there is common agreement about this. Gender is rarely mentioned. Unfortunately the term human has been too often synonymous with male. Whether particular theories are, in fact, equally applicable to both sexes appears to be essentially an empirical issue. Interestingly, evidence for such generalizability has not been forthcoming for theories that have focused upon males as the human prototype (e.g., Mayer, 2005; Maddi, 2006).

There are two related general empirical questions concerning gender and personality: whether gender is important, and if so, how it manifests itself.

Is gender important in personality? There appears to be a peculiar schism in how importantly gender is viewed between many personality theorists and those in other areas of psychology. The pervasiveness and significance of gender has been widely recognized in human development, social psychology, and psychopathology. Frank (2000), for example, notes that “gender influences the ways in which our brains develop” and that “gender and gender role appear to be key determinants of the kinds of psychosocial experiences we have.” According to this view, its influence could not be more significant. Despite this, however, as noted above, one has to look long and hard for any mention of gender in many textbooks about personality theory.

How then might gender manifest itself in personality structure and development? There appear to be at least three possible answers to this question.

The first possibility is that the major personality theorists are correct: the basic mechanisms underlying personality development are essentially similar for males and females. As previously noted, however, we believe that this view requires empirical justification, which has been lacking. Moreover, this assumption is certainly at odds with the vast amount of effort that has gone into demonstrating gender differences. Nevertheless, it might accord with mounting evidence of gender similarity (e.g., Hyde, 2005).

A second possibility is that there are some commonalities in underlying mechanisms that determine male and female personalities and some significant differences. Once again, it would be an empirical issue to tease out what these are, and what the distribution might be.

A third possibility is that entirely different theories may be needed to account for male and female personality (and possibly more, if one wishes to take into account other variables such as race and demographic variables). It could be argued that in an ideal and equal world, separate theories might not be necessary, but in the one in which we live, the socialization processes are so different that this might be the most parsimonious way to begin. This possibility does not necessarily imply that boys and girls differ so much at birth, but rather that their subsequent lives take such different paths that it is necessary to explore them separately so as to better understand the patterns that emerge. While developmental psychologists within the...
United States have often concluded that the socialization experiences of boys and girls are exceedingly different (e.g., Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974), this conclusion does not seem to generalize to females on a global scale. In a recent article in the New York Times, for example, Herbert (2006) describes how “women, by the millions, are systematically targeted for attack because they are women.” His article was based upon a recent report released by the United Nations describing bride burnings, honor killings, female infanticide, genital mutilation, sex trafficking, and mass rape as a weapon of war, affecting hundreds of millions of girls and women.

**Gender Differences in Intellectual Functioning**

While differences in intellectual functioning may not be considered critical to an understanding of personality differences per se, any empirical work or cultural stereotypes affirming the relative superiority of one gender’s intellectual functioning over the other’s may be expected to form a backdrop that differentially influences factors that have traditionally been within the domain of personality. These include self-esteem, feelings of competence, need to dominate, feelings of deference, and the general milieu of social expectations that confront males and females.

The history of this field demonstrates the vagaries of trying to establish sex differences, and there are some interesting parallels to personality theory construction as well. Early demonstrations of gender differences in intelligence were frequently published in the late 19th and early 20th centuries as male psychologists concluded that women were inferior to men in intellectual functioning (Deaux & Kite, 1987). In contrast, however, female researchers who subsequently investigated these claims (by surveying the same relevant literature) concluded that unadulterated bias and/or poor methodology had accounted for these earlier incorrect conclusions (Woolley, 1910). Subsequent scrutiny of differences in performance across a wide variety of intellectual tasks led Hollingsworth (1918) to conclude that any gender differences obtained were random and meaningless. Consequently, subsequent work in this area was guided by the assumption that there were no gender differences in intellectual functioning (or at least no differences favoring females). Perhaps this perspective prompted the decision made by Binet and Terman to eliminate questions on which females as a group scored higher than males in the development of their famous intelligence test. Yet, as Jacklin (1987) has pointed out, one wonders if the same procedure would have ensued had males scored higher.

Although contemporary researchers have concurred with the conclusion that no viable evidence exists documenting gender differences in general intellectual functioning, more recent research has focused on potential gender differences in more circumscribed cognitive abilities. Thirty years ago, the evidence suggested that boys were superior in mathematical and spatial ability, whereas girls were superior in verbal skills (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974). Much research has been conducted since then, and these differences appear to be diminishing. In addition to a number of meta-analyses (e.g., Linn & Hyde, 1988), there has been a burgeoning of interest in an area called “stereotype threat,” initiated by Claude Steele and his associates. This research has demonstrated that intellectual behavior is often determined by stereotypes that people hold about the groups in which they are categorized. Female college students, for example,
performed better on a test when it was not labeled as an assessment of their mathematical ability than when it was. Thus, what we categorize as “intellectual” may have many social influences as well, and may well be affected by personality.

**Sex Differences in Selected Social Behavior**

As with intellectual functioning, there have been multiple studies of social behavior with a view toward establishing sex differences. Most of these have been laboratory based. Reviews of these studies suggest that there are at least four areas where sex differences have been reliably and consistently obtained:

1. Aggression
2. Sensitivity to nonverbal cues
3. Conformity
4. Helping behaviors

With regard to aggression, meta-analyses have indicated that, not surprisingly, men behave more aggressively than women do, and these differences are greater for physical than for verbal aggression (e.g., Eagly & Steffen, 1986; Eagly, 1987). These gender differences are even more pronounced in children (Hyde, 1986). While overall differences are relatively small in laboratory-based studies, males are vastly overrepresented on indices of aggression in crime statistics regarding homicides and other violent crimes, so this difference seems to be very clear-cut.

With regard to sensitivity to nonverbal cues, females show greater sensitivity. They are also better at decoding nonverbal messages than males are (e.g., Hall, 1978, 1984). Perhaps as a result, females also demonstrate greater ability to empathize and to communicate emotional support to others (Reisman, 1990). Such gender differences in communication and relationship style have also been noted in the domain of marital and family relationships (e.g., Markman & Kraft, 1989) and may be one of the most significant dimensions of female personality.

Females appear to be more conforming and easily influenced than males are (Eagly & Carli, 1981). While this has been frequently been interpreted as a negative quality, particularly by male researchers, it could also be interpreted as another instance of their greater sensitivity to social cues (Langer, 1989), which may be adaptive in certain circumstances but not in others.

**Gender Differences in Personality Traits**

As one might expect, males attribute traits to themselves that are regarded as more normative and desirable for males, whereas females describe themselves, on average, with traits regarded as feminine. Several decades ago, new paradigms and measuring devices were offered that allowed these masculine and feminine traits to be assessed independently, instead of using methods of viewing masculinity and femininity as opposite poles of a continuum (e.g., Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974; Bem, 1974). A considerable body of research was subsequently conducted assessing the construct of androgyny; utilizing various ways of combining such independently measured male and female traits. The construct of androgyny appears to be a widely accepted one now, and research interest in it has dwindled considerably.

While androgyny allowed for greater freedom in self-descriptions, and variability was related to a number of other variables, the main effect of gender on self-descriptions still
appears to be robust across cultures. Different characteristics are ascribed to males and females, largely in accordance with gender stereotypes (see, e.g., Williams & Best, 1982, 1990). Males generally perceive themselves as more dominant, autonomous, aggressive, and active, whereas females describe themselves as more nurturing, affiliative, and deferential. Interpretations of these differences have varied. Some investigators, for example, have attributed such gender differences to differential social roles (e.g., Eagly, 1995). Despite varying interpretations, however, these findings are consistent and strong.

It is important to recall that these findings are based entirely upon self-descriptions and not on behaviors observed by others. This does not mean that self-perceptions may not be a significant factor in personality, but it is clearly not the whole picture when it comes to the assessment of gender differences. This is an area where social desirability and self-presentation factors play a very important role in how people respond to questionnaires.

**Gender Differences in Psychopathology**

Gender differences obtained in psychological symptoms are even more impressive than in the areas previously discussed. Marked differences have been found in both the frequency and content of maladjustment for both children and adults. The gender trends obtained depend largely on age.

The developmental literature suggests that between infancy and adolescence, boys are considerably more at risk for displaying psychopathology than are girls (Erne, 1979), whereas the reverse gender difference appears in adulthood (Regier et al., 1988; Silvern & Katz, 1986). At the grade-school level, for example, the preponderance of children in special classes for those with emotional problems are boys, and a majority of these exhibit “acting out” types of symptoms—poor impulse control, physical aggressiveness, very short attention span, and so on (Achenbach, 1982; Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1981). Silvern & Katz (1986) found that gender-role patterns were also predictive of the types of mental health problems exhibited—and not just gender itself. In that study, externalizing or conduct disorder problems were associated with boys who held very stereotypically masculine self-concepts. For girls, higher levels of internalizing personality problems, such as excessive shyness and anxiety, were associated with highly stereotyped feminine self-concepts.

Sex roles appear to play a part in adult psychopathology as well, and both masculinity and femininity have their hazards. Acting-out behavior continues to predominate in males over the life span, as attested by gender differences in rates of violent crimes, antisocial personality disorders and substance abuse, whereas women have higher rates of affective and somatization disorders (Regier et al., 1988). While it is beyond the scope of the present review, it should also be noted that psychiatric diagnosis itself may be influenced by sex bias (Strickland, 1988) so that the same behaviors may be differentially diagnosed in men and women.

There have been widely differing interpretations of these gender differences. Let us take as an example the frequently documented finding that women are twice as likely to suffer from depression as men (Dusek, 1987). Almost every imaginable type of explanation has been offered for this gender difference, ranging from the hormonal predisposition theory (Akiskal, 1979) or other biochemical differences, long accepted by physicians (better to treat with
pharmaceuticals), to the possibility that the phenomenon is an artifact attributable either to
women’s greater verbalization about these symptoms or to clinicians’ bias in diagnosis (Phillips
& Segal, 1969). The fact that women have less power than males has also been suggested as an
explanation for the high rate of depression in women (Nolen-Hoeksema, 1987; Herschfield &
Cross, 1982). An interesting finding that has not been as widely popularized as differences in
depression rates is that men have a higher incidence of successful suicides (Strickland, 1988).
Achievement oriented instrumentality is not invariably positive.

None of the various explanations for gender differences in feelings of depression has yet
received unambiguous support, but considerable research continues in this area. It is somewhat
ironic to note that despite discussions about possible artifacts and incomplete experimental
designs (e.g., Ingram, Cruet, Johnson, & Wisnicki, 1988; Dusek, 1987), published gender
differences are generally interpreted as a masculine advantage. Assertiveness and self-
confidence are often taken as the criteria of psychological health, just as such masculine
strengths are valued culturally. In most research concerning adults, factors such as nurturance,
emotional expressiveness, and intimate communication skills are ignored as health indices, just
as criminality and conduct disorder are ignored as indices of pathology in favor of depression
and low self-esteem. The emphasis is particularly paradoxical in this instance, because of the
long tradition of psychodynamic theory that suggests that it is healthier to express than repress.
Nevertheless, if the women are the affect expressers, they are deemed less healthy.

THEORETICAL MODELS USED TO INTERPRET GENDER DIFFERENCES IN
PERSONALITY

There have been three major types of theories that have focused on why males and
females may differ in personality patterns. They roughly, but not completely, correspond to the
independent variables outlined in the introductory section. The first type has emphasized the
role of biological factors. The second type has emphasized the significance of differential
socialization for boys and girls as they mature and/or an adult milieu that maintains
differential expectations and treatment in a wide variety of areas. A third type, emerging more
recently, has studied the role of the social structure, and particularly sexism, as the major
underlying factor involved in sex differences in personality. Although this last type of theory
could be subsumed under the category of socialization, its emphasis is sufficiently different to
warrant separate discussion. Its focus has been on the structural aspects of society, which, in
turn, influence both individual socialization and most adult activity.

Biologically Based Theories

Theories emphasizing biological factors have long been and continue to be espoused. In
one sense, beliefs that behavioral differences are attributable to biological causes appear to flow
quite naturally from a gender category system defined by a biological dichotomy, even when
this dichotomy itself is open to question (cf. Lorber, 2005). As previously noted, unsupported
generalizations from anatomical differences to behavioral ones are illogical and typical of
preschool reasoning (Piaget, 1928), but are common in adults, nevertheless.

There are political issues with biological positions, as well. To the lay public, biological
causes appear to be more fundamental and unchangeable than psychological ones. Thus,
feminists may be justifiably concerned that biological findings may be used against women, much in the way that such findings historically have hindered the cause of racial equality. Often, as was illustrated in earlier sections, it is not only the accuracy of a documented difference but both the interpretation and the power of the interpreter that can be potentially damaging.

The best-known advocate of a biological approach to personality is, of course, Sigmund Freud. His oft-cited dictum that “anatomy is destiny” may be the most global statement of a biological personality theory (Freud, 1964). While anatomy may well be destiny in a society that practices female infanticide, most contemporary theorists assume that this position, at the very least, needs further elaboration and documentation. With regard to the types of models discussed at the outset, Freud’s position is an example of the Type III model, that is, separate variables leading to distinctly different personalities for males and females.

Freud postulated that genital differences were the primary determinant of personality differences in females and males. His theory of psychosexual development hypothesized that all children went through several stages. During the first two, the oral stage (first year of life) and the anal stage (approximately ages 1–3), boys and girls did not differ. Major differences occurred, however, during the oedipal stage, the third stage of development, when genital differences were observed. Freud assumed that when girls compared their anatomy to boys, they experienced castration anxiety and developed penis envy. Both of these were assumed by Freud to have long-lasting and significant personality implications for females, including feelings of inferiority, greater vanity, weaker superegos (with corresponding tendencies toward less ethical behavior), and weaker gender identity than their male counterparts. The superego differences were attributed to girls’ weaker anxiety about future castration than boys, thus having less to lose from impulsive or taboo behavior. Similarly, he viewed girls as identifying more ambivalently with their own gender and sometimes seeking to take on male characteristics. Androgyny was not in fashion then. Moreover, girls’ incomplete resolution of the oedipal stage, which was itself due to anatomy, was thought to have even further consequences. Without a sufficiently mature resolution, women were presumed to be more likely to manifest the wishes associated with pre-Oedipal stages. Such wishes would include greater dependency, which Freud linked to expressions of infantile oral stage drives.

There are no other global personality theories based on biological factors. There has been, however, increasing research interest in biological factors that may be associated with gender differences in behavior. One area concerns studies of individuals who were abnormally exposed to gonadal hormones in utero, either because of genetic defects or medications taken during pregnancy. A second area of burgeoning interest is in differences in brain functions. These studies have been reviewed elsewhere (e.g., Hines, 1982; Hood, Draper, Crockett, & Petersen, 1987; Brizedine, 2006) and will not be reviewed in this chapter. Some differences have been found with prenatal hormone exposure and spatial functions, but they are generally small and inconsistent.

While these results are interesting, there is one overriding problem with such research: in studies of humans, the biological aspects of gender are completely confounded with its social
and psychological factors. There are consistent and pervasive environmental differences for boys and girls as they mature (Katz, 1983), which may themselves influence brain development, so it is difficult to disentangle which came first. Since the process of physical sex differentiation clearly involves genes and hormones, however, biological factors may well play an important role in personality development, one that future research will undoubtedly help to unravel.

**Socialization Theories**

Considerably more psychological attention has been devoted to positions that have espoused the significance of socialization in gender differences in personality.

Children are profoundly affected by how they are treated and responded to by the adults in their environment. At the youngest ages, it is of course the parents that are largely responsible for their early socialization, but later, the children’s social environment comes to include teachers and peers and often siblings who take on increasing importance (Katz, 1979). General theories about socialization have emphasized either reinforcement factors or modeling behaviors (e.g., Bandura, 1986), and these general theories have not specifically addressed gender, although their views clearly contain the possibility of differential reinforcement or differential modeling for girls and boys.

Gender stereotypes are so strong in adults that even within the first 24 hours of a child’s life, parents see their sons as more alert and stronger than their daughters, whereas their daughters are perceived to be softer, more finely featured, and less attentive than boys (Rubin, Provenzano, & Luria, 1974). Infants are also treated differently by strangers as a consequence of an experimentally assigned gender label (Seavy, Katz, & Zalk, 1975). In a recently completed longitudinal study (Katz), it was found that parental behaviors have more impact on children’s sex roles than did their questionnaire responses. Children who were very masculine and feminine in their toy choices and behaviour at age five had had very sex-typed rooms since infancy. Even in Maccoby & Jacklin’s (1974) review, they cite evidence that fathers and mothers differ with regard to how they engage their children in play, and that fathers offer more gender-stereotypic toys to their children. More rewards are associated with sex-appropriate behavior (Fagot, 1978), and boys receive more pressure in this area, particularly from their fathers (Ruble, 1988).

One change that has been dramatic over the past three decades has been the entry of women into the workforce. Could this be enough to effect such a change? Perhaps to some extent, yes, at least to the degree that women’s roles now frequently include working outside of the home. This is reflected in children’s responses to the question, “what do you want to be when you grow up?” In our research, we now get a variety of responses, rather than just repetitions of “A mother;” the most typical response that girls gave in the 1960s and 1970s. But the variety of vocational responses obtained still reflects the gendered nature of the workplace—teachers and nurses are far more common than college professor or astronaut.

Moreover, differences in family gender roles have lagged even further behind. In terms of the models discussed at the outset, Eagly’s social role theory is a complex subset of a Type IV theory. She does not argue that all the variables differentially affect males and females, only that the social structure does. Of course, that is the primary one in this paradigm.
A third theory to be discussed is the self-in-relation theory of Miller (1984), which is not likely to be found in texts about personality theory. This theory is similar to social role theory in that it posits that early socialization experiences account for gender-related characteristics. It differs, however, in that it assumes that the relational self is the core self-structure in women. In this sense, it exemplifies the Type III model, assuming different personality structures in men and women.

The relational self that Miller posits differs from the self construct elaborated by psychoanalytic and traditional developmental theories. These theorists have emphasized the critical importance of separation from the mother and others in order to form a mature, separate identity (e.g., Erikson, 1963; Mahler, Pine, & Berman, 1975). According to Erikson (1963), independence and autonomy are necessary for true intimacy and relational trust to be experienced. In contrast, the self-relation theory assumes that relatedness is the primary and basic goal. Autonomy is assumed to develop only within the context of a capacity for relating. Thus, the self as an autonomous being is subsumed by and dependent on relational competence.

It is interesting to note that the socialization emphases placed on females to maintain relationships and to be emotionally attuned others (see, e.g., Surrey, 1985) have typically been negatively perceived as leading to dependency, deference, or acquiescence. The devaluation of this central orientation of women may well put them at greater risk for depression, since an integral part of their identity is often devalued. Miller and her colleagues have cast a more positive light on this and thus may provide a fruitful pathway for researchers. Moreover, applications of her theoretical assumptions to clinical practice may produce dramatically different outcomes. It is interesting to note that anthropologists have applied similar concepts to societies, labeling some as being more cooperative (i.e., more relationship-oriented) and others as more competitive (stressing autonomy). Perhaps the basic problem in ours is that we have both models, but they are often associated with different genders.

**Social Structure Models: Sexism as a Theoretical Focus**

Feminist researchers have brought yet a different perspective to the realm of female personality theory, both in critiquing and reconstructing earlier writing and in attending more to previously neglected or under investigated variables that are more strongly associated with women (Fine, 1985). Feminist theorists have also been inclined to attribute most previously obtained gender differences to a political, economic, and social system that has discriminated against women for centuries. It has been argued (e.g., Schaef, 1981) that much of what seems distinctive about women is shared by other low-status groups. This would include such traits as greater sensitivity to social cues, less expressed aggression, higher deference, and better knowledge and understanding of the group in power than that group has of them. Thus, according to many recent feminist theorists, gender differences in personality are most explainable in terms of deep structural organizations of a society that has systematically condoned and practiced sexism.
Psychology is only one of many areas that are being changed by feminist thought. Feminist historians, for example, have noted the distortions and omissions that have occurred in our understanding of the past because of male historians essentially ignoring the world of women (Eisler, 1987). The law as a bastion of male power and privilege is slowly changing (MacKinnon, 2005). A burgeoning field of women’s studies has demonstrated comparable trends in almost all known academic fields in the humanities and social sciences.

According to some feminists (e.g., MacKinnon, 1987, 2005), one of the primary reasons for women behaving differently than men has to do with male dominance and, particularly, living under the constant shadow of physical assault and sexual exploitation, as was evidenced in the United Nations report cited in the introductory section of this chapter. MacKinnon, a law professor, believes that even feminists have not yet fully appreciated the degree of misogyny and sexual sadism that underlie gender inequality. Gender in her view is primarily “an inequality of power, a social status based on who is permitted to do what to whom....Inequality comes first; differences come after” (1987, p. 8). Feminist lawyers have adopted such views because of the seeming ineffectiveness of sex equality laws to obtain for most women decent job opportunities, reasonable physical security, and dignity. The commonalities in women’s personalities, then, would be attributable to their similar social status.

Domestic violence is widespread. At least one in every three women around the world has been beaten or coerced into sex or otherwise abused during her lifetime (Heise, Ellsberg, & Gottemoeller, 1999). Nearly one-third of American women report being physically or sexually abused (Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980; Commonwealth Fund, 1999). Marital violence results in injury almost exclusively to women (Greenblat, 1983); the much less frequent wife-to-husband violence is usually retaliatory or in self-defense (Saunders, 1986). Abuse often begins before marriage, with 38 percent of college women reporting battering by dates (Cate, Henton, Koval, Christopher, & Lloyd, 1982). Startlingly, when all forms of rape, sexual abuse, and battering are combined, as they were in one study, only 8 percent of women reported having never been assaulted (Russell, 1986). Moreover, in many instances, children have witnessed hundreds of thousands of acts of domestic violence, as well as having been abused themselves.

The consequences of violence to personality are difficult to study with precision. It is difficult to disentangle other confounding environmental influences, and different studies employ diverse methods and measures. There do appear to be certain areas of consensus, however. Effects that are widely agreed on include low self-esteem, clinical levels of depression, compliance or lack of assertiveness, feelings of low control or helplessness, strong fear reactions to threatening situations, vulnerability to medical illness, and a sense of needing to hold one’s aggressiveness in check because of a fear of being overwhelmed. The eerie thing about this list is its considerable overlap with personality traits, already discussed, that have been the focus of studies about gender differences in personality or that are intrinsic to gender-role stereotypes.

A particular irony should be mentioned: Child abuse may have a special relationship to the development of dissociative disorders (Briere, 1984). These disorders are exactly the sort that Freud focused on in his women patients. Freud’s early “seduction hypothesis” may have been completely accurate in attributing the problems that these women had to the sexual abuse
to which girls were frequently subjected during his time. When Freud later rejected the
seduction hypothesis, he attributed the peculiarities of these women to their own wish-
fulfilling, irrational fantasies (i.e., the theory of “infantile sexuality”), and he turned to
hypotheses about women’s biologically based inferiority, in part to explain women’s
psychological disturbance. By critically deemphasizing the importance of victimization, Freud
introduced a tradition of theorizing about female personality while ignoring what was done to
women.

It is puzzling, however, as to why the literature on violence has not been better
integrated with the literature on gender differences in personality. This may be due to a general
societal denial of the extent and importance of violence. It may also be as disquieting now as it
was in Freud’s time to inquire into whether certain female characteristics represent an
accommodation to maltreatment.

There is little question that the sexism-feminist perspective has contributed, and
continues to contribute, much to our knowledge base about women.

Post test:

1. Using the various models that you know, explain women and their personality