NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

TWO-CHILD FAMILIES: THE IMPACT OF GENDER OF CHILDREN, SOCIOLOGICAL AND RELATIONSHIP VARIABLES ON SEX ROLE ORIENTATION OF PARENTS

BY

H. Irene Thompson

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE

DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

FAMILY STUDIES

FACULTY OF HOME ECONOMICS

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL 1983

ISBN 0-315-52763-3

CONSULTING PSYCHOLOGISTS PRESS, INC.

577 College Avenue (P.O. Box 60070), Palo Alto, CA 94306 (415) 857-1444

Irene Thompson
University of Alberta Edmonton
Department of Family Studies
Faculty of Home Economics
801 General Services Building
Edmonton, Canada T6G 2H1

re: Page 1

In response to your request of June 28, 1988 (Date) permission is hereby granted you to include a reproduction of the Bem Sex Role Inventory in your bound thesis.

subject to the following restrictions:

(a) Any material used must contain the following credit lines:

> "Reproduced by special permission of the Publisher, Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc., Palo Alto CA 94306,
>
> from Bem Sex Role Inventory (publication)
>
> by Sandra Lipsitz Bem, PhD (author) © 1978
>
> Further reproduction is prohibited without the Publisher's consent."

(b) None of the materials may be sold or used for purposes other than those mentioned above.

(c) One copy of any material reproduced will be sent to the Publisher to indicate that the appropriate credit line has been used.

(d) Payment of a reproduction fee of FEE WAIVED FOR THIS PROJECT

(e) _____

Please remit without further notice and mail to my attention. **Be sure to identify material for which payment is made.**

CONSULTING PSYCHOLOGISTS PRESS, INC.

By Sue Beaver Sue Beaver Date July 21, 1988
Permissions Department

Agreed to by _____

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: H. Irene Thompson

TITLE OF THESIS: Two-child Families: The Impact of Gender of Children, Sociological and Relationship Variables on Sex Role Orientation of Parents

DEGREE: Master of Science in Family Studies

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1988

Irene Thompson

8 Lancaster Crescent
St. Albert, Alberta
T8N 2N8

Date: October 5, 1988

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled:

Two-child Families: The Impact of Gender of Children, Sociological and Relationship Variables on Sex Role Orientation of Parents,

submitted by H. Irene Thompson in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Family Studies.

Wesley J. Adams
Supervisor

Brenda Munro

[illegible]

Date: OCTOBER 5, 1988

DEDICATION

To my parents and family,

Ellen and Bob Hilliard,

Jim, Lana, Greg, Darren and Tara,

for their confidence and encouragement.

ABSTRACT

This thesis is a study of the relationship between selected sociological and relationship variables, gender composition of children and sex role orientation (SRO) of parents in the context of the two-child family. Specifically, it is a look at how the gender composition of pre-school children in intact families can influence sex role orientation of parents and which parent is most susceptible to influence. It involves the main and interaction effects, with gender of children, of selected variables on masculinity and femininity scores of parents.

Findings are interpreted within the conceptual framework of symbolic interaction theory. Gender of children and the other independent variables can be considered part of the definition of the situation and information to which parents react. The dependent variable, sex role orientation of parents, is part of the perception of self which may be revised.

A questionnaire and the Bem Sex Role Inventory were used to collect the data on 70 intact families. A secondary analysis of data was employed. One-way analysis of variance was used to determine the influence of gender of children, and two-way analysis of variance determined main and interaction effects of selected variables on sex role orientation of parents. Student-Newman-Keuls analysis determined differences between groups.

Results indicate significant main effects with fathers' SRO being impacted more than mothers' SRO by eight variables to four. Interactive effects indicate mothers were impacted more than were fathers by five to one.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First, the author would like to express her thanks to Dr. Wes Adams, the supervisor of this thesis, whose guidance, inspiration and unending enthusiasm, support and encouragement motivated me to initiate and continue work on the thesis project. Dr. Adams' investment of time and his patience will be long remembered.

Secondly, the author is grateful to the members of her thesis committee for their roles in this project. Dr. Brenda Munro provided much appreciated assistance with statistical analysis, understanding, support and encouragement when patience wore thin and discouragement became apparent. The constructive criticism and advice offered by Dr. Andrew Harrell is valued and appreciated.

Thirdly, the author would like to thank members of the Family Studies Department, the professors and support staff for their encouragement and assistance. Sincere appreciation goes to the fellow graduate students for their support and for their interest and caring when family and academic issues made for trying times.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.....1

Introduction.....1

Definitions.....1

The two-child Family.....2

Sex Role Orientation.....3

Gender.....6

Parent-Child and Child-Parent Influence.....7

Statement of Purpose.....8

Statement of the Problem.....9

Assumptions and Limitations.....10

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....12

Introduction.....12

Symbolic interaction theory.....12

Key Concepts 14

Application 16

III. LITERATURE REVIEW.....23

Introduction.....23

Development of Sex Role Orientation.....24

Shifts in Sex Role Orientation.....31

Reciprocal Nature of Parent-Child Interaction.....35

Gender.....39

Additional Relevant Variables.....45

Conclusion.....47
IV. RESEARCH DESIGN.....48
Introduction.....48
Sample.....48
Description of the Initial Interview Questionnaire.....50
Bem Sex Role Inventory.....50
Procedure.....52
Research Design.....53
Independent Variables.....54
Sociological Variables.....54
Relationship Variables Involving Parents' Perceptions.....55
Dependent Variable.....55
Sex Role Orientation.....55
Data Analysis.....56
V. RESULTS.....59
Introduction.....59
Results of Objectives.....59
Objectives 1 to 4.....59
Objective 5.....60
Objective 6.....61
Sociological Variables: Main Effects..61
Fathers' Mean Masculinity Scores...61
Fathers' Mean Femininity Scores....61
Mothers' Mean Masculinity and

Femininity scores.....64
Sociological Variables: Interaction Effects.....65
Fathers' Mean Femininity Scores....65
Fathers' Mean Masculinity Scores...68
Mothers' Mean Masculinity Scores...68
Mothers' Mean Femininity Scores....71
Age Variables: Main and Interaction Effects.....73
Fathers' Mean Masculinity and Femininity Scores.....73
Mothers' Mean Masculinity and Femininity Scores.....73
Relationship Variables: Main Effects..74
Fathers' Mean Masculinity Scores...74
Fathers' Mean Femininity Scores....74
Mothers' Mean Femininity Scores....77
Mothers' Mean Masculinity Scores...77
Relationship Variables: Interaction Effects.....80
Mothers' Mean Masculinity Scores...80
Mothers' Mean Femininity Scores....83
Mothers' Mean Masculinity and Femininity Scores.....85
Summary.....85

VI. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS.....86
Introduction.....86
Gender and Sex Role Orientation.....87
Findings and Explanation.....87
Implications.....91
Sociological Variables and Sex Role Orientation...92
Interaction Effects: Mothers.....92
Findings and Explanation.....93
Interaction Effects: Fathers.....96
Findings and Explanation.....97
Implications.....98
Main Effects: Mothers.....99
Findings and Explanation.....100
Main Effects: Fathers.....100
Findings and Explanations.....101
Implications.....102
Relationship Variables and Sex Role Orientation..102
Interaction Effects: Mothers.....103
Findings and Explanation.....103
Interaction Effects: Fathers.....105
Findings and Explanations.....106
Implications.....107
Main Effects: Mothers.....108
Findings and Explanations.....109
Main Effects: Fathers.....110
Findings and Explanations.....110

Implications.....111
Future Research.....112
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....114
APPENDIX A. Letters and Statements.....126
APPENDIX B. Questionnaire.....130
APPENDIX C. Bem Sex Role Inventory.....149
APPENDIX D. Tables for Sociological Variables.....151
APPENDIX E. Tables for Relationship Variables.....160
APPENDIX F. Summary Tables for Masculinity and Femininity Scores of Mothers and Fathers.....165
APPENDIX G. Tables of Student-Newman-Keuls Analysis...169
APPENDIX H. Tables of Non-significant Findings for Sociological and Relationship Variables.....174

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Description	Page
1.	Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Sociological Independent Variables and Fathers' Mean Masculinity Scores (main effects).	62
2.	Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Sociological Independent Variables and Fathers' Mean Femininity Scores (main effects).	63
3.	Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Sociological Independent Variables, Gender Composition of Children and Fathers' Mean Femininity Scores (interaction effects).	66
4.	Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Church Attendance, Gender Composition of Children and Fathers' Mean Femininity Scores (interaction effects).	67
5.	Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Sociological Independent Variables, Gender Composition of Children and Mothers' Mean Masculinity Scores (interaction effects).	69
6.	Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Occupation, Gender Composition of Children and Mothers' Mean Masculinity Scores (interaction effects).	70
7.	Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Education, Gender Composition of Children and Mothers' Mean Masculinity Scores (interaction effects).	72
8.	Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Age of Older Child, Gender Composition of Children and Mothers' Mean Masculinity Scores (interaction effects).	75
9.	Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Relationship Independent Variables and Fathers' Mean Masculinity Scores (main effects).	76

10. Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Relationship Independent Variables and Fathers' Mean Femininity Scores (main effects). 78

11. Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Relationship Independent Variables and Mothers' Mean Femininity Scores (main effects). 79

12. Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Relationship Independent Variables, Gender Composition of Children and Mothers' Mean Masculinity Scores (interaction effects). 81

13. Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of the Surprise of Being Able to Love Both, Gender Composition of Children and Mothers' Mean Masculinity Scores (interaction effects). 82

14. Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of the Difficulty of Discipline Problems, Gender Composition of Children and Mothers' Mean Femininity Scores (interaction effects). 84

15. Summary Table of Gender, Sociological and Relationship Independent Variables (main and interaction effects). 94

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

According to the hypotheses of this research, one's sex role orientation is one aspect of an individual that is subject to influence by various factors, one of which may be gender of others. Rossi (1984) summarized the literature on gender and concluded that gender of child and gender of parent interact so each individual impacts the other. The purpose of this section is to provide an overview of the research related to gender and sex role orientation. The context is the two-child family. From this overview, the research objectives will be drawn.

Definitions

Gender refers to the biological categories of male and female.

Sex role orientation refers to self-classification on the basis of culturally approved social behaviors that are characterized as either masculine or feminine, using the Bem Sex Role Inventory.

Mother and father with only two children of this marriage compromise a family for this study.

The two-child family

In the study of families, many researchers have considered the one-child family, while little consideration has been given to the two-child family with the influence of structure on individuals and family members. Notable exceptions have been the study of two-child family structure by Adams (1985) and the differences between one and two-child families by Knox & Wilson (1978). The paucity of literature on the two-child family is both noteworthy and understandable in view of the complexity of such a family structure.

Adams (1985) found that some parents recognized a difference in the interactions of their children when a third child was present. The third child has a stabilizing effect on the triad. That is, the third person forms a triad to establish "togetherness" to maintain the dyads (Bowen, 1978, p. 373).

Compared to the triads in the three-child family structure in which the children themselves constitute a triad, the triadic structure within the two-child family must be cross-generational, involving at least one parent and one or both children. This means that parents and children are drawn into interaction. Considering this cross-generational structure, Adams (1985) has posed the question of whether the two-child dyad will have "greater affinity with an older generation" (p. 412). If so, one is

then led to consider what other factors influence which aspects of this relationship. The author will now consider two of the variables that could be factors in the interaction of parents and children.

Sex role orientation

Consideration of sex role orientation of parents is important for several reasons. Sex roles, termed sex-typing by Huston (1983) are the qualities one associates with and considers appropriate for males and females of a given culture (Block, 1973), and are considered by some researchers to be the most salient of one's social roles (Condry, 1984). Sex role orientation, or how one attributes masculine and feminine traits (sex roles) to self, affects social functioning and adjustment (Heilbrun, 1978) so that persons of different sex role orientations behave differently in complex social situations (Bem, 1974) which the two-child family may be considered to be as there are several dyads and triads. The four-fold classification of subjects according to self-perceptions of masculine and feminine characteristics has predictive power regarding child-rearing practices and personal variables (Baumrind, 1982).

The literature indicates one's behavior can be expected to vary with one's sex role orientation (Baumrind, 1982), situation (Abrahams, Feldman & Nash, 1978), and family

structure (Adams, 1985). These behavioral differences will be manifested in the interpersonal interactions between family members. Therefore, one might expect these interactions to vary with different situations and with sex role orientations of others. Because parents interact with their children, any factor that influences that interaction, and thus the children, is of importance in studying the family.

Recent studies have indicated that sex role orientation does shift over the life span, and this shift is influenced by various factors (Heilbrun & Schwartz, 1982; McBroom, 1984; Pedersen & Bond, 1985). Parents are susceptible to shifts in their sex role orientations, although questions remain as to the nature of the factors that may influence shifts in sex role orientation of another person. This researcher questions whether parents can experience a shift in their sex role orientations through the influence of their children, particularly if interacting with two same-gender children, and if this may be a different experience for mothers and fathers. The literature does not clarify these points.

Sex role orientation itself has been studied extensively, and since Bem first introduced the androgyny concept in 1974, an abundance of research has concerned sex typing of masculinity and femininity, and androgyny. Masculinity has been associated with factors such as a sense

of well-being (Antill, 1983), adjustment and self-esteem (Orlofsky & O'Heron, 1987), and cognitive flexibility (Carter, 1985). Femininity has been related to happiness in close relationships (Antill, 1983), ambivalence regarding success in competition (Coutts, 1987), and attribution of responsibility in problem solving (Mitchell, 1987). Although gender of children have been studied as it relates to sex role orientation of parents (Ganong & Coleman, 1987; Russell, 1978), gender of children has not been associated with sex role orientation of father and mother in the two-child family exclusively.

The research to date has concentrated on the influence of parents on the development of sex role orientation of offspring (Heilbrun, 1978; Kelly & Worell, 1976; Weinraub et al., 1984; Urberg, 1982). Some researchers have found that different sex role orientations of parents have varying effects on the behavior and development of sex role orientation of their children (Baumrind, 1982; Radin, 1982 in Rossi, 1984). Others have found that sex role orientation, specifically the degree of femininity, accounted for some variance relating to parent-infant interaction (Bugen & Humenick, 1983). To the child, then, parental sex role orientation is important to his own development.

There is a dearth of knowledge of influences of children on parents, and in particular, the influence of

children on sex role orientation of parents. Several suggestions for future research are given in the literature, including age (Hartup, 1978; Havighurst, 1973), marital status and duration (McBroom, 1984), biological and environmental factors (Brim & Kagan, 1980), and situational demands (Abrahams, Feldman & Nash, 1978; McAdams, Jackson & Kirshnit, 1984). There is a need to consider how each family member's "gender role orientation and behaviors" in one particular area are "related to orientations and behaviors in other areas" (Atkinson, 1987, p. 25). This researcher then questions which relationship and sociological factors are likely to influence sex role orientations of parents.

Gender

Gender is purported to be the basic categorization of organization of the world and gender issues must be considered in family theory (Hare-Mustin, 1987). In parent-child interactions, a parent tends to relate to that child according to its gender (Roopnarine, 1986) rather than the capabilities the child may possess (Deaux, 1984), thus contributing to the development of gender appropriate characteristics and behaviors. Rossi (1984) interprets the gender research to mean that the child, at birth, brings gender predispositions that interact with parental gender differences. Gender of parent is a factor affecting parent-

child interaction (Bugen & Humonick, 1983).

It would seem that gender of either parent or child influences parent-child interaction. Gender of children may be considered a situational factor in the family. Researchers indicate a need for studying the situational context (McAdams, Jackson & Kirshnit, 1984) in social interaction where gender information is presented and acted upon (Deaux, 1984), the process by which the situation can influence and modify sex role self-concepts (Abrahams, Feldman & Nash, 1978).

Parent-child and child-parent influence

Several theorists have emphasized the reciprocal nature of parent-infant interaction (Klein, Jorgensen & Miller, 1978; Lamb, 1978; Lewis & Feiring, 1978). Most of these have considered mother-infant relationships in which the mother influences interactions and response of her infant who, in turn, determines the mother's response (Belsky, Taylor & Rovine, 1984; Brody & Axelrod, 1974; Lamb & Easterbrooks, 1980; Stern, 1974). A few have considered parent-child reciprocity involving both parents, and sex-of-child and task structure as factors in parent-child reciprocity (Davis & Hathaway, 1982). Few have considered child-parent reciprocity involving the child past infancy, an exception being Bengston & Troll (1978). Hill (1981) indicates a need for research concerning bi-directional

parent-child influence and the changing individual within the family context. Few studies have focused on the impact of infants (Hartup, 1978; Lamb, 1978) or of the older child on parents or families.

The support and direction of past family research have led this researcher to consider the question of the relationship between gender of offspring and sex role orientations of parents in the two-child family. Both gender and sex role orientation of parents are factors in the development of sex role orientation of children. As well, gender of child influences parent-child interpersonal relationships. That is, considering the reciprocal nature of the parent-child relationship, not only do parents influence the sex role orientation of their children, but their participation in activities with their children, for example, may influence a shift in sex role orientation of the parents. This leads the researcher to question whether gender of children could be a factor influencing the sex role orientation of parents.

Statement of Purpose

There are some discrepancies in the literature regarding shifts in sex role orientation and the precise nature of the influence of gender of children on sex role orientation of parents. A dearth of knowledge exists regarding impact of children on parents. Because of these

issues, objectives are appropriate. The purpose of this study is to explore differences in the relationship between gender of offspring and sex role orientation of parents in the context of the two child family in which both children are of the same gender as opposed to the two child family in which the two children are of mixed gender. Ordinal position of children in families having offspring of mixed gender composition will also be considered.

Statement of the Problem

The problem may be stated thus: Is there a relationship between gender of offspring and the sex role orientation of parents in the two child family? If so, who is most subject to influence? What are the influential factors? More specifically, the research objectives will explore the following issues.

(1) How is the degree of femininity of mothers, as measured by the Bem Sex Role Inventory, related to gender composition of children in a two-child family (two females, two males, older female, older male gender composition)?

(2) How is the degree of masculinity of mothers, as measured by the Bem Sex Role Inventory, related to gender composition of children in a two-child family (two females, two males, older female, older male gender composition)?

(3) How is the degree of femininity of fathers, as measured by the Bem Sex Role Inventory, related to gender

composition of children in a two-child family (two females, two males, older female, older male gender composition)?

(4) How is the degree of masculinity of fathers, as measured by the Bem Sex Role Inventory, related to gender composition of children in a two-child family (two females, two males, older female, older male gender composition)?

(5) Are mothers or fathers more likely to reflect influences of gender of children on their degree of masculinity and femininity, as measured by the Bem Sex Role Inventory?

(6) What other sociological and relationship factors may exert interaction effects, when gender of children is considered, and main effects on sex role orientation of parents?

Assumptions and Limitations

Assumptions. The following assumptions are taken from the literature.

Men and women carry both masculine and feminine traits which are independent dimensions.

Gender impacts the degree of masculinity and femininity of one's sex role orientation.

Parents and children exert an influence on each other. Parents influence sex role orientation of children, and children may influence sex role orientation of parents.

Sex role orientation may change over time.

Limitations

The sample is non-random, therefore results cannot be generalized to other two-child families.

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction

Symbolic interaction theory views the family in terms of interaction of its members (Schvaneveldt, 1981). It provides a perspective for both the individual and interpersonal relationships involved in parent-child social interactions in the two-child family.

This section consists of a description of aspects of symbolic interaction theory that are of importance to this research. Then, the application of the theoretical framework to the current research will be described.

Symbolic interaction theory

Man is a social animal who depends on social interaction and membership in social groups for his existence. It is through social interaction that the individual develops a sense of self (Chenitz & Swanson, 1986).

In symbolic interaction theory, the world is defined as an arena of interacting personalities. Charon (1985) emphasizes interaction relevant to the study of social behavior. Interaction is of an interpersonal and dynamic nature (Charon, 1985) as humans act in relation to each other and take each other into account. As well,

interaction involves what is happening within the individual in response to a world that he/she has defined (Charon, 1985). Interaction occurs within a cultural environment that is the result of past interaction (Schvaneveldt, 1981). Thus, interaction in one stage of family development directs and determines interaction in subsequent stages (Schvaneveldt, 1981).

Behavior, of which interaction is a part, is influenced by both culture and past experience (Charon, 1985). Through interaction with others, man learns expectations for his behavior (Stryker,1968). One's behavior is both cause and effect of behavior of another as each person modifies the behavior of the other (Schvaneveldt, 1981). Interaction in the family socializes the children to conform, most of the time, to cultural behavior requirements (Schvaneveldt, 1981).

Each person occupies a position in society that is defined by role expectations of those with whom he/she interacts and of society as a whole. It is largely through social interaction that these role expectations are formed by the individual. The individual interacts with others, family and society to aid in the development of roles and personal identity such that change is allowed in the individual and society.

Central to symbolic interaction theory is the concept of meaning of man's symbolic environment. This environment

is the product of his use of language and gestures that have a shared meaning and guide his/her self-definitions. Man's per tions are functions of social interactions that occur wi this symbolic environment.

Man defines events to give them meaning which leads to action (Chenitz & Swanson, 1986). Man is both actor and reactor; he initiates acts and reacts to others on the basis of the meanings that the others have for him. Meaning is derived by a process of interpretation from the social interaction man has with others (Blumer, 1969). The infant, born a-social, acquires complex sets of symbols by which he gives meaning and understanding to behavior (Stryker, 1972) in the process of becoming a social being.

In sum, interaction is viewed within the context of how those involved define each other and themselves in the social situation. Social behavior results from the process of role development through social expectations and continually changing social interaction in a symbolic environment. That is, an individual's interpretation and meaning of the world and social interaction are integral aspects of human functioning.

Key concepts

Symbolic interaction theory considers many concepts, but the following key concepts deal specifically with parental re-definition of self.

The self is a process of defining one's own characteristics through interaction with others (Stryker, 1972) and involves symbolic communication (Nye & Berardo, 1973a). It is reflexive in that the self can be the object of one's own actions, and it changes with the role played and the audience (Nye & Berardo, 1973a). Self is at the heart of the dynamic personality system (Kimmel, 1979) which includes social interactions in a social environment.

Self concept is a product of this self reflection, and is developed through defining one's behavior in terms of the expectations others have of him, a part of the self labeled the "me" (Stryker, 1972). Involved in the definition of self is role-taking in which one can anticipate the responses of others to a social act (Stryker, 1972), one behaves according to expectations of the generalized or significant other, a reference group through which one assesses and directs one's own behavior. A social act is behavior that results from adjustment to another as each person takes the other into account.

Participants in a social act occupy positions, a socially organized category such as father, mother or child, which organizes behavior and leads to expectations of particular behaviors called roles (Stryker, 1972). Socialization must be specific to roles (Nye & Berardo, 1973a).

Upon entering a situation, one must symbolically define

the situation which prompts behavior (Stryker, 1972). Basic to the interaction process, the reciprocal stimulation of at least two people, is communication involving shared meaning between the initiator and the perceiver of symbols or actions. Language is a "system of significant symbols" (Stryker, 1972, p. 21) or shared meanings. The interaction process involves use of communication and the indelible mind to incorporate new with old information so one, thus, redefines his/her self, the situation and the chosen line of action.

The following theoretical analysis will indicate how symbolic interaction theory helps explain the relationship between gender of children and sex role orientation of parents, the two main variables of the study. Also to be considered is the role of other independent variables. This analysis will focus on the aspects of social interaction and definitions or meanings an individual attaches to self and others in the process of interaction.

The application of symbolic interaction theory

The context of this study is the family. Burgess (1974) defines the family "a unity of interacting persons" (p. 150), meaning "a living, changing, growing thing" (Schvaneveldt, 1981, p. 97) within which social interaction takes place. A family's actual unity exists in the interaction of its members enabling it to live as each

member reacts toward others, each having a conception of his/her own role and the roles of others (Burgess, 1974). In the family context, symbolic interaction theory concerns the socialization of children and personality development of members (Schvaneveldt, 1981).

Each person, for example, occupies a particular position involving culturally sanctioned roles, such as child or parent, relative to one's position. Each member defines these roles or cultural expectations in terms of a generalized other through which one assesses and directs him/herself. For example, a parent tries to fulfill cultural expectations in socializing his/her child into gender-appropriate behavior and assesses him/herself relative to the success with which the role is carried out.

Each member of the family enters the situation with meanings developed about him/herself in terms of gender and sex role orientation, and behaves in accordance with these meanings and cultural expectations. The family itself interacts with society, so each family achieves certain tempos and rhythms through social interaction relevant to the meaning each member has of others and the meaning society associates with the positions and roles of parents, children and the family as a whole. That is, one's personal meanings and interaction within the family and with society determine behavior or social acts as each adjusts to the other and takes the other into account.

Gender is considered to be a biological attribute in this study. Being male or female influences how one relates to others (Deaux, 1984), how others relate to him, and how one views him/herself. Culture and past experience help define the situation, in terms of gender of children and the parents' own sex role orientation, for the individual, and they determine his/her response, setting the stage for action.

One judges the importance and worth of one's self and behavior through interaction with others, such as parents, who are influenced by their social culture and past experience. Through interaction in the family, one acquires and develops shared understanding of behavioral expectations relative to the situation (Schvaneveldt, 1981), position, gender and sex role orientation. Therefore, parents may feel a need to act by involving themselves in the interests and activities of their children as they help in developing gender-appropriate behavior in their children.

Lerner & Spanier (1978) contend "all sociocultural milieus are embedded in history" (p. 12). One is born into the ongoing society and culture which tell him what he/she is to be (Stryker, 1972) and which behaviors are appropriate. For example, society and culture define wh masculine or feminine characteristics are gender appropriat (Bem, 1974). Parents react positively to gender-appropriate behavior and negatively to gender-inappropriate behavior

(Fagot, 1978). Thus, a child's behavior tends to be in the direction of culturally approved gender stereotypes (Fagot, 1974). Huston (1983) cites evidence to indicate a child's knowledge about and adherence to cultural expectations and stereotypes are present by age two and increase with age. In interacting with others and taking others into account (Charon, 1985; Stryker, 1972), one reacts to the gender of others and initiates gender-appropriate behavior.

One defines the situation in terms of gender, giving meaning to behavior, and acts toward others on the basis of the meaning others have of him/her and the meaning he/she has of others (Stryker, 1972). That is, gender of both the parent and the child influences interaction on the basis of meaning attached to the gender of the participants. Parents play different roles in interaction with their children and these roles vary according to the child's gender (Fagot, 1974). Each responds to the other symbolically in language and gestures, in terms of how each defines the situation (Schvaneveldt, 1981).

The parents determine their goal of developing gender-appropriate behavior in response to their definition of the situation of having two boys, two girls, or one girl and one boy. A child thereby develops a sense of the importance of behavior and attributes associated with his/her gender and how to define the self in terms of such culturally determined attributes and behaviors deemed appropriate by

society (Richardson, 1981). Thus, one's culture defines how one is to perceive him/herself (Stryker, 1972) and results in one's self-concept through defining behavior in terms of others' expectations. One's sex role orientation depends on these culturally approved definitions internalized early in life from interacting with one's parents and other family members.

In the family, the members have an opportunity for interaction, and the members can influence each other as each takes the other into account. Each reacts to others, giving meaning to their behavior and activities, and others influence one's activities and behaviors in return. Each individual interacts differently with different people, resulting in feedback for the individual and changes in the individuals involved in the reciprocal interaction (Lerner & Spanier, 1978). This feedback influences personality (Maccoby & Martin, 1983) and relationships with others.

That is, parents not only interact with each other, but they interact with and influence their children as well, providing new information in the process that may influence the other. The children, on the other hand, interact with each other and with their parents, helping sustain parental interest and involvement. Indeed, much of what parents do is determined by the prior action of their children (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Thus, children, too, have the opportunity to influence parents. Parents define the situation in terms

of activities, conditions and interests of their children as set by societal and cultural expectations, which can impact parental behavior and sex role orientations. Huston (1983) points out that some social researchers seriously consider the "socializing function of activities, interests and roles" (p. 445), a process important to the present research. Part of this process is role-taking as each family member anticipates the responses of the other(s) to a social act, and in turn, modifies or stabilizes his/her own role (Schvaneveldt, 1981).

Man is also reflexive with an indelible mind (Burr, Leigh, Day & Constantine, 1976). Experience and the meaning one attaches to information determine who one is as one integrates new information with old, revising behavior and self-definitions (Stryker, 1972). Thus, one's perception of one's self is constantly revised in response to new information and new meanings gained in interaction.

Self-perceptions may predict behavior as well as arise from involvement in particular behavior and activities, and "may be the result of undertaking nontraditional activities..." (Huston, 1983, p. 412). One's sex role orientation is a part of how one identifies one's self in one's mind and is subject to change over time in response to others in the process of interaction. Self-perception, one aspect of which is sex role orientation, may be influenced by gender or other relationship variables as well as various

sociological factors.

The individual, open to change throughout the life cycle (Lerner & Spanier, 1978), is constantly adapting and changing in relation to his changing environment (Hartup, 1978). Part of this environment is new activities, attitudes and interests associated with the gender of children. The socio-cultural setting shapes the environment which both affects and is affected by the changing individual, as in, for example, reciprocal parent-child relationships. The new interactions become components of the individual's experience and promote individuality (Lerner & Spanier, 1978). In this process of re-definition, one is, in effect, entering a new situation in light of new information, and the interaction process continues anew.

CHAPTER III

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

In the past, family research has concentrated on the one child family. Various themes and perspectives have emerged. This family has been studied in terms of the transition to parenthood with its effect on individual parents as well as on the marital dyad (Harriman, 1983; Waldron & Routh, 1981). How the transition to parenthood relates to family of origin and marital change has also been considered (Belsky & Isabella, 1985). Other themes have emerged concerning parenthood as a crisis event (Dyer, 1963; Hott, 1976; LeMasters, 1957; Miller & Sollie, 1980; Russell, 1974), with particular emphasis on the mother-child dyad (Belsky, Taylor & Rovine, 1984) and the father-child relationship (Hott, 1976). Consideration has been given both parents and the child as a triadic system involving marital and parent-child relationships (Belsky, 1984).

However, in contrast to the one-child family, the two-child family has not been researched extensively. For instance, only a few studies, with different themes, have looked at the two-child family. Knox & Wilson (1978) investigated the differences between one and two-child families, while Kendrick & Dunn (1984) focused on the interaction of mother and first child in a two-child family.

Adams (1985) conceptualized the two-child family in terms of its dyadic and triadic structure.

The following review will expand on the problem and theory outlined in the previous two chapters. The first section of this review will examine the importance and implications of dyads and triads in family structure. This will be followed by a discussion of the development of sex role orientation. Next, shifts in sex role orientation will be considered. The following two sections will include a discussion of the reciprocal nature of parent-child interaction and the role of gender in parent-child interaction. Finally, a section on significant additional variables will be considered that could be relevant to this study, and the hypotheses will be stated.

Development of Sex Role Orientation

Sex roles, the qualities or characteristics one associates with, or considers appropriate for, males and females of a given culture (Block, 1973), are considered by many to be the most salient of one's social roles (Condry, 1984; Mussen, 1969; Urberg, 1982). Sex role orientation, or how one attributes sex roles to self, influences social functioning (Heilbrun, 1978) and adjustment (Heilbrun, 1978; Orlofsky & Windle, 1978). It is, therefore, a factor in parent-child interaction and an aspect of family relationships that requires attention.

Traditionally, sex roles have been considered to be either masculine or feminine with particular characteristics and functioning associated with each. One is sex typed according to how one applies stereotypically masculine or feminine characteristics to one's self (Bem, 1974). Bem (1974) developed the Bem Sex Role Inventory based on the theory that the psychological attributes representing masculinity and femininity may be independent rather than polarities found on a continuum. That is, a person may exhibit both masculine and feminine traits.

A fourfold typology involving high and low levels of both masculinity and femininity was developed by Spence, Helmreich & Stapp (1975), and accepted by Bem (1977). For example, if an individual measures high in masculinity, that person, whether male or female, is considered to have a masculine sex role orientation. Similarly, if a person scores high on femininity, the individual is considered to have a feminine sex role orientation. A score high in both masculinity and femininity indicates androgynous individuals whom Bem (1974) considered to be better adjusted socially than persons in any of the other groups. Low scores on both dimensions indicate an undifferentiated sex role orientation.

Research before the early 1970's concentrated on masculine and feminine sex roles. Since then, an abundance of research has concerned all four categories of sex role

orientation, focusing mainly on masculine, feminine and androgynous, with less concern for the undifferentiated category.

Sex role orientation has been related to various themes involving the family. These include coping (Patterson & McCubbin, 1984), conflict management (Yelsma & Brown, 1985) and task sharing between husbands and wives (Bird, Bird, & Scruggs, 1984; Atkinson & Huston, 1984), mate selection (Antill, 1983) and fertility decisions (Baber & Dreyer, 1986). Sex role orientation of parents has been related to transition to parenthood (Belsky, Lang & Huston, 1986), parenting (Barnett, 1981; Baumrind, 1982; DeFrain, 1979; Kelly & Worell, 1976; McHale & Huston, 1984; Robinson, 1979), and psychological adjustment in new mothers (Bassoff, 1984).

Several concepts have emerged from the study of femininity and masculinity of adults. Feminine women show ambivalence regarding success in competition (Coutts, 1987) and these women indicate attribution of responsibility in problem solving (Mitchell 1987). For both males and females, femininity contributes to happiness in close relationships, such as married couples, while masculinity is important for a sense of well-being (Antill, 1983), adjustment (Glazer & Dusek, 1985; Jones, Chernovitz & Hansson, 1978; Orlofsky & O'Heron, 1987), self esteem (Antill, 1983; Orlofsky & O'Heron, 1987), and cognitive

flexibility (Carter, 1984). High masculinity scores are positively related to mental health of new mothers (Bassoff, 1985). The masculinity component seems to be the critical predictor of attitudes, behavior and other personality components, particularly for females (Huston, 1983). Since most women have high femininity scores, an increase in masculinity scores means a tendency toward androgyny for these women.

Although many themes have been considered in the study of sex role orientation, only a few researchers (Ganong & Coleman, 1987; Lansky, 1964; Russell, 1978) have considered the relationship of gender of children to the sex role orientation of parents.

Persons of different sex role orientations behave differently in complex social situations (Bem, 1974). The two-child family may be considered a complex social situation with its many dyads and triads. We may, therefore, expect family members having different sex role orientations to exhibit different behaviors and influence interaction between family members. For example, both male and female individuals sex-typed masculine and feminine, respectively, restrict their behavior to that considered appropriate for their gender (Bem, 1977; Orlofsky & Windle, 1978). Opposite sex behavior tends to be rejected by both males and females, but to a greater extent by males (Bussey & Perry, 1982). Thus, sex role orientation impacts the

behavior of parents and children.

Parental influence has been found to be a major factor in the development of a child's sex role orientation, a process that begins early in life and continues over several years. There are indications that sex role socialization has already begun at birth (Richardson, 1981) as daughters are described as having more stereotypically feminine characteristics, with fathers being more extreme and stereotyped in their judgments than are mothers (Rubin, Provenzano & Luris, 1976).

Some researchers have found that children as young as two and three (Kuhn, Nash & Brucken, 1978; Weinraub et al., 1984) develop concepts of masculinity and femininity with girls less sex-typed than boys, particularly if their mothers work outside the home (Gold & Andres, 1978; Urberg, 1982). Mothers' employment, the father's sex-typed personality traits, and sex-typed activities in the home were found to be predictors of sex role development in children in their third year (Weinraub et al., 1984). Barnett (1981) found that non-traditional sex role attitudes of parents have a significant effect on the earlier independence and greater emphasis on achievement in a study of four and five year old girls. Both mothers and fathers have a significant effect on their children's sex-typing, particularly on the same-sex offspring (Huston, 1983).

Heilbrun (1978) found a relationship between sex role

orientation of mothers and the development of sex role orientation in their adolescent male children; androgynous males identified most often with a mother exhibiting both masculine and feminine characteristics, and undifferentiated males identified usually with a mother stereotyped as feminine. No differences were found for females (Heilbrun, 1978), indicating a possibly greater influence of mothers on the sex role development of their sons than on that of their daughters. Boys in homes with only a mother and an absent father were found to have lower masculinity scores (Drake & McDougall, 1977).

Less research has appeared focusing on the sex role orientation of daughters than of sons. However, findings indicate femininity of daughters is positively related to the father's masculinity scores (Heilbrun, 1976b) as well as his approval of the mother as a model (Lewis & Feiring, 1978) for the daughter.

Different characteristics of parents produce different sex role orientations in sons and daughters. A warm affectionate relationship with parents results in feminine or androgynous sex role orientation of male offspring, while female offspring acquire nontraditional sex roles if parents encourage intellectual-achievement behaviors in their daughters (Kelly & Worell, 1976).

Baumrind (1982) contends the sex role classifications of masculinity, femininity, androgynous and undifferentiated

types for parents have predictive power in determining children's competence. Children of masculine or feminine sex-typed parents are more competent than are children of androgynous parents (Baumrind, 1982). Spence (1982), however, cautions it is premature to draw any conclusions about the impact of parents' instrumental and expressive characteristics , involving perceptions of masculinity and femininity, respectively, on their children. Kelly & Worell (1976) conclude that sex role orientation is learned; parents who exhibit and reinforce cross-typed sex role characteristics tend to produce children with nontraditional sex roles. However, Lamke & Filsinger (1983) contend the relationship between sex role orientation of mothers and childrearing practices is unclear.

The child in his/her family is part of a social context in which the child acquires particular characteristics and behaviors through interaction with parents. This is consistent with symbolic interaction theory which considers man to be a social animal born into a social context in which he acquires a complex set of symbols that give meaning and understanding to behavior, retaining what he judges to be good and discarding what he perceives bad through interaction with others. Some conformity to social and cultural values is a part of the 'me', that part of the self determined by social expectations of what one should be. As a child incorporates socially expected sex role behaviors as

a part of his 'self', the child would also seem to be developing his or her sex role orientation.

The literature appears to support the contention that parents are influential in the development of their children. Specifically, the literature presents evidence that the sex role orientation of parents can stimulate the development of sex role orientation in their children. This, in turn, influences behavior and social interaction of all concerned. The influence and effect may differ for each parent and for sons and daughters. What requires clarification is what factors can influence self-perceptions of masculinity and femininity in parents.

The next section will consider shifts in sex role orientation of parents.

Shifts in Sex Role Orientation

Although Kagan (1964) concludes that sex role standards, the culturally approved characteristics for males and females, are not easily altered once learned, several more recent researchers contend that how one classifies one's self as having masculine or feminine characteristics does shift as individuals and patterns of interaction change (Brim & Kagan, 1980; Huston, 1983; Lerner & Spanier, 1978; Klein, Jorgensen & Miller, 1978).

Research indicates sex role orientation is a process occurring over several years from infancy into adulthood

until the adult reaches a plateau (Condry, 1984). This process may produce shifts in sex role orientation as one proceeds through life cycle stages. Feldman, Biringen & Nash (1981) suggest masculine and feminine traits are a function of stage of the life cycle.

Several themes have emerged in the literature. Masculinity self-perceptions increase over time for boys and, particularly, for girls (Hall & Halberstadt, 1980; Huston, 1983), while girls' femininity scores decline (Hall & Halberstadt, 1980).

In one study covering a 20 year span, Heilbrun & Schwartz (1982) found that females tended toward developing an androgynous sex role orientation during the decade of the sixties, reaching a plateau in the seventies, while males decreased in androgyny in the sixties but showed growth in the seventies. They also found males to be generally more androgynous than females in both self-report and laboratory observation studies. Pedersen & Bond (1985) found current students, both male and female, to be more androgynous compared to students of a decade before, taking cultural change into consideration.

In a longitudinal study over five years, McBroom (1984) found a decrease in traditionalism of sex role orientation, with females showing a greater shift than males, and the most recent cohort shifting the most. Fifty years earlier, in contrast to McBroom (1984), Terman & Miles (1936) found

that males increase their tolerance of opposite sex tendencies in themselves more than do females. Emmerich (1973) summarizes evidence suggesting that older individuals become increasingly tolerant of tendencies in themselves that have been traditionally associated with members of the opposite sex.

On the other hand, some research indicates increased sex-typing of both males and females (Lueptow, 1985) over time. Feldman, Biringen & Nash (1981) found parents of young children with one child less than 10 years of age have been found to be more traditional in self-descriptions than are parents of older children. Mothers of young children score higher in tenderness, a feminine trait, than do other women, and fathers score higher in autonomy, a masculine trait, than other men (Feldman, Biringen & Nash, 1981).

Thus, there is little agreement in the literature regarding the person influenced or the direction of the shifts, although there is agreement that shifts do occur.

Abrahams, Feldman & Nash (1978), taking the situational approach to the study of shifts in sex role orientation, summarize several theorists in stating various life situations involve specific task performance that require re-orientation of the personality. Different experiences require different behaviors defined as masculine or feminine. The situations demanding mainly feminine (or masculine) behavior result in subjects describing themselves

as more feminine (or more masculine) (Abrahams, Feldman & Nash, 1978).

These perceptions can influence behavior. Society demands particular behaviors in specified roles and may demand change as one enters adult roles and positions. One often wishes to conform to these social demands in becoming a "better" father or mother, for example (Brim & Kagan, 1980). In doing so, one may revise one's self- perceptions of masculinity and femininity so these perceptions are congruent with their roles as parents.

Symbolic interaction theory indicates the human mind is constantly changing as it revises the old while incorporating new information. Sex role orientation, how one ascribes certain characteristics of masculinity and femininity to one's self, is a function of the mind. Thus, as one incorporates new information, sex role orientation may be subject to shifts, as research indicates.

In sum, studies indicate that sex role orientation is subject to shifts over time for both males and females. However, there is little evidence supporting the nature of this shift (Feldman, Biringen & Nash, 1981) as specific influences on shifts in sex role orientation have not been clearly identified. There is conflicting evidence regarding shifts in androgynous sex role orientations. Sex-typed situational demands alter one's self-description in terms of masculine and feminine characteristics. This shift may be

greater for females than for males.

The literature indicates sex role orientations of parents influence their children. Therefore, any shifts in sex role orientation will have implications for the child. The reciprocal nature of parent-child interaction will be considered in the next section.

The Reciprocal Nature of Parent-Child Interaction

In the study of family interaction, the researcher must consider not only the impact of parents on children, but also the impact of the children on their parents (Bell, 1968; Keller & Bell, 1979; Lerner & Spanier, 1978), as all social interaction is characterized by reciprocity (Klein, Jorgensen & Miller, 1978). Yarrow, Waxler & Scott (1971) stress the reciprocal nature of the parent-child interaction with both parent and child effects. In effect, the child helps "create his own social world" (Cantor & Gelfand, 1977, p. 238).

Researchers of the family continued to study only the child as an object of parental actions until the late 1960's when Bell (1968) advanced the notion of the child as a stimulant of parental behavior. In recent years, the reciprocal nature of parent-child interaction has been studied in the parent-infant context, particularly involving the mother, in which the mother influences interactions and responses of her infant who, in turn, determines the

mother's responses so their behavior is synchronized (Belsky, Taylor & Rovine, 1984; Brody & Axelrod, 1978; Hartup, 1978; Hartup & Lempers, 1973; Klein, Jorgensen & Miller, 1978; Lamb & Easterbrooks, 1980; Lewis & Feiring, 1978; Stern, 1974).

Because the study of triads and larger units of analysis is so complex, most research has tended to focus on dyads such as mother-infant, and has treated differences among children and between parents as aggregates (Klein, Jorgensen & Miller, 1978). Those studying the mother-father-infant triad have focused mainly on the infant (Atkinson, 1987). A few have considered parent-child reciprocity involving both parents (Fagot, 1974; Osofsky & O'Connell, 1972).

Various themes have emerged, including communication involving infant vocalizations (Keller & Scholmerich, 1987), substantial verbal relationships involving four-year-olds with both parents (Davis & Hathaway, 1982), the influence of non-verbal behavior of 11-year-old children on evaluation of children by adults (Bates, 1976), and the influence of child responsiveness on favorable evaluations of children by adults regarding intellectual and social abilities (Cantor, Wood & Gelfand, 1977).

Children can also impact parents in other ways. In an analysis of fourteen studies involving child influence on parents or adults, Bell & Chapman (1986) concluded that

child characteristics of independence-dependence, activity-hyperactivity and person orientation elicit different reactions from the parent/adult. Different situations, such as dependency and independence (Osofsky & O'Connell, 1972) and activity level (Buss, 1981) of the child elicit different parental responses. Several researchers (Bates,1976; Cantor & Gelfand, 1976; Davis & Hathaway, 1982; Yarrow, Waxler & Scott, 1971) have found gender of parents and children to be a factor in parent-child reciprocity. However, some researchers contend a child's behavior and social interaction is a function of the structure of the activity rather than the gender of the child (Huston & Carpenter, 1985).

The study of interaction between members of the entire family is necessary to understand development because, as Lamb (1978) points out, early development takes place in a family context. This means members of the family other than the mother-child dyad are usually involved in the interaction. Mothers participate in activities with their children more than do fathers (Block, 1987), so the opportunity may be greater for mothers to alter their own self-concepts or sex role orientation in response to this greater participation than may be the case for fathers.

Age of children is a factor in interaction and its influence is a source of discrepancy in the literature. Some research indicates parents tend to interact more with

younger children of less than 12 months (Smith & Daglish, 1977). Other results indicate parents are more likely to attend to the behavior of older infants of 18 months (Roopnarine, 1986).

Symbolic interaction theory supports the idea of parent-child reciprocity in that man is an actor and reactor in his social environment, responding to others around him while initiating activity to which others respond. One responds to others as or takes others into account in interactions with ther

In sum, research ha ended to concentrate on the parent-child relationship as parents impact children. Parents influence the development of sex role orientation, for example, of their children, but children also impact parents. However, few studies have focused on child influence on parents and families, some exceptions being Hartup (1978), Lamb (1978) and Ganong & Coleman (1987).

Considering the reciprocal nature of parent-child interaction and the influence of parents' sex role orientation on children, an examination of factors which may influence a shift in sex role orientation of the parents, one of which may be gender of children, is required. Gender of both parents and children will next be discussed as it impacts interaction.

Gender

In parent-child interactions, a parent tends to relate to a child according to its gender (Ahammer, 1973; Fagot, 1974; Fagot, 1978; Liddel, Henzi & Drew, 1987; Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974; Roopnarine, 1986; Rubin, Provenzano & Luria, 1976; Smith & Daglish, 1977; Snow, Jacklin & Maccoby, 1983; Straus, 1967) rather than the capabilities the child may possess (Deaux, 1984; Peterson, Rollins, Thomas & Heaps, 1984).

Parental response to gender-appropriate behavior is favorable, but response is less favorable for gender-inappropriate behavior of toddlers (Fagot, 1978). Gender-inappropriate behavior is discouraged, particularly for boys (Fagot, 1977). Parents will punish gender-inappropriate behavior as well as reward gender-appropriate behavior in their children which leads to the acquisition of sex-typed traits by the children (Kagan, 1964). Emmerich (1973) summarizes evidence that parents, as socializing agents, tolerate deviance from general norms differently, depending on the gender of the child and the kind of behavior. For example, girls exhibiting adult-oriented dependent behavior elicit a more positive response from care-takers (Emmerich, 1973) than those exhibiting active, large motor activity who elicit a more negative response (Fagot, 1978). Huston (1983) contends the expectations of "success, attainment values, minimum standards, and achievement effort" (p.404)

of both boys and girls are generally greater in stereotypically gender-appropriate domains than in stereotypically gender-inappropriate domains.

Thus, gender-appropriate behavioral expectations of children by parents are encouraged (Fagot, 1978; Power & Parke, 1986) and contribute to development of gender appropriate behavior in the child. For example, boys and girls tend to engage in different play behaviors (Smith & Daglish, 1977) and choose different toys stereotyped as gender appropriate (O'Brien & Huston, 1985). Conformity to behavioral role requirements in different situations has been found to influence sex role attributes (Abrahams, Feldman & Nash, 1978). Block (1973) contends the socialization process by parents has produced differences in personality development of males and females, with males having greater behavioral options than females.

Kagan (1964), in summarizing the research on sex role identification, contends behavior such as aggression, interpersonal dominance, initiation of sexual behavior and suppression of strong emotion is given cultural approval and even encouragement for boys, while such behavior as dependency, passivity, conformity, submissiveness to males and inhibited overt signs of sexual behavior are given cultural approval for girls.

Some discrepancy exists in the literature regarding aggression, considered a masculine trait, of children.

Parents expect more overt aggression in sons than in daughters (Kagan , 1964), and aggression is tolerated more in boys than in girls (Emmerich, 1973). However, others have found no difference in parental reaction to aggressive behavior of boys or girls (Fagot, 1978).

Although gross motor skills can be learned by boys while alone, most sex-typed responses of girls, such as poise, passivity, and interest in babies, "require reactions from other people" (Kagan, 1964, p. 151). This researcher then questions if self-perceptions of females are more likely to be influenced by interpersonal relationships than are those of males.

There is little agreement in the literature regarding several aspects of parent-child interaction considering gender. Some results indicate parents interact equally with boys and girls (Fagot, 1974). Lamb (1977a), on the other hand, found fathers to be particularly salient to sons, while mothers and fathers interact equally with daughters. Other studies indicate parents interact more with girls than with boys (Fagot, 1974; Fagot, 1978) with fathers playing more with sons than with daughters and engage in more active play with boys than with girls (Fagot, 1974; Huston, 1983; Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974).

Parent-child interaction with fathers is different from interaction with mothers (Lamb, 1977b). Some have found adults to respond differently to the same characteristics of

boys and girls, with boys having a stronger modifying effect on the adult behavior (Yarrow, Waxler & Scott, 1971). However, Cantor & Gelfand (1977) found no significant effects of sex of child on adult behavior.

There are contradictions in the literature regarding differences in gender of child(ren) influence on masculinity and femininity scores of parents. In families having two girls, fathers' femininity scores decrease, and in families having one or more boys, fathers' masculinity scores increase (Rosenberg & Sutton-Smith, 1968). However, Ganong & Coleman (1987) found fathers' femininity scores decrease with the presence of boys, compared to having only daughters, with no influence on masculinity scores.

Early studies indicate mothers' masculinity and femininity scores are not significantly influenced by gender of children (Rosenberg & Sutton-Smith, 1968; Rosenberg & Sutton-Smith, 1971). Lansky (1964) found mothers' sex role orientation to be less susceptible to influence of gender composition of children than is that of fathers. A more recent study indicates mothers are as influenced as fathers by gender of children: mothers' femininity scores increase with the presence of boys compared to having only daughters with no influence on masculinity scores (Ganong & Coleman, 1987).

Some confusion exists in the literature regarding the relationship of gender and socialization of children.

Barnett (1981) found that child rearing values showed few sex-of-child or sex-of-parent differences, and the father's child rearing values were relatively unaffected by sex of children. This finding differs from other studies which found that family decision making clearly favored career goals for adolescent sons over the career goals of adolescent daughters (Peterson, Rollins, Thomas & Heaps, 1984). Hendrix & Johnson (1985) found multiple dimensions rather than any single factor responsible for differences in the socialization of boys or girls, and conclude there is probably more differences between cultures than between sexes in the socialization process.

Much evidence exists to suggest gender is an influential factor in relationships. Rossi (1984) has interpreted the literature on gender to indicate that the child, at birth, brings with it gender predispositions that interact with parental gender difference., That is, there is an interaction of gender of child and gender of parent (Fagot, 1978; Lamb, 1977a; Lamb, 1977b; Lynn, 1976; Seavey, Katz & Zalk, 1975; Smith & Daglish, 1977). Parental sex-typing is a function of gender of both child and parent (Rubin, Provenzano & Luria, 1976; Davis & Hathaway, 1982).

Parents show gender-differentiated reactions to daughters, and daughters vary their behavior in relation to gender of parent (Osofsky & O'Connell, 1972). Both parents rate newborn daughters as less alert, smaller with finer

features and softer as compared to sons. Fathers tend to perceive sons as stronger and hardier than daughters, and fathers perceive more differences between sons and daughters than do mothers (Rubin, Provenzano & Luria, 1974).

Some confusion exists in the literature regarding the relationship of gender of children and sex role orientation of parents. Russell (1978), one of the few researchers to discuss the topic, in this case the father, found no significant relationship between gender of children and sex role orientation of parents. However, he had a relatively small sample (N = 43) with numbers in the four sex typed categories being too small to analyse statistically (Russell, 1978). As well, the size of the families was not consistent. Some families had only one child, and others had more than two. Both the size and number of families could influence the results.

Ganong & Coleman (1987) found no significant relationship for gender composition of children on sex role orientation of parents in two boys, two girls, or mixed sub-family units. They did find a relationship between presence of male children (considering any boys and all girl sub-family units) and increased femininity scores of mothers, and decreased femininity scores of fathers, compared to parents of daughters only. No significant effect was found on masculinity scores of parents. However, their sample contained families having from one to eight children, so

they did not study the two-child family exclusively. In contrast, an earlier study by Lansky(1964) indicated sons rather than daughters enhance femininity scores of fathers.

Gender may interact with other factors. Although ordinal position alone was not a factor affecting masculinity and femininity scores of parents, sex of sibling and ordinal position were found to interact so differences in femininity scores of fathers increased linearly from two-girl, older girl, older boy to two-boy families (Rosenberg & Sutton-Smith, 1971).

Consistent with symbolic interaction theory, one will react to another, taking the other into account, and initiate behavior toward another depending on one's gender and the gender of the other.

In sum, the literature supports the contention that children impact parents, one source of impact being gender of child. This would seem to have implications for parent-child interaction. What needs clarification is the impact that gender of children may have on the sex role orientation of parents.

Additional Relevant Variables

In addition to gender, several other factors relevant to sex role orientation have been suggested for study in the literature. These include ordinal position and spacing of children (Hill, 1981), ages of children (Hartup, 1978), the

influence of situational demands (Havighurst, 1973), age of parent (Nye & Berardo, 1973b; Russell, 1978; Smith & Fischer, 1982), socio-economic status and gender of parent (Russell, 1978), religion (Lueptow, 1985) and the effect of religious behavior on personality (Havighurst, 1973), the role of education, income (Lueptow, 1985), age, prestige and religion in modification of social class influence on sex role attitudes (Smith & Fischer, 1982), interests, leisure activities and work satisfaction (Havighurst, 1973), gender of parents (Rossi, 1982), and the need to control for age, gender, marital status and duration (McBroom, 1984). Brim & Kagan (1980) discuss the need to determine the kinds of biological and environmental events that can produce change in adults. As people are in interaction with others in the process of living together in a family context, relationship factors must also be considered.

Past studies usually involved various mixed number and gender composition of families, and often used different measuring instruments. The study undertaken by this researcher uses the Bem Sex Role Inventory and will consider all four family sub-units of two-girl, older girl, two-boy and older boy in the two-child family. Analysis will also be done on other sub-family unit combinations. Selected sociological variables included for study will be occupation, education, church attendance , years married, age difference of children, ordinal position of children,

and age of parents. Relationship variables of time needed for two children, discipline problems, more fulfillment with two children, able to love both children and grandparents helping with the care of the second child will be examined.

Conclusion

It has been fairly well documented in the literature that the number of members in a family influence interactions within that family by the dyads and triads that are formed. Triads are sought out as a means of stabilizing relationships, and in the two child family, this is cross-generational, always involving at least one parent and child(ren). Parents play a role in the socialization of their children, including sex role orientation. Sex role orientation is a process extending into adulthood, and is subject to shifts over time. Parent-child interaction is reciprocal so parents influence children in their interaction, and children influence parents. Interaction in the family is influenced by gender of child and parent. What is not well documented is if gender of children may actually influence sex role orientations of parents in this mutual, reciprocal relationship.

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH DESIGN

Introduction

The basic research method employed to address the research questions is discussed. The chapter includes a description of the selection and characteristics of the sample, and the materials and procedure used in data collection. Details of the research design and the statistical analysis used in the study are then discussed.

Sample

The sample for this study was a non-random, purposive type sample obtained from birth notices in a local newspaper. The families were residents of the metropolitan Edmonton area. Seventy mothers and seventy fathers participated. Fathers were about two years older than mothers. Mean age for fathers was 32.3 with a range from 23 to 43 years, and for mothers, it was 30.3 years with a range from 21 to 38 years. All couples were married at least three years, with a range from three to seventeen years, and mean years married was 8.57. Education levels indicated 50% of fathers and almost 46% of mothers had part or complete university training, with 31% of fathers and 23 of mothers completing college or graduate school.

The percent of fathers employed full time was 94.3%,

and mothers employed full time was 14.3%. An additional 1.4% of fathers and 35.7% of mothers were employed part time, bringing the percent of fathers employed either full or part time to almost 96, and for mothers to 50.

Social class ranged from lower to upper, using Hollingshead's "Two Factor Index" (Hollingshead, 1957). The percentage of fathers classifying themselves as upper middle and upper was 24%, only slightly higher than mothers at 23%; 29% of fathers and 39% of mothers classified themselves as middle class; and 47% if fathers and only 37% of mothers classified themselves as lower middle and lower, with no mothers in the lower category.

Gross income for fathers ranged from less than $10,000. to over $50,000., while for mothers the range was from less than $10,000 to $40,000. Forty-six percent of fathers and only 1.4% of mothers earned over $35,000. At the other extreme, only 1.4% of fathers had no income, while 46%, or nearly half, of mothers had none. Only 39% of fathers were professional or involved in business, while 59% of mothers were in this category.

Just over half of the sample was Protestant, with 51% of fathers and 54% of mothers. About one third was Catholic, with 31% of fathers and 34% of mothers. Only 2% were Jewish for both fathers and mothers, and 14% of fathers and 9% of mothers reported other as their religious affiliation. Most did not attend church, with 75% of

fathers and 59% of mothers rarely or never attending. The percentage of fathers attending monthly or more often was 25%, and for mothers it was 41%. The largest category for both was rarely.

Description of the Initial Interview Questionnaire

The questionnaire used in this research was designed by Adams (1983) for investigating a variety of issues involving the two-child family. It covered several topics, including demographic factors, the pregnancy and birth experience, the parenting experience (difficulties, surprises and enjoyment), child care, past family, home management, and marital relationships and happiness with two-child families (see Appendix B).

Bem Sex Role Inventory

Sex role orientation was measured using the complete 60 item version of the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) (Bem, 1978). The basis of this scale is the "conception of the sex-typed person as someone who has internalized society's sex-typed standards of desirable behavior for men and women" (Bem, 1974: 155). These culturally acceptable standards are the standards against which one evaluates one's own behavior (Bem, 1978).

This instrument consists of two independent dimensions for measuring masculinity and femininity assessed on a seven

point scale. Subjects receive a separate score for both masculinity and femininity. A mean score is calculated for the masculinity and the femininity scale. Bem (1978) recommends that the median split method be used to classify subjects into four separate sex role groups: masculine, feminine, androgynous and undifferentiated.

Internal consistency, as computed using coefficient alpha, is high with masculinity = .86 and femininity = .80 (Bem, 1974). Test-retest reliability, after a four week interval, was also high. Using product-moment correlations, r = .9 for masculine, r = .9 for femininity, and r = .93 for androgyny (Bem, 1974). This researcher concludes the Bem Sex Role Inventory is as reliable as other written instruments used to measure similar personality dimensions, a conclusion supported in research (Yanico, 1985).

Bem (1974) demonstrated high construct validity of the BSRI both empirically and logically. One hundred judges categorized two hundred personality characteristics as either masculine or feminine and "significantly more desirable for a man or a woman" ($p <= .05$), using two-tailed t tests (Bem, 1974, p. 157). Each judge rated characteristics either for a man or for a woman. These judgments indicate high face validity as well.

Using Pearson product moment correlation, the BSRI is uncorrelated with a tendency to social desirability, average r = -.06 (Bem, 1977). Discriminant validity is high as

masculinity and femininity scores are logically and empirically independent. Using Pearson r, r ranges from -.02 to .11 for males, and from -.07 to -.14 for females (Bem, 1974).

Bem (1974) illustrated moderate concurrent validity of BSRI with the California Psychological Inventory, using Pearson r: r = -.42 for masculinity for males, and r = -.25 for masculinity for females; r = .27 for femininity for males, and r = .25 for femininity for females; r = .50 for androgyny for males, and r = .30 for androgyny for females.

In summary, the BSRI was determined to be valid and reliable, and was thus used to measure sex role orientation of parents in this study. A copy of this inventory is in Appendix C.

Procedure

From the pool of names gathered from the newspaper, letters were sent out first to explain the study, followed by phone contact to determine if families met the following sample criteria: the families were intact, there were only two children, the children were of this marriage with the youngest child at least six months of age and the oldest child up to first grade, and the family was not in the process of moving. If the criteria were met, the families were invited to participate in the research. Participation was near 100%.

Initially, a pilot study was done with 30 families for the purpose of refining the questionnaire. Then, interviews were scheduled with 70 other families, providing data on 140 parents which comprises the data for this study. The mother and father in each family were interviewed separately, in the family's home, for between one and two hours each. To help assure that answers were independent, participants were asked not to communicate with each other until both interviews were complete. Families were categorized into four groups according to gender of children: both males, both females, older male and older female. Anonymity was preserved by assigning numbers to participants and results will be presented without any participant identifying components.

This study was reviewed by the Faculty of Home Economics Human Ethics Review Committee. Policy guidelines regarding ethical considerations as set out by the General Faculties Council of the University of Alberta were followed, and the study was approved.

Research Design

The research undertaken in this study used a survey design, namely a static-group comparison design. Surveys have been used extensively to study family interaction providing a logical basis for inferring reciprocal effects in families (Klein, Jorgensen & Miller, 1978).

Independent Variables

Two general, independent variables were used in the study, namely sociological and relationship variables. They were selected from the literature review which indicated these variables could influence sex role orientation. To determine the most important variables which explain the variance in masculinity and femininity as measured by the Bem Sex Role Inventory, regression analysis was utilized. Reciprocal interaction (for example, parent-child interaction) can be treated in linear terms, so multivariate statistics based on linear correlations and regression can be used (Klein, Jorgensen & Miller, 1978).

Sociological variables.

Gender of child is defined as the biological designation of male or female.

Occupation was obtained by the question, What is (was) your occupation? with choices ranging from higher executive and major professional to never worked and unskilled, referring to categories of work developed by Hollingshead (1957).

Education was measured by level of completed education, with choices from graduate professional training to less than seven years of school, and refers to years of formal education in an educational institution.

Church attendance was obtained by the question, How

often do you attend church? (daily to never).

Years married refers to years the husband and wife have been married to each other.

Age of parent was obtained by their birth date, as was age of both children. Age difference of children refers to age difference in years of the two children.

Relationship variables involving parents' perceptions.

Time needed for two children refers to the amount of time perceived as required for two children compared to only one child.

Discipline problems refers to the perceived level of difficulty encountered in disciplining the children.

Increased fulfillment refers to the perceived level of enjoyment with the arrival of the second child.

Able to love both children refers to the perceived degree of surprise at being able to love both children.

Grandparents' help refers to their helping with the care of the second child as perceived by the child's parents.

Dependent Variable

Sex role orientation. The dependent variable is sex role orientation of the parents, defined as self-classification on the basis of culturally approved social behaviors that are characterized as either masculine or

feminine, as measured by the Bem Sex Role Inventory.

The scale was administered only once, so history, maturation, testing effect, regression to the mean, experimental mortality, instrument error, and selection-maturation are not likely to be threats to internal validity. The external validity of the data will likely be low, as the sample is non-random. There may be bias in the results as the source of participants precludes the participation of parents who did not put birth notices in the newspaper. Sample criteria act as controls, reducing some error variance and helping to control for spuriousness.

In summary, the research design addresses the research questions directly to provide answers to the questions, and it relates to symbolic interaction theory as the theoretical framework.

Data Analysis

This study has utilized a secondary analysis of data which were collected to examine various topics related to the two-child family.

To answer research questions one to four as noted in chapter one, one-way analysis of variance will be utilized to determine significant differences between means for masculinity and femininity scores of mothers and fathers who have two boys, two girls, older boy and older girl gender combinations of children. Student-Newman-Keuls analysis

will identify where the significant differences are for the different gender compositions of sub-family units.

To answer research question five, one-way analysis of variance will be used to test for a significant difference between scores of masculinity and femininity for fathers and mothers.

To answer research question six, which includes additional independent variables as noted in chapter two, two-way analysis of variance will be used to determine main effects of sociological variables of occupation, education, church attendance, years married, age of parent and older child and age differences of children, and relationship variables of time needed for two children, discipline problems, fulfillment, able to love both, and grandparents' help with care of the second child. The need to look at the interaction of the sociological variables is cited in the literature as noted in chapter three, and relationship variables are considered important in light of the theoretical perspective. Additional gender combinations* will be analyzed as the literature suggests using various combinations to examine the influence of gender of children (Ganong & Coleman, 1987) and ordinal position on sex role orientation of parents. For example, sub-family units A, C,

* A = two boys, two girls, older boy, older girl
  B = two girls and older girl, two boys and older girl
  C = two boys, two girls, mixed
  D = any boys, two girls
  E = any girls, two boys

D and E may be used to examine the influence of gender of children, and sub-family units B could be used to examine the influence of ordinal position on sex role orientation of parents.

Two-way analysis of variance will be used to determine interaction effects for demographic variables and parental perceptions and for gender composition of children in different combinations on mean masculinity and femininity scores of mothers and fathers. Again, the Student-Newman-Keuls analysis will be used to determine where significant differences are for sub-family units in each gender combination of family.

Alpha level will be set at .05 for all analyses to reduce the probability of Type I error.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Introduction

Results in Relation to Hypotheses Pertaining to Gender Composition of Children in the Two-Child Family and Masculinity and Femininity Scores of Parents as Measured by BSRI.

For each objective, results will be reported first for those families with a gender composition of two boys, two girls, older girl and older boy. This will be labeled sub-family units A. Findings from other gender combinations (sub-family units B, C, D, and E) will be reported as well.

Results of Objectives

Objective 1. How is the degree of femininity of mothers, as measured by the Bem Sex Role Inventory, related to gender composition of children in a two-child family (two daughters, two sons, older daughter, older son gender composition)?

Objective 2. How is the degree of masculinity of mothers, as measured by the Bem Sex Role Inventory, related to gender composition of children in a two-child family (two males, two females, older male, older female gender composition)?

Objective 3. How is the degree of femininity of fathers, as measured by the Bem Sex Role Inventory, related to gender composition of children in a two-child family (two males, two females, older male, older female gender composition)?

Objective 4. How is the degree of masculinity of fathers, as measured by the Bem Sex Role Inventory, related to gender composition of children in a two-child family (two males, two females, older male, older female gender composition)?

Findings for sub-family units A (two boys, two girls, older boy, older girl) (Appendix H, Table H-1) reveal no significant relationship between gender of children, ordinal position of children, and mean masculinity and femininity scores of parents (specific mean scores are noted in Appendix F, Table F-1).

Objective 5. Are mothers or fathers more likely to reflect influences of gender composition of children on their degree of masculinity and femininity, as measured by the Bem Sex Role Inventory?

Findings for sub-family units A (two boys, two girls, older boy, older girl) (Appendix H, Table H-2) reveal no significant differences between masculinity and femininity scores for mothers and fathers (specific mean scores are noted in Appendix F, Table F-1).

Objective 6 will deal with main and interaction effects of the independent variables.

Objective 6. What other sociological and relationship factors may exert interaction effects, when gender composition of children is considered, and main effects on sex role orientation of parents?

Sociological Variables: Main Effects

Fathers' Mean Masculinity Scores. Findings in Table 1 for sub-family units A (two boys, two girls, older boy, older girl) reveal occupation, education and years married to have significant main effects on mean masculinity scores of fathers. Fathers in professional occupations have significantly higher mean masculinity scores than do fathers who are in non-professional occupations. Fathers having post-secondary education have significantly higher mean masculinity scores than fathers with no post-secondary education. Mean masculinity scores were significantly higher for fathers married eight years or less than for those married more than eight years. There is no significant main effect for church attendance on mean masculinity scores of fathers.

Fathers' Mean Femininity Scores. Findings in Table 2 for sub-family units A (two boys, two girls, older boy, two girls, older boy, older girl) reveal church attendance

Table 1

Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Sociological Independent Variables and Fathers' Mean Masculinity Scores (main effects)

Sources of Variance	Group	Mean	df	ms	f	sig f
Main effects						
Occupation (fathers)						
prof.	1	5.33	1	2.748	5.655	0.020*
non-pro.	2	4.91				
Education						
post-sec.	1	5.28	1	2.938	6.034	0.017*
no post-sec.	2	4.86				
Church attendance						
1/mon. or more	1	5.14	1	0.041	0.077	0.783
less 1/mon.	2	5.06				
Years married						
8 years/less	1	5.22	1	2.025	4.078	0.048*
9 years/more	2	4.88				

* p=<.05

Table 2

Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Sociological Independent Variables and Fathers' Mean Femininity Scores (main effects)

Sources of Variance	Group	Means	df	ms	f	sigf
Main effects						
Occupation						
professional	1	4.40				
			1	0.277	0.954	0.332
non-prof.	2	4.53				
Education						
post-sec.	1	4.53				
			1	0.173	0.610	0.438
no post-sec.	2	4.43				
Church attendance						
1/month, more	1	4.71				
			1	1.295	5.364	0.024*
less 1/month	2	4.40				
Years married						
8 years/less	1	4.46				
			1	0.021	0.072	0.790
9 years/more	2	4.50				

* p=<.05

to have a significant main effect on mean femininity scores of fathers. Fathers who attend church once a month or more often have significantly higher mean femininity scores than fathers who attend church rarely or never. There are no significant main effects for occupation, education or years married on mean femininity scores of fathers.

Mothers' Mean Masculinity and Femininity Scores. Findings for sub-family units A (two boys, two girls, older boy, older girl) (Appendix H, Tables H-3 and H-4) reveal no significant main effects for occupation, education, church attendance or years married on mean masculinity or femininity scores of mothers.

The literature indicates various other sub-family units of children may influence masculinity and femininity scores (Ganong & Coleman, 1987). Four additional sub-family units* will be considered. Analyses reveals the same main effects for the above independent variables for the five combinations of sub-family units A, B, C, D or E. That is, those independent variables having main effects with sub-family units A were significant for all sub-family units B, C, D and E, and those having no main effects for sub-family units A were not significant for sub-family units B, C, D and E.

* A = two boys, two girls, older
  B = two boys and older boy, two girls and older girl
  C = two boys, two girls, mixed
  D = any boys, two girls
  E = any girls, two boys

Sociological Variables: Interaction Effects

Results will now be presented according to interaction effect for sociological variables for first independent variable, gender composition of children, and degree of masculinity and femininity scores of parents.

Fathers' Mean Femininity Scores. Findings in Table 3 for sub-family units A (two boys, two girls, older boy, older girl) reveal a significant interaction effect for church attendance and for gender composition of children on mean femininity scores of fathers. Student-Newman-Keuls analysis (Appendix G, G-1) indicates fathers of older daughter/younger son who attend church once a month or more often have significantly higher mean femininity scores than fathers of either two daughters or older daughter/younger son who attend church rarely or never.

Findings in Table 3 reveal no significant interaction effect for occupation, for education or for years married and for gender of children sub-family units A (two boys, two girls, older boy, older girl) on mean femininity scores of fathers.

Findings in Table 4 reveal significant interaction effects for gender of children sub-family units B (two girls and older girl, two boys and older boy) and for church attendance on mean femininity scores of fathers. Fathers who attend church once a month or more and have two girls

Table 3

Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Sociological Independent Variables, Gender Composition of Children and Fathers' Mean Femininity Scores (interaction effects)

Sources of Variance	Group^	Means	df	ms	f	sigf
2-Way Interactions						
Occupation Gender	1-1	4.36	3	0.150	0.515	0.673
1=professional	1-2	4.46				
2=non-professional	1-3	4.22				
	1-4	4.48				
	2-1	4.57				
	2-2	4.44				
	2-3	4.62				
	2-4	4.50				
Education Gender	1-1	4.43	3	0.327	1.155	0.334
1=post-secondary	1-2	4.52				
2=no post-secondary	1-3	4.36				
	1-4	4.63				
	2-1	4.57				
	2-2	4.40				
	2-3	4.63				
	2-4	4.19				
Church attendance, Gender	1-1	4.37	3	0.883	3.657	0.017*
1=1/month or more	1-2	4.83				
2=less than 1/month	1-3	4.24				
	1-4	5.09				
	2-1	4.53				
	2-2	4.27				
	2-3	4.55				
	2-4	4.32				
Years married, Gender	1-1	4.56	3	0.259	0.894	0.450
1=8 years or less	1-2	4.46				
2=9 years or more	1-3	4.55				
	1-4	4.34				
	2-1	4.45				
	2-2	4.43				
	2-3	4.35				
	2-4	4.67				

^ sociological variable and sub-family units A of 1=two boys, 2= two girls, 3= older boy, 4= older girl.
* p=<.05

Table 4

Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Church Attendance, Gender Composition of Children and Fathers' Mean Femininity Scores (interaction effects)

Sources of Variance	Group^	Means	df	ms	f	sig f
2-Way Interaction						
Church attendance	B 1-1	4.95				
	1-2	4.28	1	2.501	10.870	0.002**
	2-1	4.29				
	2-2	4.54				
	C 1-1	4.37				
	1-2	4.43				
	1-3	4.71				
	2-1	4.53	2	0.315	1.186	0.312
	2-1	4.27				
	2-2	4.42				
	D 1-1	4.65				
	1-2	4.83	1	0.371	1.418	0.238
	2-1	4.45				
	2-2	4.27				
	E 1-1	4.76				
	1-2	4.37	1	0.423	1.616	0.208
	2-1	4.37				
	2-2	4.53				

^ Church attendance: 1= 1/month or more; 2= less than 1/month.

Sub-family units:
B: 1= two girls and older girl, 2= two boys and older boy.
C: 1= two boys, 2= two girls, 3= mixed.
D: 1= any boys, 2= two girls.
E: 1= any girls, 2= two boys.

** p=<.01

and older girl have significantly higher mean femininity scores than fathers of two boys and older boy. Fathers of two girls and older girl who attend church once a month or more have significantly higher mean femininity scores than fathers of either two girls and older girl or two boys and older boy who attend church less than once a month (Appendix G, Table G-2).

Fathers' Mean Masculinity Scores. Findings sub-family units A (two boys, two girls, older boy, older girl) reveal no significant interaction effect for occupation, for education, for church attendance or for years married and for gender of children on mean masculinity scores of fathers (Appendix H, Table H-5).

Mothers' Mean Masculinity Scores. Findings in Table 5 for sub-family units A (two boys, two girls, older boy, older girl) reveal a significant interaction effect for occupation of mothers and for gender of children on mean masculinity scores of mothers. However, Student-Newman-Keuls analysis does not reveal a significant difference between groups. Findings in Table 5 reveal no interaction effect for education, for church attendance or for years married and for gender composition of children (sub-family units A) on mean masculinity scores of mothers.

Findings in Table 6 reveal significant interaction effects for occupation and for mothers' mean masculinity

Table 5

Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Sociological Independent Variables, Gender Composition of Children and Mothers' Mean Masculinity Scores (interaction effects)

Sources of Variance	Group^	Means	df	ms	f	sig f
2-Way Interactions						
Occupation Gender	1-1	4.25	3	1.838	3.715	0.016*
1=professional	1-2	4.81				
2=non-professional	1-3	3.91				
	1-4	4.46				
	2-1	4.12				
	2-2	3.85				
	2-3	4.51				
	2-4	3.99				
Education Gender	1-1	4.14	3	1.020	1.906	0.138
1=post-secondary	1-2	4.83				
2=no post-sec.	1-3	3.92				
	1-4	4.45				
	2-1	4.22				
	2-2	4.04				
	2-3	4.26				
	2-4	4.05				
Church attendance, Gender	1-1	4.84	3	0.671	1.198	0.318
1=1/month or more	1-2	4.52				
2=less than 1/mon.	1-3	4.21				
	1-4	4.24				
	2-1	3.86				
	2-2	4.38				
	2-3	4.14				
	2-4	4.29				
Years married, Gender	1-1	4.12	3	0.188	0.318	0.812
1=8 years or less	1-2	4.45				
2=9 years or more	1-3	4.30				
	1-4	4.31				
	2-1	4.25				
	2-2	4.46				
	2-3	3.90				
	2-4	4.23				

^ sociological variable and sub-family units A of 1=two boys, 2= two girls, 3= older boy, 4= older girl.
* p=<.05

Table 6

Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Occupation, Gender Composition of Children and Mothers' Mean Masculinity Scores (interaction effects)

Sources of Variance	Group^	Means	df	ms	f	sig f
2-Way Interaction						
Occupation	B 1-1	4.63				
	1-2	4.04	1	4.093	8.332	0.005**
	2-1	3.93				
	2-2	4.33				
	C 1-1	4.25				
	1-2	4.81				
	1-3	4.22				
	2-1	4.12	2	1.425	2.725	0.073
	[illegible]	3.85				
	[illegible]	4.22				
	D 1-1	4.23				
	1-2	4.81	1	2.806	5.529	0.022*
	2-1	4.20				
	2-2	3.85				
	E 1-1	4.42				
	1-2	4.25	1	0.091	0.164	0.687
	2-1	4.11				
	2-2	4.12				

^ Occupation: 1= professional; 2= non-professional.
Sub-family units:
B: 1= two girls and older girl, 2= two boys and older boy.
C: 1= two boys, 2= two girls, 3= mixed.
D: 1= any boys, 2= two girls.
E: 1= any girls, 2= two boys.

* p=<.05
** p=<.01

scores with analysis for sub-family units B and D. For sub-family units B (two girls and older girl, two boys and older boy), mothers in professional occupations have significantly higher mean masculinity scores in families having two girls or older girl compared to families having two boys or older boy (Appendix G, Table G-3). Mothers having two girls or older girl have significantly higher mean masculinity scores if in professional occupations than mothers in non-professional occupations. Analysis for sub-family units D (any boys, two girls) reveal mothers in families having two girls have significantly higher mean masculinity scores if in professional occupations compared to non-professional occupations (Appendix G, Table G-3 for Student-Newman-Keuls results).

Findings in Table 7 reveal a significant interaction effect for sub-family units B (two girls and older girl, two boys and older boy) and for education on mean masculinity scores of mothers. However, differences between groups is not indicated by Student-Newman-Keuls analysis (Appendix G, Table G-4).

Mothers' Mean Femininity Scores. Findings for combination A (two boys, two girls, older boy, older girl) reveal no significant interaction effects for occupation, for education, for church attendance or for years married and for gender of children on mean femininity scores of mothers (Appendix H, Table H-6).

Table 7

Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Education, Gender Composition of Children and Mothers' Mean Masculinity Scores (interaction effect)

Sources of Variance	Group^	Means	df	ms	f	sig f
2-Way Interaction						
Education	B 1-1	4.62				
	1-2	4.04	1	2.[illegible]	4.91	0.030*
	2-1	4.04				
	2-2	4.24				
	C 1-1	4.[illegible]4				
	1-2					
	1-3	.0				
	2-1	[illegible]	2	0.916	1.705	0.190
	2-2	[illegible]4				
	2-3	16				
	D 1-1	4.26				
	1-2	4.83	1	1.732	3.295	0.074
	2-1	4.18				
	2-2	4.04				
	E 1-1	4.49				
	1-2	4.14	1	0.497	0.903	0.345
	2-1	4.13				
	2-2	4.22				

^ Education: 1= post-secondary, 2= no post-secondary.
Sub-family units:
B: 1= two girls and older girl, 2= two boys and older boy.
C: 1= two boys, 2= two girls, 3= mixed.
D: 1= any boys, 2= two girls.
E: 1= any girls, 2= two boys.

* p=<.05

Age Variables: Main and Interaction Effects

Fathers' Mean Masculinity and Femininity Scores. Findings for sub-family units A (two boys, two girls, older boy, older girl) reveal no significant main effects for age of older child, age difference of children or for age of fathers on mean masculinity or femininity scores of fathers (Appendix H, Tables H-7 and H-8).

Findings reveal no significant interaction effects for age of older child, for age difference of children or for age of fathers and for gender of children sub-family units A (two boys, two girls, older boy, older girl) on mean masculinity or femininity scores of fathers (Appendix H, Tables H-13 and H-14).

Mothers' Mean Masculinity and Femininity Scores. Findings for sub-family units A (two boys, two girls, older boy, older girl) reveal no significant main effect for age of older child, age difference of children or for age of mothers on mean masculinity or femininity scores of mothers (Appendix H, Tables H-9 and H-10).

Findings reveal no interaction effect for age of older child, for age difference of children or for age of mothers and for gender of children sub-family units A (two boys, two girls, older boy, older girl) on mean masculinity or femininity scores of mothers (Appendix H, Tables 11 and 12).

Findings in Table 8 reveal a significant interaction effect for age of older child and for sub-family units B (two girls and older girl, two boys and older boy) gender composition of children on mean masculinity scores of fathers. The groups that differed could not be determined by Student-Newman-Keuls analysis (Appendix G, Table G-5).

Relationship Variables: Main Effects

Fathers' Mean Masculinity Scores. Findings in Table 9 for sub-family units A (two boys, two girls, older boy, older girl) reveal a significant main effect for discipline problems and more fulfillment. Mean masculinity scores are significantly higher for fathers ranking discipline problems as less difficult compared to more difficult and for fathers ranking greater fulfillment with the second child as less enjoyable compared to more enjoyable. There is no main effect for the difficulty of time needed for two, for the surprise of able to love both, or for grandparents' help with the care of the second child on mean masculinity scores of fathers.

Fathers' Mean Femininity Scores. Findings in Table 10 for sub-family units A (two boys, two girls, older boy, older girl) reveal a significant main effect for increased fulfillment and for able to love both. Mean femininity scores are significantly higher for fathers ranking greater fulfillment with the second child as more enjoyable compared

Table 8

Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Age of Older Child, Gender Composition of Children and Mothers' Mean Masculinity Scores (interaction effects)

Sources of Variance	Group^	Means	df	ms	f	sig f
2-Way Interaction						
Age of Older Child	B 1-1	4.19				
1=2,3,4 years	1-2	4.34	1	2.097	3.883	0.050*
2=5 years or more	2-1	4.54				
	2-2	3.99				
	C 1-1	4.31				
	1-2	4.41				
	1-3	4.17				
	2-1	4.01	2	0.200	0.345	0.710
	2-2	4.49				
	2-3	4.28				
	D 1-1	4.21				
	1-2	4.41	1	0.013	0.024	0.879
	2-1	4.22				
	2-2	4.49				
	E 1-1	4.24				
	1-2	4.31	1	0.451	0.794	0.376
	2-1	4.36				
	2-2	4.01				

^ Sub-family units:
B: 1= two girls and older girl, 2= two boys and older boy.
C: 1= two boys, 2= two girls, 3= mixed.
D: 1= any boys, 2= two girls.
E: 1= any girls, 2= two boys.

* p=<.05

Table 9

Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Relationship Independent Variables and Fathers' Mean Masculinity Scores (main effects)

Sources of Variance	Group	Means	df	ms	f	sig f
Main effects						
Time needed for two						
most difficult	1	5.24				
			1	1.066	2.028	0.159
less difficult	2	4.95				
Discipline Problems						
most/more difficult	1	4.94				
			1	2.454	4.846	0.031*
less/least difficult	2	5.37				
More fulfillment						
most/more enjoyable	1	4.86				
			1	2.129	4.194	0.045*
less/least enjoyable	2	5.21				
Able to love both						
most/more surprising	1	4.89				
			1	0.607	1.124	0.293
least surprising	2	5.18				
Grandparents' help						
do help	1	4.89				
			1	1.573	3.057	0.085
do not help	2	5.23				

* p=<.05

to less enjoyable and for fathers ranking able to love both children as more surprising compared to least surprising. Findings in Table 10 reveal no main effect for time needed for two children, for discipline problems, or for grandparents help on mean femininity scores of fathers.

Mothers' Mean Femininity Scores. Findings in Table 11 for sub-family units A (two boys, two girls, older boy, older girl) reveal a main effect for time needed for two children, for discipline problems, or being able to love both children, and for grandparents helping with the care of the second child.

Mean femininity scores of mothers are significantly higher for mothers ranking time needed for two children and discipline problems as more or most difficult compared to less difficult, for those ranking able to love both as less surprising compared to more surprising, and for grandparents helping with the second child compared to not helping. There is no main effect for the enjoyment of increased fulfillment on mean femininity scores of mothers.

Mothers' Mean Masculinity Scores. Findings for sub-family units A (two boys, two girls, older boy, older girl) reveal no main effect for time needed for two children, for discipline problems, for increased fulfillment, for being able to love both or for grandparents helping with the care of the second child on mean masculinity scores of mother

Table 10

Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Relationship Independent Variables and Fathers' Mean Femininity Scores (main effect)

Sources of Variance	Group	Means	df	ms	f	sig f
Main effects						
Time needed for two						
most difficult	1	4.40				
less difficult	2	4.53	1	0.315	1.093	0.300
Discipline problems						
most/more difficult	1	4.41				
less/least difficult	2	4.64	1	0.012	2.977	0.089
More fulfillment						
most/more enjoyable	1	4.63				
less/least enjoyable	2	4.38	1	1.144	4.135	0.046*
Able to love both						
most/more surprising	1	4.69				
least surprising	2	4.35	1	2.083	7.948	0.006**
Grandparents' help						
do help	1	4.50				
do not help	2	4.46	1	0.016	0.056	0.814

* p=<.05

** p=<.01

Table 11

Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Relationship Independent Variables and Mothers' Mean Femininity Scores (main effects)

Sources of Variance	Group	Means	df	ms	f	sig.
Main effects						
Time needed for two						
most difficult	1	5.27				
			1	1.483	9.381	0.003**
less difficult	2	5.01				
Discipline Problems						
most/more difficult	1	5.22				
			1	0.672	4.040	0.049*
less/least difficult	2	5.02				
Fulfillment						
most/more enjoyable	1	5.17				
			1	0.029	0.180	0.690
less/least enjoyable	2	5.13				
Able to love both						
most/more surprising	1	4.98				
			1	1.343	8.101	0.008**
least surprising	2	5.25				
Grandparents' help						
do help	1	5.26				
			1	1.363	8.036	0.006**
don't help	2	4.97				

* p=<.05

** p=<.01

(Appendix H, Table H-15).

Relationship Variables: Interaction Effects

Mothers' Mean Masculinity Scores. Findings in Table 12 reveal an interaction effect for able to love both children and for gender of children sub-family units A (two boys, two girls, older boy, older girl) on mean masculinity scores of mothers. Student-Newman-Keuls analysis does not reveal a significant difference between groups.

There are no significant interaction effects for time needed for two children, for discipline problems, for more fulfillment or for grandparents helping with the care of the second child and for gender composition of children on mean masculinity scores of mothers in sub-family units A (two boys, two girls, older boy, older girl) families.

Findings in Table 13 reveal significant interaction effects for the surprise of being able to love both and for gender composition of children (sub-family units B and E) on mean masculinity scores of mothers. In sub-family units B families (two girls and older girl, two boys and older boy), mothers of two boys and older boy have significantly higher mean masculinity scores who rate being able to love both children as more surprising compared to less surprising. Mothers who rate being able to love both as less surprising have higher mean masculinity scores if families consist of two girls and older girl compared to two boys and older boy

Table 12

Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Relationship Independent Variables, Gender Composition of Children and Mothers' Mean Masculinity Scores (interaction effects)

Sources of Variance	Group^	Means	df	ms	f	sig f
2-Way Interaction						
Time needed, Gender	1-1	3.94	3	0.598	1.049	0.377
1=most difficult	1-2	4.62				
2=less difficult	1-3	4.17				
	1-4	4.39				
	2-1	4.43				
	2-2	4.22				
	2-3	4.15				
	2-4	4.06				
Discipline problems, Gender	1-1	3.92	3	0.410	0.708	0.551
	1-2	4.45				
1=most/more difficult	1-3	4.23				
2=less least diff.	1-4	4.21				
	2-1	4.56				
	2-2	4.47				
	2-3	4.05				
	2-4	4.40				
Fulfillment Gender	1-1	4.07	3	0.383	0.657	0.582
1=most/more enjoyable	1-2	4.41				
2=less/least enjoy.	1-3	4.31				
	1-4	4.10				
	2-1	4.30				
	2-2	4.48				
	2-3	3.99				
	2-4	4.45				
Able to love both, Gender	1-1	4.71	3	2.307	4.693	0.005**
	1-2	4.45				
1=most/more surprising	1-3	4.48				
	1-4	3.62				
2=least surprising	2-1	3.81				
	2-2	4.46				
	2-3	3.93				
	2-4	4.51				
Grandparents' help, Gender	1-1	4.07	3	0.258	0.427	0.734
	1-2	4.53				
1=do help	1-3	4.15				
2=do not help	1-4	4.36				
	2-1	4.41				
	2-2	4.32				
	2-3	4.27				
	2-4	4.13				

^relationship and gender(2 boys,2 girls,older boy,older girl
* p=<.01

Table 13

Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of the Surprise of Able to Love Both, Gender Composition of Children and Mothers' Mean Masculinity Scores (interaction effects)

Sources of Variance	Group^	Means	df	ms	f	sig f
2-Way Interaction						
Able to love both	B 1-1	4.10				
	1-2	4.57	1	4.674	9.339	0.003**
	2-1	4.49				
	2-2	3.89				
	C 1-1	4.71				
	1-2	4.45				
	1-3	4.08				
	2-1	3.81	1	1.325	2.431	0.096
	2-2	4.46				
	2-3	4.29				
	D 1-1	4.26				
	1-2	4.45	1	0.020	0.034	0.853
	2-1	4.19				
	2-2	4.46				
	E 1-1	4.22				
	1-2	4.71	1	2.436	4.496	0.038*
	2-1	4.34				
	2-2	3.81				

^ Able to love both: 1=most/more surprising, 2=least surprising.
Sub-family units:
B: 1= two girls and older girl, 2= two boys and older boy.
C: 1= two boys, 2= two girls, 3= mixed.
D: 1= any boys, 2= two girls.
E: 1= any girls, 2= two boys.

* p=<.05
** p=<.01

(Appendix G, Table G-6).

In combination E families (any girls, two boys), mothers of two boys have significantly higher mean masculinity scores if they rate able to love both as more surprising compared to less surprising (Appendix G, Table G-6).

Mothers' Mean Femininity Scores. Findings for sub-family units A (two boys, two girls, older boy, older girl) reveal no significant interaction effects for time needed for two children, for discipline problems, for increased fulfillment, for being able to love both or for grandparents' help with the care of the second child, and for gender composition of children on mean femininity scores of mothers (Appendix H, Table H-16).

Findings in Table 14 reveal significant interaction effects for the difficulty of discipline problems and for gender sub-family units C and E on mean femininity scores of mothers. In sub-family units C families (two boys, two girls, mixed), mothers of two boys who rate discipline problems as more or most difficult had significantly higher mean femininity scores compared to mothers of two boys who rate discipline problems as less or least difficult. In sub-family units E families (any girls, two boys), mothers of two boys have significantly higher mean femininity scores if they rate discipline problems as more/most difficult compared to less/least difficult (Appendix G, Table G-7).

Table 14

Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of the Difficulty of Discipline Problems, Gender Composition of Children and Mothers' Mean Femininity Scores (interaction effect)

Sources of Variance	Group	Means	df	ms	f	sig f
2-Way Interaction						
Discipline problems	B 1-1	5.14				
	1-2	5.35	1	0.456	2.730	0.103
	2-1	5.08				
	2-2	4.95				
	C 1-1	5.49				
	1-2	5.22				
	1-3	5.14				
	2-1	4.76	2	0.512	3.115	0.050*
	2-2	5.07				
	2-3	5.09				
	D 1-1	5.22				
	1-2	5.22	1	0.010	0.058	0.810
	2-1	5.01				
	2-2	5.07				
	E 1-1	5.17				
	1-2	5.49	1	0.988	6.160	0.016*
	2-1	5.08				
	2-2	4.76				

^ Discipline problems: 1= most/more difficult, 2= less/least difficult.
B = two girls and older girl, two boys and older boy
C = two boys, two girls, mixed
D = any boys, two girls
E = any girls, two boys

*p=<.05

Fathers' Mean Masculinity and Femininity Scores. Findings reveal no significant interaction effects for time needed for two children, for discipline problems, for increased fulfillment, for being able to love both or for grandparents' help with the care of the second child, and for gender composition of children on mean masculinity or femininity scores of fathers (Appendix H, Tables 17 and 18).

Summary

Several independent variables have main effects on the mean masculinity and/or femininity scores of mothers and fathers independent of gender composition of family. Several have an interaction effect with gender composition of children on mean masculinity and femininity scores of mothers or on mean femininity scores of fathers.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Introduction

Discussion of results will be within the framework of symbolic interaction theory, as noted in chapter two. As noted previously, one revises behavior and self-definition as one defines the situation and attaches meaning to new information through interaction. Accordingly, one's definition of the situation is the basis upon which one acts and interprets the actions of others. Variables, such as gender, may be considered a part of the situation and a form of information. Because gender is a factor in human interaction, gender of children may influence re-definition of the self by the parent. Thus, parents may revise their behavior and self-perceptions of masculinity and femininity as they participate in activities and become involved in interests through interaction with their children.

This study is concerned with learning about what influence gender composition of children and other sociological and relationship variables might have on sex role orientation of parents within the context of the two-child family. Discussion of results will first consider mean masculinity and mean femininity scores of both parents as they relate to gender composition of children, and then the mean masculinity and femininity scores of mothers as

compared to fathers. This will be followed by a discussion of effects of sociological and then relationship independent variables on mean masculinity and femininity scores of each parent. Discussion will focus on possible reasons for the findings and the implications of the findings. In conclusion, suggestions for future research will be presented.

Gender and Sex Role Orientation

The first two research questions represent the major thrust of this research.

1) Is there a relationship between gender of offspring and sex role orientation of parents in the context of the two-child family in which both children are of the same gender in contrast to the family in which the two children are of mixed gender composition?

2) Are mothers or fathers more likely to reflect influences of gender of children on their masculinity and femininity?

Findings and Explanation. There are no significant findings related to these two questions for those family units with combinations of two males, two females, older male or older female. Gender composition of children per se does not appear to influence mean masculinity or femininity scores of either parent, a finding supported by Russell (1978). Ganong & Coleman (1987) also found no effect on

masculinity or femininity scores of parents when considering gender combination of two girls, two boys, mixed.

There are several possible explanations for the findings supporting the lack of impact of gender of children on sex role orientations of parents. Pre-school children may be too young (Appendix D, Tables D-1 and 2) for their gender to have a significant impact on the self-perceptions of masculinity and femininity of the parents in parent-child interaction. While gender of children is apparently not yet having any direct impact on sex role revision of parents, this does not rule out its possible influence on sex role orientation of parents. The impact, if any, of the child influencing the parents' masculine and feminine self-perceptions may yet be years away.

Another factor may be the parenting stage in which the parents find themselves. Feldman, Biringen & Nash (1981) found parents of younger children (youngest child less than 10 years old) tend to be more sex typed than are parents of older children (youngest child 14-17 years old), and attributed sex-typing to the parenting stage of family development. In fact, results indicate the parents of this sample are sex-typed in that most mothers have high femininity scores and lower masculinity scores, and most fathers have high masculinity scores and low femininity scores (Appendix F, Table F- 1).

Another explanation may be that the parenting role

itself may have a greater influence on self-perceptions than does gender of children. That is, it is not interaction with children of a particular gender, but rather the parenting tasks involved in interaction with children that can produce a re-confirmation, or re-definition, of masculinity and femininity. This is supported in the literature by the finding that the parenting stage in the family life cycle demands stereotypically masculine or feminine behaviors and sex-typing is enhanced (Abrahams, Feldman & Nash, 1978).

The second research question asks: Are mothers or fathers more likely to reflect influences of gender of children on their degree of masculinity and femininity? Null hypothesis 3 indicates mothers are expected to show no greater differences in their sex role orientation scores than are fathers, based on contradictory findings in the literature (Ganong & Coleman, 1987; Lansky, 1964; Rosenberg & Sutton-Smith, 1968; 1971). No significant differences in mean masculinity and femininity scores between mothers and fathers are noted.

One may expect the parent having the most interaction with the children would have the greatest opportunity to revise self-perceptions as he/she defines the situation and processes new information through interaction with the children. For example, most mothers in this study would be expected to have greater interaction with their children

than would fathers. Only 14% of mothers worked full time compared to 94% of fathers (Appendix D, Table D-12), providing greater opportunity for interaction for mothers. Mothers tend to spend more time with the children than do fathers, independent of employment status. However, mothers do not seem to be subject to revision of self-perceptions any more than are fathers.

Since the second research question flows from the first research question, the same explanation for both questions appears warranted. That is, interaction itself would appear to be less of an influence on self-perceptions of masculinity and femininity than are other factors. For example, the young ages of the children, the life cycle stage of the parents in the parenting situation and the parenting role itself may preclude any differences in findings between mothers and fathers on self- perceptions of masculinity and femininity.

According to symbolic interaction theory, parents would define their own characteristics or "self" as they interact (Stryker, 1972) with their children. This process changes with the role of parenting, for example, compared to other roles such as spouse. The parents, in their positions as mother and father, have been socialized in their families of origin and influenced by society to behave according to certain social expectations in their roles as parents. Incorporated into expectations of the parent role are the

sex roles each parent is to perform as mother or father. Paradoxically, it seems these role expectations may be somewhat independent of gender of children. Although each individual interacts with others in terms of gender, the gender of the child is apparently not sufficient in itself to influence self-perceptions of masculinity and femininity of the parents. The shared meaning of the definition of the situation involving gender seems secondary to that of the parenting role, or part of the "me" of the self. Furthermore, it seems the parenting role activates the "I" part of the self, promoting parental response toward the children consistent with society's role expectations of mothers and fathers. The child may be perceived by the parents as responding to the parent in the role of a "child" rather than a boy or a girl. The parent seems to be saying, "The real me is first of all a mother or father, not a mother or father of boys or girls."

Implications

Although parents attach the label of boy or girl to each offspring, and this label influences behavior toward the child, it does not seem to carry sufficient weight to also influence self-perceptions of masculinity and femininity of the parent. Aspects of the self other than sex role orientation that this research does not consider may be revised by parents in response to gender of their children.

For example, a boy may bring out parents' stereotypical attitudes and beliefs about boys.

It seems both mothers and fathers assign importance to their own roles as parents, so the amount of interaction with children does not have a significant influence on revising parents self-perceptions of masculinity and femininity. It seems that for the gender of children as a variable, it isn't the child that is the influential significant other in the family relationship; it is likely parent to parent and parent to child.

Sociological Variables and Sex Role Orientation

The third research question asks: What other sociological and relationship factors exert main and interaction effects on sex role orientation of parents, considering gender of children? Discussion will first focus on significant findings for interaction and main effects for sociological variables for each parent and include a discussion of insignificant findings.

Interaction Effects: Mothers

Although sociological variables do not appear to exert main effects on self-perceptions of mothers, there are several interaction effects of these variables and of gender of children on their mean masculinity scores only. That is, the influence of sociological variables is on the cross-

gender scores of mothers.

Findings and Explanations. Mean masculinity scores of mothers are enhanced by occupations, education and age of older child in interaction with gender of children (Table 15, p.94). As mentioned previously, none of these variables alone influence masculinity or femininity scores of mothers. Although statistical analysis could not determine which gender composition or other independent variable groups are responsible for the differences because of either too much variance or small cell sizes, differences between groups can be noted in the tables.

The presence of girls along with other variables appears to enhance masculinity scores of mothers. Mothers of two girls and older girl (sub-family units B) or two girls (sub-family units D) and are in professional occupations have higher mean masculinity scores than mothers of two boys and older boy or any boys who work in non-professional occupations (Table 11).

Mothers who have post-secondary education and two girls or older girl have higher mean masculinity scores than do mothers who have two boys or older boy or mothers with less than post-secondary education regardless of gender composition of children.

Mothers' mean masculinity scores are influenced by age of older child and gender of children. The point of greatest difference is for groups of children of five years

Table 15

Summary Table of Gender, Sociological and Relationship Independent Variables (main and interaction effects)

	Main Effects				2-Way Interaction			
	Mother		Father		Mother		Father	
Hypotheses	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Gender Variable								
1. Femininity: Girls/older girl								
2. Masculinity: Boys/older boy								
3. Mother/father greater differences								
Sociological Variables								
4/5. Occupation			x		A,B,D			
Education			x		B			
Church attendance				x				A,B
Years married			x					
6/7. Child's age difference								
Age older child					B			
Age parent								
Relationship Variables								
8/9. Time for two		x						
Discipline problems		x	x			C,E		
Fulfillment			x	x				
Love both		x		x	A,B,E			
Grandparents help		x						
Totals	0	4	5	3	4	1	0	1

A = two boys, two girls, older boy, older girl
B = two girls and older girl, two boys and older boy
C = two boys, two girls, mixed
D = any boys, two girls
E = any girls, two boys

or older in families having two girls and older girl compared to having two boys and older boy (Table 8). The age factor is partially supported by Lansky (1964) who found age to interact with gender of children to influence sex role identification in both parents of preschool children; fathers and mothers were more sex-typed by the presence of older boys and girls. However, Lansky (1964) did not find masculinity score of mothers to be influenced by girls, as we do. This could indicate a shift in influence from boys to girls, or it may indicate mothers are simply becoming less sex-typed and more androgynous than earlier parent cohorts. Differences may also be due to the different conceptualization of masculinity and femininity as polarities and measured by the Gough scale for measuring femininity scores may account for the differences in results.

The impact of occupation, education or age of older child alone seems too weak to significantly influence mean masculinity scores of mothers, but when in combination with gender of children, mean masculinity scores are influenced. This suggests gender of children is a critical factor influencing masculinity scores of mothers when considered in interaction with others variables.

It seems the presence of daughters enhances self-perceptions of masculinity in mothers' re-definition of self. This finding lends support to the author's premise

that female children are becoming more influential in families and on parents. Mothers in particular, are recognizing the need to be role models of masculine characteristics for their daughters in this changing world, which may explain why mothers' femininity scores do not appear to be influenced by occupation. We may be seeing a change in Kagan's (1964) earlier view that females acquire feminine characteristics through interaction with others. Females may acquire feminine and masculine characteristics through interaction.

If one considers the role of the parent in socializing a daughter to survive in a world demanding more masculine characteristics along with feminine ones, one can recognize the relationship between gender of child and re-definition of self. The mother wants to see her daughter develop masculine characteristics to help her better cope in the modern world with its economic problems and family instability. That is, in fulfilling the parent role, mothers encourage development of masculine characteristics in their daughters, and in so doing become increasingly aware of their own masculine characteristics. Thus, gender is only one factor in the process of developing in the child and parent a re-definition of self.

Interaction Effects: Fathers

Fathers' self-perceptions of femininity only are

influenced by one sociological variable (Table 15, p. 94).

Findings and Explanations. Only mean femininity scores of fathers are influenced by church attendance and gender composition of children. In sub-unit A families (two boys, two girls, older boy, older girl), fathers who attend church once a month or more often and have an older daughter/younger son have significantly higher femininity scores than fathers who attend church rarely or never and have two daughters or older daughter/younger son in their families (Appendix G, Table G-1). This finding is supported in analysis of sub-family units B (two girls and older girl, two boys and older boy) (Table 4).

It seems the presence of an older daughter enhances the femininity of fathers who attend church, functioning to enhance femininity scores only if the father attends church fairly regularly. The presence of an older son seems to inhibit femininity scores of fathers regardless of frequency of church attendance. However, if the father does not attend church regularly, that is, he attends seldom or never, the presence of an older daughter seems to have no bearing on his femininity scores. The gender composition of older daughter with either a younger daughter or younger son does not, in itself, seem to be strong enough to significantly influence femininity scores of fathers, but when combined with church attendance, produces a significant interaction effect on fathers' femininity scores.

A possible explanation is that both variables in the situation, gender and church attendance, are of a feminine nature and can be expected to influence femininity scores. This reasoning is supported in the literature which contends participation in masculine/feminine demands will influence masculine/feminine self-perceptions (Abrahams, Feldman & Nash, 1978), and that one begins to see opposite sex characteristics in one's self over time (Emmerich, 1973; Heilbrun & Schwartz, 1982; McBroom, 1984). It also supports the theoretical contention that involvement in feminine activities with females will enhance re-definition of self in a more feminine way. This may also account for the lack of influence on masculinity scores of fathers and mothers.

These findings differ from those of Lansky (1964) and Rosenberg & Sutton-Smith (1968) who found the presence of sons to enhance femininity scores of fathers. This difference could be due to different conceptualizations of masculinity and femininity as polarities while in the present research they are independent dimensions, and different instruments were used which could measure the scales differently. It could also mean daughters are becoming more influential in the family and sons less so.

Implications

Girls seem to be exerting more influence on parents' self-perceptions of masculinity and femininity than are

boys. That is, girls appear to be promoting androgyny in their parents. Given the apparent influence of girls on their parents, one must ask: What part do boys play in the family in terms of their gender?

Symbolic interaction theory is supported in analysis of main and interaction effects of sociological variables on self-perceptions of masculinity and femininity of mothers and fathers. One may be influenced by gender and other variables in one's environment through interaction with others. These relationships may be interactive and appear very complex. The view of sex role orientation as a dynamic process influenced by many different variables rather than a static phenomena is congruent with the concept of life stages of development.

Main Effects: Mothers

Main effects, an outcome of two-way analysis of variance, influence sex role orientation and, therefore, may be useful for future research. Howev r, since they do not deal directly with gender, the discussion of main effects will be brief.

That mothers' self-perceptions of masculinity and femininity can vary in response to different sociological variables is consistent with symbolic interaction theory. That is, as one interacts with one's environment, one revises self-perceptions.

Findings and explanations. Interestingly, there are no main effects for sociological variables on sex role orientation of mothers (Table 15, p. 94). Occupation and level of education, church attendance, years married and age variables do not appear to have any significant influence on self-perceptions of masculinity and femininity for mothers.

Female gender and role, such as mother, may be the critical factors impacting self-perceptions for females rather than education, occupation or church attendance. This seems to support the literature contending one's roles will be consistent with cultural tradition (Burgess, 1974) and with the demands of society (Brim & Kagan, 1980). The stage of life development involving the parenting role seems to negate the influence of years married and age variables.

In their roles as mothers, both stereotypically masculine and feminine behaviors are already employed in responses to their children. Since all mothers are dealing with similar phenomena involving child rearing, they seem to experience, as a result, no real differences in influence on masculine or feminine self-perceptions for any of the sociological variables.

Main Effects: Fathers

Analyses of the data summarized in Table 15 (p. 94) indicate main effects of sociological variables influence fathers more than mothers. In fact, fathers' self-

perceptions of masculinity and femininity are influenced by four variables for main effects.

Findings and Explanation. Occupation, education and years married seem to enhance mean masculinity scores, and church attendance seems to enhance femininity scores of fathers.

It would seem that work roles are a central concept in explaining the impact of occupation and education on self-perceptions of males. These findings seem to support the contention of Helmreich, Spence and Holahan (1979) who suggest the Bem Sex Role Inventory actually measures instrumental-expressive characteristics and not just masculinity and femininity.

It seems reasonable that a young father may be more likely to conform to societal role expectations for him than would an older father. Participation in a family activity such as church attendance, which may be considered somewhat important, is likely to have a greater influence on self-perceptions than if the activity is considered unimportant. The role of father and the stage of family development seem to be perceived by fathers to be more important than any of the age variables. Therefore, one will not necessarily revise one's self perceptions in response to an unimportant factor.

According to symbolic interaction theory, social role is assigned by significant and generalized others from past

experience. This history dictates socially expected behavior for their position as parents based on their sex role, and parents assess and direct their behavior accordingly. They appear to define the parent role as the influential factor in their self-perceptions as opposed to the sociological factors discussed. This definition of the situation would seem to relate directly to their life cycle stage of development.

Implications

While fathers have the potential for becoming increasingly involved in family activities, there seems to be greater influence from outside the family in maintaining their traditional role of father, "the provider". This would suggest males remain somewhat outside the family sphere while females retain the responsibilities of the family. Also, we do not know for certain that the sociological variables will continue to have no impact on self-perceptions of masculinity and femininity of mothers as they progress through the stages of the life cycle and parenting becomes a less important role in their lives.

Relationship Variables and Sex Role Orientation

Unlike sociological variables, relationship independent variables have both main and interaction effects on self-perceptions of masculinity and femininity of both mothers

and fathers (Table 15, p. 94).

Interaction Effects: Mothers

Interaction effects for relationship variables, one for mean masculinity scores and one for mean femininity scores, are present for mothers only (Table 15, p. 94).

Findings and Explanations. Mothers' mean femininity scores are influenced in two sub-family units. In sub-family units C (two boys, two girls, mixed), and E (any girls, two boys), mothers of two boys who rate discipline problems as more or most difficult have significantly higher mean femininity scores than mothers who rate discipline problems as less or least difficult and are mothers of two boys compared to mothers of girls. This would indicate the presence of boys seems to influence not only how mothers rate discipline problems, but how they define themselves in terms of sex role orientation.

The presence of two boys seems to be the critical factor in perceptions of problems and re-definition of self. This suggests girls may have a much different influence on mothers than do boys, perhaps because girls either do not present problems to mothers or because mothers do not expect, and therefore, do not perceive problems with their daughters, but do for their sons. This contention finds support in the literature which states that parents respond differently to gender of children (Ahammer, 1973; Fagot,

1978; Liddell, Henzi & Drew, 1987; Snow, Jack Maccoby, 1983) rather than capabilities of the child (Deaux, 1984; Peterson, Rollins, Thomas & Heaps, 1984; Roopnarine, 1980). The literature suggests certain behavior is preferred and expected in a child, depending on its gender (Fagot, 1978; Power & Parke, 1986). That is, perceptions vary according to expectations which may depend on gender of the child. Discipline problems may arise when certain behaviors and abilities perceived in the child are unacceptable to the adult, and this may vary according to gender of child.

Disciplining is usually considered an instrumental role of males. Feminine females may perceive disciplining as outside their role as mothers and, therefore, difficult. As well, the characteristics of femininity are somewhat contrary to those necessary for the task of disciplining, a father role. That is, role seems to be the critical factor in self-perceptions.

Mothers have higher masculinity scores who rate able to love both as most/more surprising compared to less/least surprising if they have two boys compared to older girl (Table 12). Differences can be noted for all of sub-family units A (two boys, two girls, older boy, older girl), B (two girls and older girl, two boys and older boy) and E (any girls, two boys) (Tables 12 and 13). The presence of boys and the surprise of being able to love both influence masculinity scores of mothers. This suggests that a first

born boy may be perceived by mothers high in masculinity to never be equalled in receiving love, but when another child arrives, there is great surprise at being able to love it as much as the first. That femininity scores are not influenced suggests that loving children is an expectation of females and as their role, femininity scores are not impacted as are masculinity scores.

Definition of the situation regarding gender of children is a critical factor in self-perception, congruent with symbolic interaction theory. If mother defines the situation as being able to love both children because they are of a particular gender and it is their role to love both, she will not be surprised that she does love both.

Only mothers are influenced by relationship variables interacting with gender of children, suggesting that mothers are involved with their children more than are fathers. It also suggests relationship issues are the domain of mothers, and as part of their role as females, tend to influence them to a greater degree than fathers. These findings again suggest the Bem Sex Role Inventory may be measuring roles and not just masculinity and femininity of males and females.

Interaction Effects: Fathers

One would expect relationship variables in interaction with gender of children to influence self-perceptions of

masculinity and femininity of persons involved with the children.

Findings and Explanation. There are no interaction effects for any of the five relationship variables and gender composition of children on mean masculinity or femininity scores of fathers (Table 15, P. 94).

A possible explanation is that fathers see the role of mothers, and not themselves, to be the caretakers of the children, providing more time for interaction with children with mothers. Fathers tend to interact with children less than do mothers, so any possible influence of gender and relationship variables on self-perceptions of masculinity and femininity is less likely for fathers, if time in interaction is a factor. It seems interaction is, indeed, important in revision of one's definition of one's characteristics for fathers at least.

For example, fathers are expected to discipline children in interaction and their masculinity characteristics are congruent with this role. Therefore, it is not surprising that gender of children does not influence masculinity scores of fathers, most of whom are masculine anyway. Nor would one expect masculinity scores of mothers to be impacted for the same reason. What may be surprising is that femininity scores of fathers are not impacted. This may be because characteristics associated with male gender and role of father override any influence from other

sources.

According to symbolic interaction theory, a parent will define his/her roles in terms of a generalized other through which he/she assesses and directs him/her self. The meanings a parents attach to particular role expectations determines the social acts of the parent as the parent and child adjust to each other and take the other into account. This taking of the other into account involves gender and affects interaction. Interaction in the family enables its members to acquire shared understanding of role expectations in particular situations defined as including such factors as position, gender and sex role orientation. One acts and reacts to the gender of the other on the basis of the meaning each has of both him/her self and of the other. Cultural expectations help define how each person perceives him/her self and influences self-concept. Sex role orientation is dependent on these cultural expectations as one interacts with family members and society.

Implications

Fathers appear to play the traditional role of non-involvement with home issues and not spend time interacting with their children. If fathers are to be impacted by relationship factors and their children, they need to increase participation in parent-child interaction. This is not to say they are not interested in or influenced by the

children. They may well be, but their instrumental role does not traditionally incorporate family relationship issues. The mutual concern of the parents for the family but lack of involvement of the father means fathers continue to get satisfaction from outside the family, and mothers will nurture members and get satisfaction from the family circle.

Mothers are impacted mainly by the presence of girls in many different sub-family units. The different degrees of influence between sons and daughters on mothers and fathers could become problematic for parents. Problems could increase as the child becomes older with a greater likelihood that he/she will influence parental self-perceptions should cross gender self-definitions become apparent. This could be more problematic for mothers than for fathers as mothers appear to be more susceptible to influence than are fathers when gender and another variable is involved in interaction with other people.

Main Effects: Mothers

Relationship factors may be considered part of the expressive role of females. Therefore, as might be expected, for mothers, relationship variables exert main effects on only mean femininity scores. Again, discussion of main effects will be brief as they bear on sex role orientation but do not involve gender.

Findings and Explanations. Femininity scores of mothers are enhanced for those who perceive the time needed for two children and discipline problems as more difficult compared to less difficult, for being able to love both as less surprising compared to more surprising, and for those who had grandparents help with the second child (Table 15, P.94).

Part of a mother's role is primary caretaker in these families and she would, therefore, be acutely aware of the time required for care. Mothers who perceive discipline problems as difficult and define themselves as more feminine may perceive their feminine characteristics, such as caring, as incongruent with the action of disciplining. Also, dealing with discipline problems are her husband's role, not hers. To love both children is no surprise as that is what society expects of mothers, and they may perceive themselves as more feminine in return. These findings support the literature that says those who participate in activities regarded as feminine perceive themselves as more feminine (Abrahams, Feldman & Nash, 1978).

Many feminine characteristics denote a sense of helplessness or dependency. Thus, those mothers who seem helpless may unwittingly solicit grandparents' help and get it and, in return, perceive themselves as more feminine.

Relationship factors influence femininity scores of mothers because relationship issues, as noted by symbolic

interaction, are within the role domain of females. If they are to have an influence at all, it would be expected to be on femininity, supporting the literature contending one's masculinity and femininity is influenced by involvement in masculine and feminine activities and behaviors (Abrahams, Feldman & Nash, 1978).

Main Effects: Fathers

Unlike mothers whose self-perceptions of femininity only are influenced, there are main effects for relationship variables on both mean masculinity and femininity scores of fathers. Interestingly, discipline problems and able to love both children influence self-perceptions of both mothers and fathers. The third variable, increased fulfillment, although influencing fathers only, influences both masculinity and femininity scores of fathers (Table 15, p. 94).

Findings and Explanations. Mean masculinity scores of fathers are enhanced for those rating discipline problems as less difficult compared to more difficult, and for those rating increased fulfillment with the second child as less enjoyable compared to more enjoyable. Complementing the latter finding, mean femininity scores are enhanced for fathers rating increased fulfillment as more enjoyable compared to less enjoyable. Mean femininity scores are also enhanced for fathers rating able to love both children as

more surprising compared to less surprising.

Handling discipline problems is considered a function of being a father in Western culture. As fathers define discipline as a man's job, they define themselves as being more masculine in that role, consistent with the literature (Abrahams, Feldman & Nash, 1978).

While mothers may find enjoyment from fulfillment within the family, fathers may get more enjoyment from fulfillment outside the family such as in work. Thus, fulfillment through interaction and enjoyment within the family, considered stereotypically feminine, would impact femininity scores and less enjoyment would impact masculinity scores for fathers.

Those fathers who find being able to love both "surprising" appear to perceive themselves as more feminine than do those who do not find this surprising. Fathers are not expected to be nurturing, and their roles may not indicate they are expected to love both children equally. This finding is supported in the literature contending one re-defines one's self as masculine or feminine influenced by situational demands of masculine and feminine behavior (Abrahams, Feldman & Nash, 1980).

Implications

Fathers may find enjoyment from fulfillment outside the family. Those who become involved with their children

appear to be more likely to experience enhanced femininity, and fathers who do not become involved with their children may perceive themselves to be more masculine. Are perceptions of masculinity interfering with parent-child interaction?

Future Research

In conclusion, the following suggestions are offered for consideration in future research.

1) Study Replication. A suggestion is to repeat the study using a new questionnaire which looks at other factors such as attitudes toward women (for example, protectiveness of daughters), involvement in gender-appropriate activities with the children (play activities, sports such as hockey with boys), self-esteem, parenting sty and values and beliefs (socialization of children into gender-appropriate behavior). These results, hopefully, should reveal, both separately and collectively, the direct influence of gender of children on sex role orientation of parents.

Methodological changes that could be incorporated into a new study would include a random sample and a larger number of families. The Bem inventory could be used again as well as another instrument to measure masculinity and femininity.

2) Longitudinal Study. The research results indicate no influence of gender on differences in the mean

masculinity and femininity scores for fathers or mothers. The author interprets these findings to most likely reflect the current stages of family development in which there are pre-school children. To either confirm or reject this interpretation, a longitudinal study is required spanning several years and covering children of early school age and adolescent stages of family development.

3) Androgynous Study. Another interpretation of findings suggests female offspring appear to play a significant role in influencing the development of androgyny in parents. Future research must consider the impact of females on family interactions and on self-perceptions of family members to determine if females offspring are the key to parents' androgynous development, and if the process continues in later stages of family life development.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abrahams, B., Feldman, S.S. & Nash, S.C. (1978). Sex role self-concept and sex role attitudes: Enduring personality characteristics or adaptations to changing life situations? Developmental Psychology, 14, 393-400.

Adams, W.J. (1983). A Study of Intact Two-Children Families (Parental Perspectives). Unpublished questionnaire.

Adams, W.J. (1985). The missing triad: The case of two-child families. Family Process, 24, 409-413.

Ahammer, I. M. (1973). Social-learning theory as a framework for the study of adult personality development. In P.B. Baltes & K.W. Schaie (Eds.), Life-span developmental psychology: Personality and socialization (pp.253-284). N.Y.: Academic Press.

Antill, J.K. (1983). Sex role complementarity versus similarity in married couples. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45, 145-155.

Atkinson, J, (1987). Gender roles in marriage and the family: A critique of some proposals. Journal of Family Issues, 8, 5-41.

Atkinson, J. & Huston, T.L. (1984). Sex role orientation and division of labour early in marriage. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46, 330-345.

Baber, K.M. & Dreyer, A.S. (1986). Gender-role orientations in older child-free and expectant couples. Sex Roles, 14, 501-512.

Barnett, R.C. (1981). Parental sex-role attitudes and child-rearing values. Sex Roles, 7, 837-845.

Bassoff, E.S. (1984). Relationships of sex-role characteristics and psychological adjustment in new mothers. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 46, 449-454.

Bates, J.E. (1976). Effects of children's nonverbal behavior upon adults. Child Development,47, 1079-1088.

Baumrind, D. (1982). Are androgynous individuals more effective persons and parents? Child Development, 53, 44-75.

Bell, R.Q. (1968). A reinterpretation of the direction of effects in studies of socialization. Psychological Review, 75, 81-95.

Bell, R.Q. (1971). Stimulus control of parent or caretaker behavior by offspring. Developmental Psychology, 4, 63-72.

Bell, G.C. & Schaffer, K.F. (1984). The effects of psychological androgyny on attributions of causality for success and failure. Sex Roles, 11, 1045-1055.

Belsky, J. (1984). Early human experience - a family perspective. In D.H. Olson and B.C. Miller (Eds.), Family studies review yearbook (Vol.2), (pp.233-254). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Belsky, J. & Isabella, R.A. (1985). Marital and parent-child relationships in family of origin and marital change following the birth of a baby: A retrospective analysis. Child Development, 56, 342-349.

Belsky, J., Lang, M. & Huston, T.L. (1986). Sex typing and division of labor as determinants of marital change across the transition to parenthood. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50, 517-522.

Belsky, J., Taylor, D.J. & Rovine, M. (1984). The Pennsylvania infant and family development project,11: The development of reciprocal interaction in the mother-infant dyad. Child Development, 55, 706-717.

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

Bem, S.L. (1975). Sex role adaptability: One consequence of psychological androgyny. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31, 634-643.

Bem, S.L. (1977). Beyond androgyny: Some presumptuous prescriptions for a liberated sexual ider[illegible]. In C. Carney & S. McMalton (Eds.), Exploring c[illegible]orary male and female roles: A facilitator's guide[illegible]29). La Jolla, Ca.: University Associates.

Bem, S.L. (1978). The Bem Sex-Role Invento[illegible]o, Ca: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

Bem, S.L. & Lenney, E. (1976). Sex typing a[illegible]idance of cross-sex behavior. Journal of Persona[illegible] Social Psychology, 33, 48-53.

Bengtson, V.L. & Troll, L. (1978). Youth and their parents: Feedback and intergenerational influence on socialization. In R.M. Lerner & G.B. Spanier (Eds.), Child influences on marital and family interaction: A life-span perspective (pp.215-240). N.Y.: Academic Press.

Bird, G.W., Bird, G.A. & Scruggs, M. (1984). Determinants of family task sharing: A study of husbands and wives. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 46, 345-355.

Block, J.H. (1973) Conceptions of sex role - some cross-cultural and longitudinal perspectives. American Psychologist, 28, 512-526.

Blumer, H. (1969). Symbolic interaction: Perspective and method. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Publishing Co.

Bowen, M. (1978). Family therapy in clinical practice. New York: Aronson.

Brim, O.G. & Kagan, J. (1980). Constancy and change: A view of the issues. In O.G. Brim, Jr. & J. Kagan (Eds.), Constancy and change in human development. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Brody, L. & Axelrod. S. (1974). Mothers, fathers and children. New York: International Universities Press.

Bugen, L.A. & Humonick, S.S. (1983). Instrumentality, expressiveness and gender effects upon parent-infant interaction. Basic and Applied Psychology, 4, 239-251.

Burgess, E.W. (1974). The family and the person. In D.J. Bogue (Ed.). The basic writings of Ernest W. Burgess, (pp. 150-155). Chicago: University of Chicago.

Burr, W.R., Leigh, G.K., Day, R. & Constantine, J. (1976). Symbolic interaction/role theory and the family. Paper prepared for the NCFR Theory Construction Workshop, October 19, 1976. New York City.

Buss, D.M. (1981). Predicting parent-child interactions from children's activity level. Developmental Psychology, 17, 59-65.

Bussey, K. & Perry, D.G. (1982). Same-sex imitation: The avoidance of cross-sex models or the acceptance of same-sex models? Sex Roles, 8, 773-784.

Cantor, N.L. & Gelfand, D.M. (1977). Effects of responsiveness and sex of children on adults' behavior. Child Development, 48, 232-238.

Carter, D.B. (1985). Relationships between cognitive flexibility and sex-role orientation in young adults. Psychological Reports, 57, 763-766.

Charon, J.M. (1985). Symbolic interactionism (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Chenitz, W.C. & Swanson, J. M. (1986). Qualitative research using grounded theory. In W.C. Chenitz & J.M. Swanson (Eds.). From practice to grounded theory: Qualitative research in nursing (p.3-15). California: Addison-Wesley.

Condry, J.C. (1984). Gender identity and social competence. Sex Roles, 11, 485-511.

Coutts, J.S. (1987). Masculinity-femininity of self-concepts: Its effect on the achievement behavior of women. Sex Roles, 16, 9-18.

Davis, A.J. & Hathaway, B.K. (1982). Reciprocity in parent-child verbal interactions. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 140, 169-183.

Deaux, K. (1984). From individual differences to social categories - analysis of a decade's research on gender. American Psychologist, 39, 105-116.

DeFrain, J. (1979). Androgynous parents tell who they are and what they need. The Family Coordinator, 28, 237-243.

Drake, C.T. & McDougall, D. (1977). Effects of the absence of a father and other male models on the development of boys' sex roles. Developmental Psychology, 13, 537-538.

Dyer, E.D.(1963), Parenthood as crisis: A re-study. Marriage and Family Living, 25, 196-201.

Emmerich, W. (1973). Socialization and sex-role development. In P.B.Baltes & K. Schaie (Eds.), Life-span developmental psychology: Personality and socialization,(pp.123-144). N.Y.: Academic Press.

Fagot, B.I. (1974). Sex differences in toddlers' behavior and parental reaction. Developmental Psychology 10, 554-558.

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

Fagot, B.I. (1978). The influence of sex of child on parental reactions to toddler children. Child Development, 49, 459-465.

Feldman, S.S., Biringen, Z.C. & Nash, S.C. (1981). Fluctuations of sex-related self-attributions as a function of stage of family life cycle. Developmental Psychology, 17, 24-35.

Ganong, L.H. & Coleman, M. (1987). Effects of children on parental sex-role orientation. Journal of Family Issues, 8, 278-290.

Gerber, G.L. & Balkin, J. (1977). Sex-role stereotypes as a function of marital status and role. Journal of Psychology, 95, 9-16.

Glazer, C.A. & [illegible]k, J.B. (1985). The relationship between sex-role orientation and resolution of Eriksonian developmental crises. Sex Roles, 13, 653-661.

Gold, D. & Andres, D. (1978). Relations between maternal employment and development of nursery school children. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 10, 116-129.

Hall, J.A. & Halberstadt, A.G. (1980). Masculinity and femininity in children: Development of the children's Personal Attributes Questionnaire. Developmental Psychology, 16, 270-280.

Hare-Mustin, R.T. (1987). The problem of gender in family therapy theory. Family Process, 26, 15-27.

Harriman, L.C. (1983). Personal and marital changes accompanying parenthood. Family Relations, 32, 387-394.

Hartup, W.W. (1978). Perspectives on child and family interaction: Past, present and future. In R.M. Lerner & G.B. Spanier (Eds.), Child Influence on Marital and Family Interaction: A Life-Span Perspective, (pp.23-46). N.Y.: Academic Press.

Hartup, W.W. & Lempers, J. (1973). A problem in life-span development: The interactional analysis of family attachments. In P.B. Baltes & K.W. Schaie (Eds.), Life-span developmental psychology: Personality and socialization, pp. 235-252. N.Y.: Academic Press.

Havighurst, R.J. (1973). History of developmental psychology: Socialization and personality development through the life span. In P.B. Baltes & K.W. Schaie (Eds.), Life-span developmental psychology: Personality and socialization (pp.3-24). N.Y.: Academic Press.

Heilbrun, A.B. (1976). Identification with the father and sex-role development of the daughter. The Family Coordinator, 25, 411-416.

Heilbrun, A.B. (1978). An exploration of antecedents and attributes of androgynous and undifferentiated sex roles. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 132, 97-107.

Heilbrun, A.B. & Schwartz, H.L. (1982). Sex-gender differences in level of androgyny. Sex Roles, 8, 201-214.

Helmreich, R.L., Spence, J.T. & Holahan, C.K. (1979). Psychological androgyny and sex role flexibility: A test of two hypotheses. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1631-1644.

Hendrix, L. & Johnson, G.D. (1985). Instrumental and expressive socialization: A false dichotomy. Sex Roles, 13, 581-595.

Hill, R. (1981). Theories and research design linking family behavior and child development: A critical overview. Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 12, 1-18.

Hollingshead, A.B. (1957). Two factor index of social position, A.B. Hollingshead, New Haven, Connecticut (mimeo.).

Hott, J. (1976). The crisis of expectant fatherhood. American Journal of Nursing, 76, 1440-1442.

Huston, A.C. (1983). Sex-typing. In P.H. Mussen & E.M. Hetherington (Eds.), Handbook of child psychology, Vol.4, Socialization, personality, and social development (4th edition), (pp.387-467). N.Y.: John Wiley & Sons.

Huston, A.C. & Carpenter, C.J. (1985). Gender-related differences in social interaction: The influence of adults. In L.C. Wilkinson & C.B. Marret (Eds.), Gender influence in classroom interaction (pp. 143-165). N.Y.: Academic Press.

Kagan, I. (1964). Acquisition and significance of sex typing and sex role identity. In M.L. Martin & L.W. Hoffman (Eds.), Review of Child Development Research, 1, pp. 137-167). N.Y.: Russell Sage Foundation.

Keller, B.B. & Bell, R.Q. (1979). Child effects on adults' method of eliciting altruistic behavior. Child Development, 50, 1004-1009.

Keller, H. & Scholmerich, A. (1987). Infant vocalizations and reactions during the first four months of life. Developmental Psychology, 23, 62-67.

Kelly, J.A. & Worell, L. (1976). Parent behaviors related to masculine, feminine and androgynous sex role orientations. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 44, 843-851.

Kendrick, C. & Dunn, J. (1984). Caring for a second baby - effects on interaction between mother and firstborn. In D.H. Olson & B.C. Miller (Eds.) Family studies review yearbook (Vol. 2) (pp. 263-272). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Kimmel, D.C. (1979). Relationship initiation and development: A life-span developmental approach. In R.L. Burgess & T.L. Huston (Eds.), Social exchange in developing relationships (pp. 351-377). N.Y. Academic Press.

Klein, D.M., Jorgensen, S.R. & Miller, B.C. (1978). Research in developmental reciprocity in families. In R.M. Lerner & G.B. Spanier (Eds.), Child influences on marital and family interaction: A life-span perspective (pp.107-135). N.Y.: Academic Press.

Knox, D. & Wilson, K. (1978). The difference between having one and two children. Family Coordinator, 27, 23-25.

Kuhn, D., Nash, S.C. & Brucken, L. (1978). Sex role concepts of two- and three-year-olds. Child Development, 49, 445-451.

Lamb, M.E. (1977a). The development of parental preferences in the first two years of life. Sex Roles, 3, 495-497.

Lamb, M. (1977b). Father-infant and mother-infant interaction in the first year of life. Developmental Psychology, 13, 637-648.

Lamb, M.E. (1978). Influence of the child on marital quality and family interaction during the prenatal, perinatal, and infancy periods. In R.M. Lerner & G.B. Spanier (Eds.), Child influences on marital and family interaction: A life-span perspective (pp.137-163). N.Y. Academic Press.

Lamb, M. & Easterbrooks, M. (1981). Individual differences in parental sensitivity: Some thoughts about origins, components, and consequences. In M. Lamb & L. Sherrod (Eds.), Infant social cognition: Empirical and theoretical considerations (pp. 127-153). Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.

Lamke, L.K. & Filsinger, E.E. (1983). Parental antecedents of sex role orientation. Adolescence, 18, 429-432.

Lansky, L.M. (1964). The family structure also affects the model: Sex-role identification in parents of preschool children. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Behavior and Development, 10, 39-50.

LeMasters, E.E. (1957). Parenthood as crisis. Marriage and Family Living, 19, 352-355.

Lerner, R.M. & Spanier, G.B. (1973). A dynamic interactional view of child and family development. In R.M. Lerner & G.B. Spanier (Eds.), Child influences on marital and family interaction: A life-span perspective (pp.1-22). N.Y.: Academic Press.

Lewis, M. & Feiring, C. (1978). The child's social world. In R.M. Lerner & G.B. Spanier (Eds.), Child influences on marital and family interaction: A Life-span perspective (pp.47-69). N.Y.: Academic Press.

Liddell, C., Henzi, S.P. & Drew, M. (1987). Mothers, fathers, and children in an urban park playground: A comparison of dyads and triads. Developmental Psychology, 23, 262-266.

Lueptow, L.B. (1985). Conceptions of femininity and masculinity: 1974-1983. Psychological Reports, 57, 859-862.

Lynn, D.B. (1976). Fathers and sex role development. The Family Coordinator, 25, 404-409.

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

Maccoby, E.E. & Martin, J.M. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In P.H. Mussen & E.M. Hetherington (Eds.), Handbook of child psychology, Vol.4, Socialization, personality and social development, 4th ed., N.Y.: Wiley.

McAdams, D.P., Jackson, R.J. & Kirshnit, C. (1984). Looking, laughing, and smiling in dyads as a function of intimacy motivation and reciprocity. Journal of Personality, 52, 261-273.

McBroom, W.H. (1984). Changes in sex-role orientation: A five- year longitudinal comparison. Sex Roles, 11, 583-592.

McHale, S.M. & Huston, T.L. (1984). Men and women as parents: Sex role orientations, employment and parental roles with infants. Child Development, 55, 1349-1361.

Miller, B. & Sollie, D. (1980). Normal stresses during the transition to parenthood. Family Relations, 29, 459-465.

Mitchell, C.L. (1987). Relationship of femininity, masculinity, and gender to attribution of responsibility. Sex Roles, 16, 151-164.

Nye, F.I. & Berardo, F.M. (1973a). The socialization of children. In The family: Its structure and interaction, (pp. 373-404). N.Y.: The Macmillan Company.

Nye, F.I. & Berardo, F.M. (1973b). Structural perspective: Social class and the family. In The family: Its structure and interaction (pp. 54-70). N.Y.: The Macmillan Company.

O'Brien, M. & Huston, A.C. (1985). Activity level and sex-stereotyped toy choice in toddler boys and girls. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 146, 527-533.

Orlofsky, J.L. & O'Heron, C.A. (1987). Stereotypic and nonstereotypic sex role trait and behavior orientations: Implications for personal adjustment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52, 1034-1042.

Orlofsky, J.L. & Windle, M.T. (1978). Sex-role orientation, behavioral adaptability and personal adjustment. Sex Roles, 4, 801-811.

Osofsky, J.D. & O'Connell, E.J. (1972). Parent-child interaction: Daughters' effects upon mothers' and fathers' behaviors. Developmental Psychology, 7, 157-168.

Patterson, J.M. & McCubbin, H.I. (1984). Gender roles and coping. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 46, 95-104.

Pedersen, D.M. & Bond, B.L. (1985). Shifts in sex-role after a decade of cultural change. Psychological Reports, 57, 43-48.

Peterson, G.W., Rollins, B.C., Thomas, D.L., & Heaps, L.K. (1984) Social placement of adolescents. In D.H. Olson & B.C. Miller (Eds.) Family studies review yearbook (Vol. 2) (pp. 385-396). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Power, T.G. & Parke, R.D. (1986). Patterns of early socialization: Mother- and father-infant interaction in the home. International Journal of Behavioral Development, 9, 331-341.

Richardson, L.W. (1981). The dynamics of gender (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton Miffin Co.

Robinson, B.E. (1979). Men caring for the young: an androgynous perspective. The Family Coordinator, 28, 553-560.

Roopnarine, J.L. (1986). Mothers' and fathers' behaviors toward the toy play of their infant sons and daughters. Sex Roles, 14, 59-68.

Rosenberg, B.G. & Sutton-Smith, B. (1968). Family interaction effects on masculinity-femininity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 8, 117-120.

Rosenberg, B.G. & Sutton-Smith, B. (1971). Sec-role identity and sibling composition. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 118, 29-32.

Rossi, A.S. (1984). Gender and parenthood. American Sociological Review, 49, 1-19.

Rubin, J.Z., Provenzano, F.J. & Luria, Z. (1976). The eye of the beholder: Parents' views on sex of newborns. In A.G. Kaplan & J.P. Bean (Eds.), Beyond sex-role stereotypes: Readings toward a psychology of androgyny (pp.179-186). Boston: Little, Brown & Co.

Russell, C. (1974). Transition to parenthood: Problems and gratifications. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 36, 294-300.

Russell, G. (1978). The father role and its relation to masculinity, femininity and androgyny. Child Development, 49, 1174-1181.

Schvaneveldt, J.D. (1981). The interactional framework in the study of the family. In F.I. Nye & F.M. Berardo (Eds.), Emerging conceptual frameworks in family analysis (pp. 97-129). N.Y.: The Macmillan Co.

Seavey, C.A., Katz, P.A. & Zalk, S.R. (1975). Baby X: The effect of gender labels on adult responses to infants. Sex Roles, 1, 103-109.

Smith, P.K. & Daglish, L. (1977). Sex differences in parent and infant behavior in the home. Child Development, 48, 1250-1254.

Smith, M.D. & Fischer, L.J. (1982). Sex-role attitudes and social class: A reanalysis and clarification. Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 13, 77-88.

Snow, M.E., Jacklin, C.N. & Maccoby, E.E. (1983). Sex-of-child differences in father-child interaction at one year of age. Child Development, 54, 227-232.

Spence, J.T. (1982). Comments on Baumrind's "Are androgynous individuals more effective persons and parents?" Child Development, 53, 76-80.

Spence, J.T. & Helmreich, R.L. (1978). Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates and antecedents (pp 19-43, 49-72). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Spence, J.T., Helmreich, R.L. & Holahan, C.K. (1979). Negative and positive components of psychological masculinity and femininity and their relationships to self-reports of neurotic and acting-out behaviors. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1673-1682.

Spence, J.T., Helmreich, R. & Stapp, J. (1975). Ratings of self and peers on sex role attributes and their relation to self-esteem and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32, 29-39.

SPSSx User's Guide. (1983). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Stern, D.N. (1974). Mother and infant at play: the dyadic interaction involving facial, vocal and gaze behaviors. In M. Lewis & L.A. Rosenblum (Eds.) The effect of the infant on its caregiver (pp. 187-213). New York: Wiley.

Straus, M.A. (1967). The influence of sex of child and social class on instrumental and expressive family roles in a laboratory setting. Sociology and Social Research, 52, 7-21.

Stryker, S. (1968). Identity salience and role performance: The relevance of symbolic interaction theory for family research. Marriage and Family Living, 30, 558-564.

Stryker, S. (1972). Symbolic interaction theory: A review and some suggestions for comparative family research. Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 3 , 17-32.

Terman, L.M. & Miles, C.C. (1936). Sex and personality. N.Y.: McGraw-Hill.

Urberg, K.A. (1982). The development of concepts of masculinity and femininity in young children. Sex Roles, 8, 659-668.

Waldron, H. & Routh, D.K. (1981). The effect of the first child on the marital relationship. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 43, 785-788.

Weinraub, M., Clemens, L.P., Sockloff, A., Ethridge, T., Gracely, E. & Myers, B. (1984). The development of sex role stereotypes in the third year: Relationships to gender labeling, gender identity, sex-typed toy preferences, and family characteristics. Child Development, 55, 1493-1503.

Yanico, B.J. (1985). BSRI scores: Stability over four years for college women. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 9, 277-283.

Yarrow, M.R., Waxler, C.Z. . cott, P.M. (1971). Child effects on adult behavior, Developmental Psychology, 5, 300-311.

Yelsma, P. & Brown, C.T. (1985). Gender roles, biological sex, and predisposition to conflict management. Sex Roles, 12, 731-748.

APPENDIX A

	Page
Letter of introduction	127
Introduction via telephone	128
Informed consent	129

Pages 127-148 Inclusive have been removed
due to copyright restrictions.

APPENDIX C

Page

Bem Sex Role Inventory 150

APPENDIX D

Page

Tables for Sociological Variables 152

APPENDIX D

Table D-1

Age of First Child

Age (years)*	N	%	Cum.%
2	1	1.4	1.4
3	11	15.7	17.1
4	25	35.7	52.8
5	22	31.4	84.3
6	5	7.1	91.4
7	4	5.7	97.1
8	2	2.9	100.
	N=70		

*Age according to mother's report.

Table D-2

Age of Second Child

Age (years)*	N	%	Cum.%
1	4	5.7	5.7
2	64	91.4	97.1
3	2	2.9	100.
	N=70		

*Age according to mother's report.

Table D-3

Age Difference Between First and Second Child

Age Difference (years)*	N	%	Cum.%
1	9	12.9	12.9
2	37	52.9	65.7
3	15	21.4	87.1
4	3	4.3	91.4
Other	6	8.6	100.
	N=70		

* Age difference according to mother's report.

Table D-4

Gender Composition of Children (two boys, two girls, older boy, older girl).

Category	N	%	Cum.%
Two boys	12	17.1	17.1
Two girls	19	27.1	44.3
Older boy, younger girl	17	24.3	68.6
Older girl, younger boy	22	31.4	100.
	N=70		

Table D-5

Gender Composition of Children (two girls and older girl, two boys and older boy).

Category	N	%	Cum.%
Two girls, older girl	41	59	59
Two boys, older boy	29	41	100.
	N= 70		

Table D-6

Gender Composition of Children (two boys, two girls, mixed).

Category	N	%	Cum.%
Two boys	12	17	17
Two girls	19	27	44
Mixed	39	56	100
	N=70		

Table D-7

Gender Composition of Children (any boys, two girls).

Category	N	%	Cum.%
Any boys	51	73	73
Two girls	19	27	100
	N=70		

Table D-8

Gender Composition of Children (any girls, two boys).

Category	N	%	Cum.%
Any girls	58	83	83
Two boys	12	17	100
	N=70		

Table D-9

Ages of Parents

	Fathers			Mothers		
Age	N	%	Cum. %	N	%	Cum. %
21 - 24	1	1.4	1.4	3	4.3	4.3
25 - 28	7	10.0	11.4	14	20.0	24.3
29 - 32	32	45.7	57.1	36	51.4	75.7
33 - 36	22	31.5	88.6	13	18.6	94.3
37 - 40	5	7.2	95.8	4	5.7	100.
41 - 43	3	4.2	100.	0		
	N=70			N=70		

Table D-10

Years Married of Couples From Two-Child Families

Years Married	Frequency	Percent	Cum. Percent
3 - 5	6	8.6	8.6
6 - 8	32	45.7	54.3
9 - 11	22	31.4	85.7
12 - 14	7	10.0	95.7
15 - 17	3	4.3	10
	N=70		

Table D-11

Education Levels of Parents

	Fathers			Mothers		
Education	N	%	Cum.%	N	%	Cum.%
Grad. prof. training	8	11.4	11.4	2	2.9	2.9
College, univ. grad.	14	20.0	31.4	14	20.0	22.9
Partial college/univ.	13	18.6	50.0	16	22.8	45.7
High school grad.	24	34.3	84.3	31	44.3	90.0
Partial high school	9	12.8	97.1	7	10.0	100.
Junior high school	2	2.9	100.	0		
	N=70			N=70		

Table D-12

Employment Status of Parents

	Fathers			Mothers		
Employment	N	%	Cum.%	N	%	Cum.%
Full time	66	94.3	94.3	10	14.3	14.3
Part time	1	1.4	95.7	25	35.7	50.0
Laid off	3	4.3	100.	0		50.0
Maternity leave	0			0		50.0
Other	0			35	50.0	100.
	N=70			N=70		

Table D-13

Socioeconomic Status of Parents

	Fathers			Mothers		
Social Class	N	%	Cum.%	N	%	Cum.%
Upper	5	7.1	7.1	1	1.4	1.4
Upper-middle	12	17.1	24.3	15	21.4	22.9
Middle	20	28.6	52.9	27	38.6	61.4
Lower middle	29	41.4	94.3	27	38.6	100.
Lower	4	5.7	100.	0		
	N=70			N=70		

Table D-14

Income of Parents

	Fathers			Mothers		
Income	N	%	Cum.%	N	%	Cum.%
None	1	1.4	1.4	32	45.7	45.7
Less than $10,000	2	2.9	4.3	22	31.4	77.1
$10,000-$14,999	1	1.4	5.7	5	7.1	84.3
$15,000-$19,999	5	7.1	12.9	2	2.9	87.1
$20,000-$24,999	6	8.6	21.4	3	4.3	91.4
$25,000-$29,999	12	17.1	38.6	3	4.3	95.7
$30,000-$34,999	11	15.7	54.3	2	2.9	98.6
$35,000-$39,999	12	17.1	71.4	1	1.4	100.
$40,000-$49,999	11	15.7	87.1	0		
$50,000 or more	9	12.9	100.	0		
	N=70			N=70		

Table D-15

Occupations of Parents

	Fathers			Mothers		
Occupation	N	%	Cum.%	N	%	Cum.%
Exec./major prof.	5	7.1	7.1	1	1.4	1.4
Bus. Mgrs./Prop.	12	17.1	24.3	16	22.9	24.3
Sm.Bus./Minor prof.	10	14.3	38.6	24	34.3	58.6
Clerical/Sales	21	30.0	68.6	26	37.1	95.7
Skilled Manual	13	18.6	87.1	0		
Semi-skilled	9	12.9	100.	3	4.3	100.0
	N=70			N=70		

Table D-16

Religion of Parents

	Fathers			Mothers		
Religion	N	%	Cum.%	N	%	Cum.%
Catholic	22	31.4	31.4	24	34.3	34.3
Protestant	36	51.4	82.8	38	54.3	88.6
Jewish	2	2.9	85.7	2	2.9	91.5
Other	10	14.3	100.	6	8.5	100.
	N=70			N=70		

Table D-17

Church Attendance of Parents

	Fathers			Mothers		
Attendance	N	%	Cum.%	N	%	Cum.%
Daily	0			0		
Several times/week	1	1.4	1.4	0		
Once/week	7	10.1	11.5	16	22.9	22.9
Every 2-3 weeks	6	8.7	20.2	9	12.9	35.7
Monthly	3	4.3	24.5	4	5.7	41.4
Rarely	39	56.5	81.	33	47.1	88.6
Never	13	18.8	99.8	8	11.4	100.
	N=69			N=70		

APPENDIX E

	Page
Tables for Relationship Variables	161

APPENDIX E

Table E-1

Difficulty of Time Needed for Two Children Evaluated by Fathers and Mothers.

	Fathers			Mothers		
Category	N	%	Cum.%	N	%	Cum.%
Most	29	41.4	41.4	36	51.4	51.4
	16	22.9	64.3	14	20.	71.4
	7	10.	74.3	10	14.3	85.7
	15	21.4	95.7	2	2.9	88.6
Least	3	4.3	100.	8	11.4	100.
	N=70			N=70		

Table E-2

Difficulty of Stress of Parenting Evaluated by Fathers and Mothers.

	Fathers			Mothers		
Category	N	%	Cum.%	N	%	Cum.%
Most	11	15.9	15.9	6	8.6	8.6
	19	27.1	42.9	26	37.1	45.8
	16	22.9	65.7	17	24.3	70.
	13	18.6	84.3	13	18.6	88.6
Least	11	15.7	100.	8	11.4	100.
	N=70			N=70		

Table E-3

Difficulty of Discipline Problems Evaluated by Fathers and Mothers.

	Fathers			Mothers		
Category	N	%	Cum.%	N	%	Cum.%
Most	9	12.9	12.9	7	10.	10.
	16	22.9	35.7	13	18.6	28.6
	24	34.3	70.	25	35.7	64.3
	14	20.	90.	15	21.4	85.7
Least	7	10.	100.	10	14.3	100.
	N=70			N=70		

Table E-4

Enjoyment of More Fulfillment of Fathers and Mothers as Second Time Parents.

	Fathers			Mothers		
Category	N	%	Cum.%	N	%	Cum.%
Most	5	7.1	7.1	6	8.6	8.6
	9	12.9	20.	9	12.9	21.4
	14	20.	40.	18	25.7	47.1
	23	32.9	72.9	16	22.9	70.
Least	19	27.1	100.	21	30.	100.
	N=70			N=70		

Table E-5

Surprise of Being Able to Love Both Children Evaluated by Fathers and Mothers.

	Fathers			Mothers		
Category	N	%	Cum.%	N	%	Cum.%
Most	9	12.9	12.9	14	20.	20.
	6	8.6	21.4	7	10.	30.
	11	15.7	37.1	5	7.1	37.1
Least	44	62.9	100.	44	62.9	100.
	N=70			N=70		

Table E-6

Surprise that Both Children Require Much Time Evaluated by Fathers and Mothers.

	Fathers			Mothers		
Category	N	%	Cum.%	N	%	Cum.%
Most	4	5.7	5.7	5	8.6	8.6
	17	24.3	30.	16	22.9	31.5
	35	50.	80.	36	51.4	82.9
Least	14	20.	100.	12	17.1	100.
	N=70			N=70		

Table E-7

Effectiveness as a Parent: Evaluation of Self by Fathers and Mothers.

	Fathers			Mothers		
Category	N	%	Cum.%	N	%	Cum.%
Very poor	0			0		
Poor	0			0		
Fair	9	12.9	12.9	8	11.4	11.4
Good	49	70.	82.9	45	64.3	75.7
Very good	12	17.1	100.	17	24.3	100.
	N=70			N=70		

Table E-8

Parents of Fathers and Mothers Help With Care of Second Child as Evaluated by Fathers and Mothers.

	Fathers			Mothers		
Category	N	%	Cum.%	N	%	Cum.%
Yes	33	47.1	47.1	43	61.4	61.4
No	23	32.9	80.	17	24.3	85.7
Unavailable	14	20.	100.	10	14.3	100.
	N=70			N=70		

APPENDIX F

Page

Summary Tables of Mean Masculinity and Femininity Scores of Mothers and Fathers 166

APPENDIX F

Table F-1

Summary of Fathers' and Mothers' Mean Masculinity and Femininity Scores for Sub-family Units A in the Two-Child Family

BSRI Classification	BSRI means for Sub-family Units A			
	Two boys N=12	Two girls N=19	Older boy N=17	Older girl N=22
Fathers'				
Masculinity	4.80	5.17	5.03	5.16
Femininity	4.50	4.45	4.48	4.49
Mothers'				
Masculinity	4.19	4.46	4.16	4.27
Femininity	5.18	5.17	5.18	5,07

Table F-2

Summary of Fathers' and Mothers' Mean Masculinity and Femininity Scores for Sub-family Units B in the Two-Child Family

BSRI Classification	BSRI means for Sub-family Units B	
	Two girls and older girl N=41	Two boys and older boy N=29
Fathers'		
Masculinity	5.16	4.93
Femininity	4.46	4.48
Mothers'		
Masculinity	4.36	4.17
Femininity	5.12	5.19

Table F-3

Summary of Fathers' and Mothers' Mean Masculinity and Femininity Scores for Sub-family Units C in the Two-Child Family

BSRI Classification	BSRI means for Sub-family Units C		
	Two boys N=12	Two girls N=19	Mixed N=39
Fathers'			
Masculinity	4.80	5.16	5.10
Femininity	4.50	4.45	4.48
Mothers'			
Masculinity	4.19	4.44	4.42
Femininity	5.18	5.17	5.12

Table F-4

Summary of Fathers' and Mothers' Mean Masculinity and Femininity Scores for Sub-family Units D in the Two-Child Family

BSRI Classification	BSRI means for Sub-family Units D	
	Any boys N=61	Two girls N=19
Fathers'		
Masculinity	5.03	5.16
Femininity	4.47	4.44
Mothers'		
Masculinity	4.21	4.45
Femininity	5.13	5.17

Table F-5

Summary of Fathers' and Mothers' Mean Masculinity and Femininity Scores for Sub-family Units E in the Two-Child Family

BSRI Classification	BSRI means for Sub-family Units E	
	Any girls N=58	Any boys N=12
Fathers'		
Masculinity	5.12	4.78
Femininity	4.47	4.50
Mothers'		
Masculinity	4.29	4.18
Femininity	5.13	5.18

APPENDIX G

	Page
Results of Student-Newman-Keuls Analyses	170

APPENDIX G

Table G-1

Student-Newman-Keuls Results for Interaction Effect for Church Attendance and for Gender Composition of Children^ on Mean Femininity Scores of Fathers

Mean	Group^	3	6	8	1	5	7	2	4
4.24	A 3								
4.27	6								
4.32	8								
4.37	1								
4.53	5								
4.55	7								
4.83	2								
5.09	4		*	*					

^A: 1,5 = two boys: 2,6 = two girls: 3,7 = older boy; 4,8 = older girl.

Table G-2

Student-Newman-Keuls Results for Interaction Effect for Church Attendance and for Gender Composition of Children^ on Mean Femininity Scores of Fathers

Mean	Group^	2	3	4	1
4.29	B 2				
4.28	3				
4.54	4				
4.95	1	*	*	*	*

^B = two girls and older girl, two boys and older boy.

Table G-3

Student-Newman-Keuls Results for Interaction Effect for Occupation and for Gender Composition of Children^ on Mean Masculinity Scores of Mothers

Mean	Group^	3	2	4	1
3.93	B 3				
4.04	2				
4.33	4				
4.63	1	*	*		

		4	3	1	2
3.85	D 4				
4.20	3				
4.23	1				
4.81	2	*			

^ B = two girls and older girl, two boys and older boy
D = any boys, two girls

Table G-4

Student-Newman-Keuls Results for Interaction Effect for Education and for Gender Composition of Children^ on Mean Masculinity Scores of Mothers

Mean	Group^	2	3	4	1
4.03	B 2				
4.04	3				
4.24	4				
4.62	1				

^ B = two girls and older girl, two boys and older boy

Table G-5

Student-Newman-Keuls Results for Interaction Effect for Age of Older Child and for Gender Composition of Children^ on Mean Masculinity Scores of M t

Mean	Group^	*	1	2	3
3.99	B 4				
4.10	1				
4.34	2				
4.54	3				

^ B = two girls and older girl, two boys and older boy

Table G-6

Student-Newman-Keuls Results for Interaction Effect for Able to Love Both and for Gender Composition of Children^ on Mean Masculinity Scores of Mothers

Mean	Group^	4	1	3	2
3.89	B 4				
4.10	1				
4.49	3	*			
4.57	2	*			

		4	1	3	2
3.81	E 4				
4.22	1				
4.34	3				
4.71	2	*			

^ B = two girls and older girl, two boys and older boy
E = any girls, two boys

Table G-7

Student-Newman-Keuls Results for Interaction Effect for Discipline Problems and for Gender Composition of Children^ on Mean Masculinity Scores of Mothers

Mean	Group^	4	5	6	3	2	1
4.76	C 4						
5.07	5						
5.09	6						
5.14	3						
5.22	2						
5.49	1	*					

		4	3	1	2
4.76	E 4				
5.08	3				
5.17	1				
5.49	2	*			

^ C = two boys, two girls, mixed
E = any girls, two boys

APPENDIX H

Page

Tables of Non-significant Findings for Sociological and Relationship Variables 175

Table H-1

Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Gender Composition of Children and Mothers' and Fathers' Mean Masculinity and Femininity Scores in the Two Child Family

BSRI Class.	Between Groups^ ss	ms	Within Groups^^ ss	ms	f	sig f
Fathers'						
Masc.	1.2432	0.4144	34.3738	0.5208	0.7957	0.5006
Fem.	0.0298	0.0099	18.7329	0.2838	0.0350	0.9911
Mothers'						
Masc.	0.9416	0.3139	37.4444	0.5673	0.5532	0.6478
Fem.	0.1771	0.0590	12 0545	0.1826	0.3232	0.8086

^ df = 3
^^df = 66

Table H-2

Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Gender Composition of Children and Mothers' Mean Masculinity and Femininity Scores Over Fathers' Mean Masculinity and Femininity Scores in the Two-Child Family

Sources of Variance	ss^	ms^	f	sig f
Masculinity				
Mother/father x Gender Groups	0.409	0.136	0.251	0.861
Femininity				
Mother/father x Gender Groups	0.123	0.041	0.176	0.913

^df = 3

Table H-3

Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Sociological Independent Variables and Mothers' Mean Masculinity Scores (main effects)

Sources of Variance	Group	Means	df	ms	f	sig f
Main effects						
Occupation						
prof.	1	4.40				
			1	1.254	2.535	0.116
non-prof.	2	4.11				
Education						
post-sec.	1	4.44				
			1	1.222	2.284	0.136
no post-sec.	2	4.14				
Church attendance						
1/month/more	1	4.42				
			1	0.667	1.189	0.280
less 1/month	2	4.18				
Years married						
8 years/less	1	4.31				
			1	0.139	0.234	0.630
9 years/more	2	4.24				

Table H-4

Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Sociological Independent Variables and Mothers' Mean Femininity Scores (main effects)

Sources of Variance	Group	Means	df	ms	f	sigf
Main effects						
Occupation						
prof.	1	5.12	1	0.063	0.347	0.558
non-prof.	2	5.18				
Education						
post-sec.	1	5.10	1	0.116	0.615	0.436
no post-sec.	2	5.19				
Church attendance						
1/month/more	1	5.07	1	0.260	1.438	0.235
less 1/month	2	5.20				
Years married						
8 years/less	1	5.13	1	0.036	0.196	0.660
9 years/more	2	5.17				

Table H-5

Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Sociological Independent Variables, Gender Composition of Children and Fathers' Mean Masculinity Scores (interaction effect)

Sources of Variance	Group^	Mean	df	ms	f	sigf
2-Way Interactions						
Occupation Gender	1-1	5.10	3	0.502	1.033	0.384
1=professional	1-2	5.77				
2=non-professional	1-3	5.24				
	1-4	5.21				
	2-1	4.66				
	2-2	4.88				
	2-3	4.91				
	2-4	5.11				
Education Gender	1-1	5.09	3	0.415	0.853	0.470
1=post-secondary	1-2	5.62				
2=no post-secondary	1-3	5.12				
	1-4	5.23				
	2-1	4.52				
	2-2	4.83				
	2-3	4.98				
	2-4	5.02				
Church attendance, Gender	1-1	5.10	3	0.422	0.795	0.501
1=1/month or more	1-2	5.02				
1=less than 1/month	1-3	5.42				
	1-4	5.09				
	2-1	4.74				
	2-2	5.23				
	2-3	4.91				
	2-4	5.24				
Years married, Gender	1-1	4.58	3	0.520	1.047	0.378
1=8 years or less	1-2	5.39				
2=9 years or more	1-3	5.12				
	1-4	5.45				
	2-1	4.92				
	2-2	4.92				
	2-3	4.87				
	2-4	4.82				

^ sociological variable and sub-family units A of 1=two boys, 2= two girls, 3= older boy, 4= older girl.

Table H-6

Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Sociological Independent Variables, Gender Composition of Children and Mothers' Mean Femininity Scores (interaction effects)

Sources of Variance	Group^	Means	df	ms	f	sig f
2-Way Interactions						
Occupation Gender	1-1	5.32	3	0.243	1.340	0.269
1=professional	1-2	5.32				
2=non-professional	1-3	5.16				
	1-4	5.05				
	2-1	5.04				
	2-2	5.19				
	2-3	5.40				
	2-4	5.11				
Education Gender	1-1	5.18	3	0.073	0.385	0.764
1=post-secondary	1-2	5.20				
2=no post-sec.	1-3	5.03				
	1-4	5.00				
	2-1	5.19				
	2-2	5.14				
	2-3	5.25				
	2-4	5.16				
Church attendance, Gender	1-1	5.32	3	0.201	1.112	0.351
1=1/month or more	1-2	5.13				
2=less than 1/mon.	1-3	5.12				
	1-4	4.88				
	2-1	5.11				
	2-2	5.21				
	2-3	5.22				
	2-4	5.23				
Years married, Gender	1-1	5.05	3	0.242	1.328	0.273
1=8 years or less	1-2	5.09				
2=9 years or more	1-3	5.30				
	1-4	5.03				
	2-1	5.32				
	2-2	5.26				
	2-3	4.98				
	2-4	5.11				

^ demographic variable and sub-family units A of 1=two boys, 2= two girls, 3= older boy, 4= older girl.

Table H-7

Results of Unweighted Means Analysis for Age Independent Variables and Fathers' Mean Masculinity Scores (main effect)

Sources of Variance	Group	Means	df	ms	f	sig f
Main effects						
Age difference (children)						
1 or 2 years	1	4.98	1	1.028	1.901	0.173
3,4 years, other	2	5.22				
Age of older child						
2, 3 or 4 years	1	4.94	1	1.429	2.705	0.105
5 years or more	2	5.23				
Age of father						
31 years or less	1	5.13	1	0.442	0.817	0.370
32 years or more	2	5.02				

Table H-8

Results of Unweighted Means Analysis for Age Independent Variables and Fathers' Mean Femininity Scores (main effect)

Sources of Variance	Group	Means	df	ms	f	sig f
Main effects						
Age difference						
1 or 2 years	1	4.50	1	0.091	0.309	0.580
3,4 years, other	2	4.43				
Age of older child						
2, 3 or 4 years	1	4.53	1	0.197	0.665	0.418
5 years or more	2	4.42				
Age of father						
31 years or less	1	4.39	1	0.540	2.028	0.159
32 years or more	2	4.55				

Table H-9

Results of Unweighted Means Analysis for Age Independent Variables and Mothers' Mean Masculinity Scores (main effects)

Sources of Variance	Group	Mean	df	ms	f	sig f
Main effects						
Age difference (children)						
1 or 2 years	1	4.34				
			1	0.360	0.617	0.435
3,4 years, other	2	4.17				
Age of older child						
2, 3 or 4 years	1	4.25				
			1	0.025	0.044	0.834
5 years or more	2	4.31				
Age of mother						
29 years or less	1	4.21				
			1	0.357	0.622	0.433
30 years or more	2	4.34				

Table H-10

Results of Unweighted Means Analysis for Age Independent Variables and Mothers' Mean Femininity Scores (main effects)

Sources of Variance	Group	Mean	df	ms	f	sig f
Main effects						
Age difference (children)						
1 or 2 years	1	5.15				
			1	0.360	0.617	0.435
3,4 years, other	2	5.14				
Age of older child						
2, 3 or 4 years	1	5.20				
			1	0.280	1.582	0.213
5 years of more	2	5.09				
Age of mother						
29 years or less	1	5.11				
			1	0.034	0.178	0.675
30 years or more	2	5.18				

Table H-11

Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Age Independent Variable, Gender Composition of Children and Mothers' Mean Masculinity Scores (interaction effects)

Sources of Variance	Group^	Mean	df	ms	f	sig f
2-Way Interaction						
Age difference,						
Gender	1-1	4.44	3	0.310	0.532	0.662
1=1 or 2 years	1-2	4.40				
2=3,4 years, other	1-3	4.28				
	1-4	4.28				
	2-1	3.93				
	2-2	4.57				
	2-3	3.98				
	2-4	4.23				
Age of older child,						
Gender	1-1	4.31	3	0.828	1.470	0.231
	1-2	4.41				
1=2,3 or 4 years	1-3	4.36				
2=5 or more	1-4	4.07				
	2-1	4.01				
	2-2	4.49				
	2-3	3.98				
	2-4	4.62				
Age of mother,						
Gender	1-1	3.74	3	0.509	0.888	0.453
1=29 years or less	1-2	4.52				
2=30 years or more	1-3	4.18				
	1-4	4.21				
	2-1	4.50				
	2-2	4.41				
	2-3	4.15				
	2-4	4.37				

^ demographic variable and sub-family units A of 1=two boys, 2= two girls, 3= older boy, 4= older girl.

Table H-12

Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Age Independent Variables, Gender Composition of Children and Mothers' Mean Femininity Scores (interaction effects)

Sources of Variance	Group^	Mean	df	ms	f	sig f
2-Way Interactions						
Age difference,						
Gender	1-1	5.11	3	0.206	1.119	0.348
1=1 or 2 years	1-2	5.11				
2=3,4 years, other	1-3	5.22				
	1-4	5.14				
	2-1	5.26				
	2-2	5.30				
	2-3	5.14				
	2-4	4.83				
Age of older child,						
Gender	1-1	5.08	3	0.264	1.491	0.226
	1-2	5.19				
1=2,3 or 4 years	1-3	5.30				
2=5 or more	1-4	5.21				
	2-1	5.33				
	2-2	5.16				
	2-3	5.09				
	2-4	4.84				
Age of mother,						
Gender	1-1	5.09	3	0.022	0.115	0.951
1=29 years or less	1-2	5.13				
2=30 years or more	1-3	5.21				
	1-4	5.07				
	2-1	5.25				
	2-2	5.20				
	2-3	5.18				
	2-4	5.08				

^ demographic variable and sub-family units A of 1=two boys, 2= two girls, 3= older boy, 4= older girl.

Table H-13

Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Age Independent Variables, Gender Composition of Children and Fathers' Mean Masculinity Scores (interaction effects)

Sources of Variance	Group^	Means	df	ms	f	sig f
2-Way Interactions						
Age difference, Gender 1=1 or 2 years 2=3,4 years, other	1-1	4.71	3	0.028	0.051	0.985
	1-2	5.07				
	1-3	4.97				
	1-4	5.05				
	2-1	4.93				
	2-2	5.38				
	2-3	5.11				
	2-4	5.36				
Age of older child, Gender 1=2,3 or 4 years 2=5 or more	1-1	4.68	3	0.061	0.116	0.951
	1-2	5.08				
	1-3	4.89				
	1-4	5.01				
	2-1	4.98				
	2-2	5.23				
	2-3	5.18				
	2-4	5.43				
Age of father, Gender 1=31 years or less 2=32 years or more	1-1	4.81	3	0.122	0.225	0.879
	1-2	5.15				
	1-3	5.18				
	1-4	5.33				
	2-1	4.79				
	2-2	5.17				
	2-3	4.92				
	2-4	5.02				

^ demographic variable and sub-family units A of 1=two boys, 2= two girls, 3= older boy, 4= older girl.

Table H-14

Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Age Independent Variables, Gender Composition of Children and Fathers' Mean Femininity Scores (interaction effects)

Sources of Variance	Group	Mean	df	ms	f	sig f
2-Way Interactions						
Age difference, Gender 1=1 or 2 years 2=3,4 years, other	1-1	4.53	3	0.150	0.512	0.675
	1-2	4.46				
	1-3	4.41				
	1-4	4.59				
	2-1	4.47				
	2-2	4.41				
	2-3	4.57				
	2-4	4.31				
Age of older child, Gender 1=2,3 or 4 years 2=5 or more	1-1	4.57	3	0.044	0.150	0.929
	1-2	4.52				
	1-3	4.46				
	1-4	4.56				
	2-1	4.41				
	2-2	4.40				
	2-3	4.50				
	2-4	4.37				
Age of father, Gender 1=31 years or less 2=32 years or more	1-1	4.52	3	0.559	2.098	0.110
	1-2	4.28				
	1-3	4.63				
	1-4	4.19				
	2-1	4.47				
	2-2	4.54				
	2-3	4.37				
	2-4	4.74				

^ demographic variable and sub-family units A of 1=two boys, 2= two girls, 3= older boy, 4= older girl.

Table H-15

Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Relationship Independent Variables and Mothers' Mean Masculinity Scores (main effects)

Sources of Variance	Group	Means	df	ms	f	sig f
Main effects						
Time needed for two						
most difficult	1	4.36				
			1	0.292	0.511	0.477
least difficult	2	4.20				
Discipline Problems						
most/more difficult	1	4.24				
			1	0.286	0.494	0.485
less/least difficult	2	4.35				
Fulfillment						
most/more enjoyable	1	4.22				
			1	0.141	0.242	0.624
less/least enjoyable	2	4.33				
Able to love both						
most/more surprising	1	4.32				
			1	0.053	0.108	0.743
least surprising	2	4.26				
Grandparents' help						
do help	1	4.31				
			1	0.031	0.052	0.821
do not he	2	4.26				

Table H-16

Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Relationship Independent Variables, Gender Composition of Children and Mothers' Mean Femininity Scores (interaction effects)

Sources of Variance	Group^	Means	df	ms	f	sig f
2-Way Interaction						
Time needed Gender	1-1	5.40	3	0.257	1.627	0.192
1=most difficult	1-2	5.35				
2=less difficult	1-3	5.11				
	1-4	5.22				
	2-1	4.97				
	2-2	4.92				
	2-3	5.22				
	2-4	4.82				
Discipline problems,	1-1	5.49	3	0.357	2.149	0.103
Gender	1-2	5.22				
1=most/more difficult	1-3	5.25				
2=less/least diff.	1-4	5.06				
	2-1	4.76				
	2-2	5.07				
	2-3	5.09				
	2-4	5.09				
Fulfillment Gender	1-1	5.00	3	0.231	1.262	0.295
1=most/more enjoyable	1-2	5.18				
2=less/least enjoy.	1-3	5.28				
	1-4	5.16				
	2-1	5.37				
	2-2	5.17				
	2-3	5.09				
	2-4	4.99				
Able to love both,	1-1	4.96	3	0.146	0.878	0.457
Gender	1-2	5.01				
1=most/more	1-3	5.16				
surprising	1-4	4.72				
2=least surprising	2-1	5.34				
	2-2	5.29				
	2-3	5.20				
	2-4	5.20				
Grandparents' help,	1-1	5.21	3	0.118	0.691	0.561
Gender	1-2	5.34				
1=do help	1-3	5.35				
2=do not help	1-4	5.15				
	2-1	5.12				
	2-2	4.89				
	2-3	4.93				
	2-4	4.98				

^ relationship variable and sub-family units A of 1=two boys, 2= two girls, 3= older boy, 4= older girl.

Table H-17

Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Relationship Independent Variables, Gender Composition of Children, and Fathers' Mean Masculinity Scores (interaction effects)

Sources of Variance	Group^	Means	df	ms	f	sigf
2-Way Interaction						
Time for two,	1-1	4.94	3	0.238	0.453	0.716
Gender	1-2	5.26				
1=most difficult	1-3	4.96				
	1-4	5.44				
2=less/least diff.	2-1	4.74				
	2-2	5.03				
	2-3	5.05				
	2-4	4.93				
Discipline problems,	1-1	4.77	3	0.175	0.345	0.793
Gender	1-2	5.06				
1=most/more difficult	1-3	4.96				
	1-4	4.92				
2=less/least diff.	2-1	4.92				
	2-2	5.40				
	2-3	5.25				
	2-4	5.58				
Fulfillment, Gender	1-1	4.77	3	0.255	0.502	0.682
1=most/more surprising	1-2	5.06				
	1-3	4.64				
2=less/least surprising	1-4	4.81				
	2-1	4.83				
	2-2	5.26				
	2-3	5.15				
	2-4	5.41				
Able to love,	1-1	4.82	3	0.094	0.173	0.914
Gender	1-2	4.89				
1=most/more surprising	1-3	4.91				
	1-4	5.00				
2=least surprising	2-1	4.75				
	2-2	5.26				
	2-3	5.14				
	2-4	5.20				
Grandparents' help,	1-1	4.67	3	0.301	0.585	0.627
Gender	1-2	4.70				
1=do help	1-3	4.76				
2=do not help	1-4	5.16				
	2-1	5.20				
	2-2	5.25				
	2-3	5.27				
	2-4	5.17				

^ demographic variable and sub-family units A of 1=two boys, 2= two girls, 3= older boy, 4= older girl.

Table H-18

Results of Unweighted Means Analysis of Relationship Independent Variables, Gender Composition of Children, and Fathers' Mean Femininity Scores (interaction effects)

Sources of Variance	Group^	Means	df	ms	f	sig f
2-Way Interaction						
Time for two,	1-1	4.94	3	0.191	0.664	0.577
Gender	1-2	5.26				
1=most difficult	1-3	4.96				
2=less/least diff.	1-4	5.44				
	2-1	4.74				
	2-2	5.03				
	2-3	5.05				
	2-4	4.93				
Discipline problems,	1-1	4.39	3	0.333	1.222	0.309
Gender	1-2	4.32				
1=most/more difficult	1-3	4.38				
	1-4	4.53				
2=less/least diff.	2-1	4.85				
	2-2	4.72				
	2-3	4.81				
	2-4	4.41				
Fulfillment, Gender	1-1	4.64	3	0.147	0.533	0.661
1=most/more enjoyable	1-2	4.48				
	1-3	4.62				
2=less/least enjoy.	1-4	4.77				
	2-1	4.37				
	2-2	4.41				
	2-3	4.43				
	2-4	4.29				
Able to love,	1-1	4.58	3	0.135	0.513	0.674
Gender	1-2	4.59				
1=most/more surprising	1-3	4.73				
	1-4	4.74				
2=least surprising	2-1	3.98				
	2-2	4.39				
	2-3	4.26				
	2-4	4.43				
Grandparents' help,	1-1	4.57	3	0.145	0.492	0.689
Gender	1-2	4.40				
1=do help	1-3	4.58				
2=do not help	1-4	4.43				
	2-1	4.30				
	2-2	4.45				
	2-3	4.39				
	2-4	4.58				

^ demographic variable and sub-family units A of 1=two boys, 2= two girls, 3= older boy, 4= older girl